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Maar al te licht is men geneigd, het gezag daar te zoeken, waar men het krachtens zijn ervaring altijd gevonden meent te hebben. Men wil desnoods toegeven, dat het (oude) gezag enkele lacunes vertoont, maar er is een zekere hardheid des gemoeds voor nodig om de diagnose van ‘voorsheid’ of ten slotte ‘ijlheid’ of ‘vervluchting’ te kunnen stellen. De gezagsverhouding in de zin van de bovengenoemde definitie is immers zonder een zekere mate van eerbied, waardering, verering of, zo men wil, liefde moeilijk denkbaar. Maar het is juist dat eerwaardige karakter van het gezag, dat hen, die onder zijn bekoring zijn gekomen, zo vaak de ogen doet sluiten voor symptomen van verzwakking of decadentie. De mee-dogenloze constatering: „zo is het” wordt onwillekeurig verdrongen door een wishful thinking: „zo behoort het te zijn”.

Kloeke 1951:1
BACKGROUND
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 PREAMBLE

The 1980s British television series Blackadder Goes Forth is situated in the trenches of the West Front of World War I. This series features characters who seem unaware of each other’s worlds. Three of them in particular seem far removed from mutual understanding, resulting in the comic situations that are the basis of the storyline. Private Baldrick, first of all, is an ordinary soldier with a simple sense of reasoning (and serious body odour). The character with the highest military ranking in the series, General Melchett, seems oblivious to the realities of combat and sees the war as a playful neighbourly competition. Captain Blackadder, finally, is the most clearheaded of the three and is mainly concerned with avoiding a confrontation with enemy gunfire and with making the best of the situation.

The smelly soldier speaks broad Cockney English, the aloof general speaks posh English, and the captain speaks Standard English. The Cockney speaker uses short sentences - often unfinished, incoherent, or ambiguous. The posh speaker uses high-flown and redundant language, abounding in cultured words and phrases that lack content. The Standard English speaker, if necessary, acts as an intermediary between the broad and posh speakers, who fail to understand much of each other’s language and logic. The posh speaker bullies the Standard English speaker, who in turn takes it out on the Cockney speaker. With winged phrases and metaphorical constructions, the Standard English speaker eloquently puts the speakers of both broad and posh English in their place, who for their part are not aware of being mocked bluntly. The speakers with a variety that deviates from the linguistic norm are thus ridiculed. These three characters are, furthermore, typified by a specific military ranking (low, high, or intermediate) and an accompanying stereotypical pattern of behaviour. The language of these characters reflects the three-way social division of language varieties in England.

The popularity of the Blackadder series in the Netherlands suggests that the Dutch audience can relate to the above combinations of social class, behaviour, and a language variety. Such an appreciation suggests the existence of a comparable set of stereotypes in the Netherlands, as well as a sense of linguistic norms amongst the Dutch.

1.2 STANDARD DUTCH

Van Haeringen (1951:317) was convinced that there is indeed a strong awareness of an unspoken linguistic ideal in the Netherlands. Laymen generally feel that there is a linguistic norm in the Netherlands, a standard language. Amongst linguists and other professionals, the notion of linguistic unity as a reality exists as well. Geerts (1987:165) pointed out that many different conceptions exist in Dutch society about the existence of the standard language but that these are all based on convictions rather than knowledge.
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Early on in the Dutch standardisation process, many considered standardised Dutch to be real. In the 17th Century already, Van Heule (1625) presumed the existence of a unitarian written language, with individual uses. In the 20th Century - three hundred years of standardisation later - similar remarks were heard. To De Vooys (1914, 1938), Van Haeringen (1924a:66, 1951:319-320, 1954), and Paardekooper (1966), Standard Dutch was a reality. The norm, Van Haeringen (1951:320) claimed, allows flexibility, while the limits are generally known. Hellinga (1938:349) suggested that the general civilised spoken language in the Netherlands is an ideal turned into a reality. He said that this reality seems to have escaped from the original ideal, yet he pointed out that this reality would not be what it is if it had not been for this ideal.

Other writers, for instance De Vries (1987:128-129), felt that the standard language exists but cannot be considered an actual language or a tangible reality. Overdiep (1949:8-17) and Kloeki (1951:43) also considered the standard language to be an abstraction, merely a guideline that indicates how the language may be used, existing ‘above’ a realistic level. Goossens (1974:12) felt that the standard variety remains but an idealisation derived from the collection of substandards, and De Vries (1980:224-225) made a similar comment and even considered one supra-regional variety of Dutch simply unrealistic. Geerts (1987:165) summed up the apparent elusiveness of Standard Dutch by indicating that the Dutch standard language exists like the Dutchman exists. Geerts said that we cannot meet him but that he is there, in some way or other.

The existence of Standard Dutch also shows in the successful efforts to codify and record a unified language. The most authoritative and established Dutch dictionary is Van Dale’s Groot Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal (‘Extensive Dictionary of the Dutch Language’), the first edition of which was printed in 1872. It is today a dictionary of a relatively normative nature, based on historical evidence of the standardisation of approximately the last century. This dictionary and the Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst (ANS; ‘General Grammar of Dutch for Specific Purposes’) together constitute a description of the basic structure and elements of contemporary written Dutch.

Dutch may already be at the furthest possible stage of standardisation and may not become more homogenous than it currently is. There is now widespread agreement on the written standard language in the Netherlands, although disagreement remains on the comprehensibility of certain spelling rules. An example is the use of ‘linking n’ between compound members, for which a satisfactory solution (which is at the same time easy to master) has as yet proven difficult to put into practice. Pronunciation is relatively fixed, despite the existence of a number of vowels and consonants that are subject to change and inter-speaker variation. Instances of these are the vowels (ei) and (ou) and the consonants (r) and (g). Furthermore, reduction and assimilation changes are taking place.

1 Parentheses in this dissertation denote pronunciation variables. Between the parentheses are the written notations. Exceptions are (g), which may occur as g or ch, (ei), which may occur as ei or ij, and (ou), which may occur as ou or au.
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The standard language discussed in this dissertation is Northern Standard Dutch. In Flanders, Southern Standard Dutch is spoken. The histories of these two varieties are closely related. This study is restricted to northern Dutch because this area has its own language norm. Southern Dutch and the language situation in Flanders do play an important role in those parts where the mutual effects of the northern and southern language and culture are relevant.

1.3 THEMES: STANDARDNESS & PRONUNCIATION

This dissertation appeals to the obvious interest in the linguistic norm in the Netherlands. The standard language was the point of departure. Besides that, a specific aspect of the standard language was looked at. The reason to describe pronunciation, rather than another aspect of Standard Dutch, is that pronunciation has turned out to be a particularly important determiner of the degree of standardness of language. The literature and our research show this convincingly. So, standardness and pronunciation are the main themes. They are approached complementarily in this dissertation. Pronunciation is a main point of attention in the chapters on standardness, and standardness is the underlying theme in the phonetic chapters.

In language, ‘standard’ can be defined as ‘meeting the most dominant linguistic norm within a speech community’. Standardness can be viewed as an absolute or a continuous entity. In the absolute view, a language is either standard or non-standard; it either meets the criteria of standardness, or it does not. In the continuous approach, a language variety has a degree of standardness, a degree to which that variety meets the linguistic norm.

Pronunciation refers to the way vowels and consonants are realised by speakers. Besides that, suprasegmental (prosodic) features determine a person’s pronunciation, and the awareness of the importance of this class of features has in recent decades grown. Connected-speech phenomena are another aspect of pronunciation. The first serious pronunciation-variation research dates from the 20th Century. The interest in this aspect of language took off in that century, amongst others in the Netherlands. In recent decades, the scientific interest in Dutch pronunciation has grown. According to De Vries (1980), phonetic variation has been given the greatest focus in research concerning the Dutch standard language. Pronunciation is also one of the more popular topics of discussion amongst non-linguists, who generally do not distinguish between segmental and suprasegmental pronunciation features. Complete pronunciation homogeneity in groups of speakers is impossible, but a high degree of standardness in pronunciation within large communities (usually countries) has in the last few centuries become a reality.

Pronunciation and standardisation are closely linked in the Netherlands. The degree of standardness of a language depends largely on subtle pronunciation characteristics. In those instances where, for instance, lexical and grammatical variation is not obvious or occurs less frequently, intra- or inter-speaker pronunciation variation will always still be noticeable across utterances. The slightest pronunciation variation can lead to variation in standardness evaluations.
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Defining Standard Dutch

If the standard language indeed exists, then the question arises as to how this phenomenon should be defined. Over the ages, various approaches to defining Standard Dutch have come and gone, under the influence of changing times and new insights, and the present time has its own set of approaches too. Looking at research in which the standard language is defined, two basic sources of a definition appear. First of all, there are the intuitions and observations by laymen. Secondly, there are the intuitions and observations of linguists or other experts. The first source (lay intuitions and observations) is increasingly used as a source, while in the past, personal intuitions and observations were the main source of inspiration for experts.

In the mid 17th Century, the influential Dutch literary writer Van den Vondel (1650:6-7) spoke of a ‘general’ language, ‘cleared of bastard words’. This was an early example of a description of a linguistic norm. His contemporary Nyloë (1703:1) took the same approach, in which ‘bastard words’ referred to words transported from a foreign language into Dutch. This approach takes the purity of the standard language as a point of departure. Today, this foreign borrowing is still a point of debate, but it is not usually used as an argument to define standardness anymore.

Kloeke (1951:26) took a broader approach and said that the civilised language is a form of expression of the ‘complete’ cultural human being, and that in order to tackle this phenomenon we should consult - besides history and linguistics - psychology, sociology, statistics, and perhaps also genetics. This is in line with Heeroma (1964, 1968:140), who believed that, for the definition of language, language structure and language type should not be the primary focus but, rather, language point of view, language will, language imagination, and language myth. Hoenigswald (1966:20) felt that we should be interested not only in what goes on (language), but also in how people react to what goes on (they are persuaded, they are put off, etc.), and in what people say goes on (talk concerning language).

Obviously, various approaches towards defining the standard language can be taken, and these are not always mutually exclusive. Stewart (1968:533-539), for instance, gave four general characteristics of the standard language: vitality, historicity, autonomy, and standardisation. A standard language, according to Stewart, requires vitality, meaning that it is widely used in society, and historicity refers to its well-documented tradition. Autonomy refers to a genetic independence from other languages, meaning that the language in question must be able to exist without depending on other languages for its development. Standardisation, finally, is the codification and acceptance of a language. Steward thus uses sociolinguistic, historical, and linguistic arguments in his approach. Haugen (1966) took a different approach and defined the standard language on the basis of stages: selection, codification, elaboration, and acceptance. If a language has gone through these stages, then it is a fully-fledged standard language. Descriptions of standard languages typically contain such simultaneous references to various types of argumentations, some of which are more salient in people’s minds than others.
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The literature contains many types of definitions of Standard Dutch. Contemporary experts tend to take living norms as their point of departure. The norm is the state that is deemed ‘normal’ by a certain category of people and on which they can focus. Jansen (1985:159) described norms as mutual expectations that have become strong to such an extent that deviations are corrected. Norms are an entity that changes with time, and such a changing entity will never be clear, Daan (1983:479-480) indicated. Moreover, popular norms and those used by linguists do not run parallel (Van der Kolk 1992). In the present research, it is assumed that in those cases where listeners and respondents independently agreed on something, this agreement is the reflection of an existing norm. An extensive description of norms regarding Standard Dutch and its pronunciation that is explicitly derived from empirical data, rather than general observation, does not exist. The present research is such an empirical description, revealing lay beliefs and evaluations, and it compares these with what linguists have so far observed and found.

Lay evaluations and beliefs are thus the basis of our description. Evaluations are intuitive reactions to speech stimuli, and beliefs are cognitive conceptions of - in our case - (aspects of) language. Beliefs are preconceived ideas or stereotypes, which are already present in the respondent’s mind and are usually induced by a survey, while evaluative descriptions are induced by a listening experiment. The speech of known and less known speakers is used as material. Unknown speakers’ speech can be assumed to evoke relatively objective evaluations, while the names of well-known speakers can - in addition - be assumed to evoke existing beliefs.

1.4 SPEECH EVALUATION

Speech evaluation is used successfully in sociolinguistics to understand the position and role of language varieties in speech communities. Members of social groups often agree, sometimes even to a high degree, in their negative and positive feelings towards language varieties, and they even largely agree on the beauty and other subjective qualities of particular linguistic features. Even linguists have been known to harbour views towards certain varieties. Van Haeringen (1924b), for instance, referred to the speech from the southern Dutch Limburg area as “something like a strange accent”. Today, writers occasionally still express their biased feelings towards language varieties (Daan 1983:478, Van Bree 1983), and their evaluations are also variable. Stroop (1992:180), for instance, felt that his norms had changed over time, considering the speech by radio presenters in the 1960s stiff and almost posh now, whereas he did not feel like that in the 1960s.

The standard language, like any other variety, is subject to specific evaluative reactions. Any language variety is subject to social rules, but in the standard language these rules seem to carry special strength and importance. Jansen (1985:159) believed that norms regarding the standard language are in fact more explicit than those relating to dialects (without being stronger). Much of the research described in the following chapters is evaluation research. Evaluation research is usually set in motion by the casual observation that within some definable speech
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community there are types of language varieties and types of listener evaluations. Several approaches to research are an option after this observation.

Many approaches have been taken in language evaluation, for instance sampling evaluations of different languages (Lambert, Hodgson, Gardner & Fillenbaum 1960) and of different varieties of the same language (Tucker & Lambert 1969). Several such research techniques can be applied in language-evaluation research. Questionnaires (usually in combination with speech recordings) are used to obtain evaluations on speech and speakers. A tool that is most commonly used in combination with recordings is the semantic differential scale. It was developed by Osgood (1957), amongst others. This scale is used to evaluate speech on different semantic dimensions, for instance ‘ugly’/’beautiful’ or ‘uneducated’/’educated’. Ideas about speakers of particular languages can be tested through Lambert’s (1967) well-known matched-guise technique. In this test, one bilingual speaker speaks the same text in two languages. Respondents are then asked to evaluate the two fragments and answer questions about the personality of ‘each’ speaker. To test ideas on speakers of certain varieties, Labov’s Subjective Reaction Test (1966) can be applied. In this test, different speakers read a text; respondents are asked to allocate a profession to the speakers. To test the relationship between language evaluations and actual speech behaviour, Labov (1972) also developed the Self Evaluation Test and the Linguistic Insecurity Test. In both tests, respondents compare speech they hear with their own speech. Besides these ‘standard’ procedures, a variety of other evaluative techniques exist, and these are usually a combination of the most commonly used techniques. For the present research, semantic differential scales were used to evaluate speech fragments.

1.5 RESEARCH INTO STANDARD DUTCH AND ITS PRONUNCIATION

The standard language in the Netherlands and its pronunciation have in the past been subjected more to casual debate than actual research. The available amount of empirical data on these two topics does not seem to reflect the high degree of interest they enjoy. Pronunciation variation has in the last few decades been subjected to serious research, but the standard pronunciation has not received any widespread empirical attention. Furthermore, Standard Dutch as a phenomenon has received relatively little empirical attention.

The first wave of writings on Standard Dutch and its pronunciation in the 16th Century was of an explorative nature, and these writings were never based on any extensive empirical research. Writers most usually ventilated their personal intuitions and observations, indicating who in their view spoke Standard Dutch and they presented their ideas on the acceptability of specific pronunciation phenomena, talking. They talked in terms of ‘civilised’ and ‘not civilised’ and used these to categorise speakers and pronunciation features. These writers were not linguists as such but, rather, personally or professionally concerned about the state of Dutch.

The second wave of attention was in the 19th Century. According to Hagen (1989, 1999:17), the 19th Century attribution of excellence to Dutch was by no means less zealous than that of the 16th Century. The writings of both periods were
mainly explorative and suggestive. The second-wave writings, however, aimed more at the endorsement of realism. In this second wave, literature again arose presenting preferences for certain linguistic forms over others, although the motivations had changed. It was a transitional period, in which the first serious signs of interest in living language use appeared — and the resultant endorsement of natural speech — as opposed to a theoretical norm. Unity in the written language was achieved to a considerable extent by the early 19th Century, while pronunciation rules remained unclear.

Towards the end of the 19th Century, the term Algemeen Beschaafd Nederlands (ABN; ‘General Civilised Dutch’) was coined to refer to the standard language in the Netherlands. This term is still used today, although it is generally deemed obsolete. It is now merely a convenient and familiar way to refer to a concept.

Not until the 20th Century, and the second part of that century in particular, did empirical research play a decisive role in literature on the Dutch language and its pronunciation. After almost four centuries of serious standardisation, the systematic and objective description of reality became a serious point of concern and centre of activity. Due to new linguistic insights, an interest in empirically establishing the pronunciation of Standard Dutch arose in the 20th Century. In the mid 1930s, for instance, an effort was made to record the standard pronunciation of Dutch (see Daan 1983:457) 2. Kruisinga (1936:17) talked about a 1935 investigation3 in which a group of listeners described the pronunciation of civilised Dutch. In these two investigations4, it was presumed that through observation the standard phoneme realisations could easily be determined and that there was agreement on them. But what they revealed most of all was considerable disagreement on Standard Dutch pronunciation. They triggered awareness of productive and evaluative variation concerning Standard Dutch.

Today, an impressive collection is available of contemporary and non-contemporary articles with loose observations on what constitutes Standard Dutch and its articulatory characteristics. It is remarkable that extensive empirical studies on what Standard Dutch is are rare, while structured and extensive efforts towards articulatory descriptions of selected phonemes have only appeared in the last few decades. No studies exist that deal elaborately with the degree of standardness of Dutch language varieties and the pronunciation characteristics of Standard Dutch, except for Heeringa (2003), who determined the mutual distance between dialects in the Netherlands, on the basis of number of deviations from the standard language. Standard Dutch as a phenomenon was addressed extensively by Kloek and Van Haeringen, but only intuitively. The most noticeable extensive articulatory description is by Van de Velde (1996), while less ambitious efforts were made by, for instance, Cassier, and Van de Craen (1986), Wilbrink-Harms (1987, 1988), and Gussenhoven (1981). These researchers convincingly showed the devoicing of fricatives and the diphthongisation of vowels in the Netherlands. Acoustic

2 This was an investigation by the Nederlandse Vereniging voor Fonetische Wetenschappen (‘Dutch Society of Phonetic Sciences’).
3 Described in the Tijdschrift voor Buitengewoon Onderwijs of November 1935.
4 Educational purposes underlay these and similar researches.
CHAPTER 1

descriptions of vowels of Dutch were performed by Pols, Tromp, and Plomp (1973) and Van Nierop, Pols, and Plomp (1973). Recently, Adank (2003, 2004) measured Dutch vowels. The above-mentioned pronunciation research on degree of standardness of Dutch most usually focussed on the segmental level. Gooskens (1997), on the other hand, looked at the evaluation (by native speakers) of the intonation patterns in varieties of Dutch and English.

All in all, in the area of the definition of Standard Dutch and its articulatory features, much is still left unexplored. In particular, the acoustic description of non-read speech has been neglected.

1.6 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Standard Dutch: what it is and what it sounds like

The present investigation is a sociolinguistic and phonetic study. What the standard Dutch phenomenon is and what it sounds like are the main research questions. Looking at degree of descriptive detail, these two themes are opposites, as the first is mostly a general observation of the perceived position of the language within society, whereas the second studies the most detailed level of the language. A further question is what the degree of variation is in the description of this phenomenon and in the realisations of specific phonemes. In other words, to what degree do people agree on the criteria to define Standard Dutch, and what degree of variation is allowed in pronunciation? Specifically, the research questions are:

1. What is the definition of Standard Dutch in the Netherlands, and what is the nature and degree of agreement on this definition?
2. What are the segmental phonetic features of the most debated phonemes of this language variety?

The first research question is discussed mainly in chapters 6, 7, 8, and 9, while the second is discussed in chapters 10, 11, and 12, mainly.

Operationalisation

To achieve the definition of Standard Dutch and its pronunciation, Standard Dutch needed to be ‘found’ first. Lay opinions were given an important role in this search. One approach towards a definition would be to simply go by popular assumptions, by what Dutchmen are known to think. One such assumption would be that Standard Dutch is spoken in Haarlem, a city in the west of the Netherlands that is popularly denoted as the place where Standard Dutch is spoken most purely. Another approach would be to take norms of listeners into consideration, but implicitly only. In this view, one could propose that radio-news presenters speak Standard Dutch because these speakers are likely to have been selected on that basis. Yet another approach would be to take norms into consideration but explicitly rather than implicitly. An
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evaluation experiment could be performed in which listeners evaluate the speech of
speakers on its closeness to the standard language.

For the present research, a combination of the above approaches has been
applied. Speech that was likely to approach Standard Dutch - by famous and less
famous speakers - was presented to lay listeners who evaluatively selected speakers
closest to Standard Dutch. After having found Standard Dutch speech that way, its
pronunciation was described. To achieve this, two research areas were entered,
namely sociolinguistics and phonetics:

1. The sociolinguistic part of this study is a description of Standard Dutch in
general terms. This description is based on literature, surveys, and a listening
experiment.
2. The phonetic part is a description of a number of selected phonemes of Standard
Dutch. A literature study, phonetic transcriptions, and acoustic measurements
were the tools used for this description.

1.7 PURPOSES

Traditionally, so the literature illustrates, the emphasis in research into standard
forms of language has been on written occurrences. Within this tradition, vocabulary
and grammar have been studied and described extensively, including in the case of
Dutch. As was indicated above, descriptions of the pronunciation norm in the
Netherlands were offentimes of a haphazard nature, and they usually constituted
individuals’ personal (conception of the) norm. In recent times, descriptions of
pronunciation variation within Standard Dutch have become more common, but an
empirically reliable description of the most debated phonemes of contemporary
Standard Dutch is not available yet. This dissertation helps to fill part of that space.

A description of the criteria to define the Dutch standard language is not
available yet. There are definitions of the standard language and hints as to how to
determine the degree of standardness of a language, but these are generally of an
intuitive nature and not supported by research. In this dissertation, a definition is
constructed on the basis of empirical data, and this definition is set side by side with
the traditional - mostly theoretical - descriptions by linguists.

The outcome is an extensive definition of Standard Dutch and the standard-
language phenomenon and of the pronunciation of Standard Dutch, in which both
lay and professional insights are incorporated. The present research aims to be an
empirical contribution to the fields of sociolinguistics, phonetics, and
‘Netherlands’ (the study of Dutch language and culture). Besides this theoretical
contribution, there are possible practical purposes.

Pronunciation dictionary

Some of the results of this dissertation can be put to use outside science. One such
application is a pronunciation dictionary. The present study can help the debate on
the necessity of such a dictionary, and it can help create ideas on the shape of a
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According to Sanders (1993:228), there is no fully-fledged pronunciation dictionary for Standard Dutch, the existing ones being outdated. He at the same time questioned the demand for, and necessity of, such a dictionary. Research by Van Dale publishers in the Netherlands (Sanders 1993:227) in fact suggested that the demand would not be enough for publication of such a dictionary. Nevertheless, new pronunciation dictionaries were produced after this research. In 1999, Beheydt, Dirven, and Kauzner produced a course called *Uitspraak Nederlands* (‘Dutch Pronunciation’), and in 2000 Heemskerk & Zonneveld published the *Uitspraakwoordenboek* (‘Pronunciation Dictionary’). According to Van de Velde (2003:56), there is still a need for a pronunciation dictionary. He indicated that relatively little is known about pronunciation variation in the Dutch-language area and the acceptance of this variation.

*Education*

Another potential practical use of our research is Dutch-language education. Kruijtinga (1936:16) indicated that it is not until we know how we actually speak that we can address the question of how we are supposed to speak and whether it is possible to reshape our pronunciation. Today, about three quarters of a century later, there are still phonemes whose realisation in the standard language is uncertain, and these are described in the present dissertation. With the data in this dissertation, the standard pronunciation of debated phonemes in Standard Dutch can be taught more convincingly to foreign learners of Dutch, and practical teaching methods can be designed in which the nuances in the accepted pronunciation are explained as well as the subtle connotations of certain phoneme realisations. Van der Berg (1984:98, 101) indicated that in the field of pronunciation in particular teachers are improvising. Teachers of Dutch as a second language indeed tend to follow their own instincts to some degree when it comes to pronunciation, and this has led to regional realisations and personal preferences being taught. This is unsatisfactory for advanced learners of Dutch language and culture at foreign universities, for they need to know the fine details of Dutch pronunciation to be able to iron out their foreign accent. For these same students, the general description of the standard language in the Netherlands is useful for understanding what the connotations are of Standard Dutch in Dutch society, how it is used, etc. This will help them apply the language naturally in conversation and writing. Ronowicz (1999:1-25) extensively illustrated how cultural knowledge and language acquisition go hand in hand and that knowing the social contexts of language varieties is essential in the final stages
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of acquiring a second language. Through understanding subtle language connotations, related to the various realisations of certain phonemes, learners’ understanding of the Dutch and their language will improve.

General

The evaluative parts of the present study reveal the social and psychological consequences of language variation. Knowledge of how language is evaluated creates an understanding of the power behind language variation. It seems unrealistic to hope that this dissertation will have a direct and measurable impact outside science in this respect, but, as Schmied (1985:237) put it, a subtle interpretation of language attitudes can help throw light on problems regarding language policy, language use, and language learning.

1.8 DISSERTATION OVERVIEW

This dissertation consists of four parts; the background to the research and the topics, the methodology, the results related to the general description of Standard Dutch, and the description of the pronunciation of this language variety. Below is an overview of each part.

The first three chapters of this dissertation are introductory, providing insights and backgrounds to the research and the research themes. Chapters 2 and 3 present the necessary information to culturally contextualise the results of later chapters. They mainly focus on those less familiar with the Dutch language situation. Chapter 2 (‘History’) discusses the history of the standardisation process that Dutch has gone through. This is a literature study describing the various stages of standardisation of Dutch, to show to what extent they are in line with stages of standardisation as posed in the literature. Chapter 3 (‘The Dutch language situation’) touches on some debates that are current in the Netherlands today. First, the languages spoken in the Netherlands are presented; regional, social, imported, and other types of distinguishable varieties. Furthermore, the factors that threaten the existence of the Dutch language are discussed. Finally, this chapter considers the future of Dutch.

Chapters 4 and 5 outline the methodologies of the empirical investigations. In Chapter 4 (‘Speech material’), the speech used in the various components of the larger research is presented. For this dissertation, a number of sociolinguistic and phonetic investigations were performed, and these are all introduced in Chapter 5 (‘Investigations’).

Chapters 6 to 9 contain the results of the sociolinguistic investigations. In chapter 6 (‘Intrinsic characteristics’), the results pertaining to the definitions of ‘standardness’ and ‘standard language’ in the Dutch context are presented as well as the qualitative definition of Standard Dutch. Chapter 7 (‘User characteristics’) looks at typical speakers of Standard Dutch; who speaks it, where it is spoken, and like matters. Chapter 8 (‘International perspective’) contains the results of an international survey held in four speech communities outside the Netherlands. This investigation sheds light on the generalisability of the Dutch results on standardness.
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Speech evaluations related to degree of standardness are discussed in Chapter 9 (‘Evaluation’). This chapter looks at the specific qualities that listeners attach to the standard language. Moreover, listener behaviour is a topic of interest in this chapter, plus the evaluations of various speakers by listeners. Most importantly, this chapter presents the results of the speaker-selection procedure. The speech of selected speakers was the basis of a phonetic description.

Chapters 10 to 12 constitute the phonetic part of the research. Chapter 10 (‘Phonemes in the literature’) is a literature study into the development, as described by various writers from various time periods, of selected vowels and consonants in Standard Dutch. Chapters 11 and 12 are phonetic descriptions of these same phonemes in the speech of our speakers. Chapter 11 (‘Perceptual description’) contains the results of transcriptions of these vowels and consonants, while Chapter 12 (‘Acoustic description’) contains acoustic measurements of the vowels in question. In the latter chapter, the acoustic measurements are also linked to the perceptual descriptions of the previous chapter. Specifically, first-element lowering and diphthongisation are discussed. Chapter 13 (‘Conclusions’), finally, summarises the results, draws more general conclusions, and uses our findings to answer the questions regarding the main research themes as posed in the present chapter.
2. HISTORY\(^1\)

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Linguistic standardisation refers to the coming to existence of a widely accepted language in a linguistically diverse speech community. The standardisation notion is to a high degree impressionistic, and describing the standardisation of a language requires a certain guideline. Several attempts have been made to define stages of standardisation, for instance by Garvin and Mathiot (1956) and Haugen (1966). This chapter uses Haugen’s stages to describe the standardisation of Dutch because these seem realistic, and they have over the years been a popular guideline for the description of the standardisation phenomenon.

According to Haugen (1966\(^2\)), a typical standard language will have passed through four stages. He described these four stages as the aspects of language development that are crucial in the steps from vernacular to standard. The stages he named were: selection, codification, elaboration, and acceptance. Selection refers to the ‘choice’ for a certain variety to be the basis of the standard language, while codification is the fixation of the standardised variety in books of grammar and in dictionaries. The third stage is the elaboration of the functions of the standard language, referring to an increasing number of contexts of usage besides the formal domain (for instance government, education, science, and literature). The final stage of standardisation is the acceptance of the language in society. It should be clear that the first two stages (selection and codification) primarily bear on language form, and that the last two (elaboration and acceptance) relate to language function. It is also obvious that, once initiated, the stages are not strictly subsequent.

Dutch has gone through all of Haugen’s stages. A development has taken place from no standardised language to today’s highly standardised language. This chapter presents a historical overview of the stages that Dutch has passed through until the advanced state of standardisation that exists today and of the various factors that have set off these stages.

Chapter overview

This and the next chapter together introduce the language situation in the Netherlands. Chapter 3 describes the present-day language situation in the Netherlands, the present chapter describes how this situation has come to existence.

---

\(^1\) Most of the information in this chapter is from Van den Toorn (1992), Van der Wal and Van Bree (1994), De Vries, Willemyns, and Burger (1995), Vandeputte, Vincent, and Hermans (1997), De Vries (1999), and Van der Horst and Van der Horst (1999). Furthermore, various other publications have been used, which are given in the text.

\(^2\) Haugen’s ideas are also explained in Coupland and Jaworski (1997:341-351).
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This chapter briefly discusses the period before a distinctive group of dialects could be discerned and the Old Dutch period (Section 2.2). The first signs of standardisation occurred in the Middle Dutch period, which is discussed in Section 2.3. Section 2.4 discusses the 16th Century, when Holland became the focus of standardisation, after the fall of Antwerp (1585). The construction of the written standard language took place for the most part in the 17th Century, and this period is discussed in Section 2.5. The 18th Century (discussed in Section 2.6) was a relatively stable period, which enabled the consolidation of Standard Dutch. The 19th Century (Section 2.7) brought a revived interest in Standard Dutch and the start of a concern for realism in writing. Section 2.8 shows how the - seemingly final - stages of standardisation took place in the 20th Century, especially the standardisation of spoken Dutch, and Section 2.9 discusses today’s standardisation situation in the Netherlands.

2.2 THE OLD DUTCH PERIOD (700-1100 AD)

Just about all languages spoken in western Europe stem from the Indo-Germanic language family. The history of this language family is considered to be about 5,000 years old. Its native land is said to be around the Elbe, Oder, and Weichsel rivers, which roughly run through the area between and around today’s cities of Berlin and Warsaw. Large-scale migrations led to the dispersal of groups of languages across Europe, and one of the language families that came to existence is the Germanic language family. With English, German, and Frisian, Dutch is part of the West-Germanic branch. Turbulent centuries of shifting governmental power and moving isoglosses preceded the emergence of a separate group of dialects in the area that is today the Netherlands.

Generally, the Old Dutch period is deemed to have run from around 700 AD to around 1100 AD. The most important changes within old continental West Germanic are thought to have occurred by the onset of the 8th Century. The 12th Century is traditionally regarded as the end of the Old Dutch period, as a major phonological development was completed by the end of that century, namely the weakening of certain vowels in unstressed syllables. For instance, the unstressed second syllable in an Old Dutch word such as zuilən (‘will’) was a non-centralised vowel, whereas after this period vowels such as these slowly moved towards schwa. Today, this word is pronounced with a schwa in the second - unstressed - syllable (zuilən).

The geographical borders of Old Dutch largely coincided with today’s borders of the Dutch language. In the south, Dutch bordered on the Roman language family; this border has not changed dramatically since. The north and west bordered on the North Sea, as they do today. The eastern border, on the other hand, was linguistically less clear-cut. Varieties of the same dialect groups were spoken in the east of today’s Netherlands and in today’s northern Germany: the Low German dialect.

No complete texts of Old Dutch dialects have remained, which is a result of the written predominance of Latin during the Old Dutch period. Several pieces of text
have nevertheless remained that are considered to be Old Dutch. The two most important ones are *De Wachtendonkse psalmen*³, from around 950, and *De Leidse Willeram*⁴ from around 1065. Furthermore, a number of scribbled notes by various unknown authors have survived. Historical linguists have had to make do with these texts and with Dutch names and glosses in the Latin texts that have been preserved from this period, and therefore the Old Dutch language remains largely a product of linguistic inference and reconstruction. Because of the scarcity of texts in Dutch from the old period, some writers, for instance Grootaers (1949:320-321), felt that there is no Old Dutch period as such, and to them the onset of the Middle Dutch period was the real start of the Dutch language.

History has shown that generally standardisation takes place in writing first. As there was no widespread written (Dutch) tradition in the Old Dutch period, it can safely be assumed that there were no standardising tendencies taking place. The selection of a language variety was out of the question, as the speakers of the various dialects were not connected through a stable and long-term government or other unifying factor. Such a binding force is a prerequisite for standardisation.

### 2.3 THE MIDDLE DUTCH PERIOD (1100-1500 AD)

The period of the Old Dutch language naturally developed into the Middle Dutch period, which has been set to have run between 1100 and 1500. Like other mediaeval western European languages, early Middle Dutch is largely an abstraction. The usual division of the Middle Dutch varieties is into *Vlaams* (‘Flemish;’ the language of Flanders), *Brabants* (‘Brabantine;’ ‘the language of Brabant’), *Hollands* (‘Hollandic;’ ‘the language of Holland’), and *Limburgs* (‘Limburgian;’ ‘the language of Limburg’). Furthermore, there was the Low Saxon dialect of the northern and eastern parts, which was to play an insignificant role in the standardisation of Dutch.

In the early Middle Dutch period, the Dutch language area was still no independent political unity, consisting of a collection of counties, dioceses, duchies, and other political entities. Being a collection of folk languages mainly, Dutch did not have much of a political function in the Dutch-speaking area. Latin was the language used in science and by the Church. Education took place in the so-called Latin schools, which were run by the Church and which led to the first universities. Latin grammar was taught and little effort was made to describe varieties of Dutch.

Some signs of small-scale standardisation became visible in the Middle Dutch period. In the 13th Century, a preliminary development took place when certain official documents were written in Dutch instead of Latin. Texts have surfaced from about 1200 onwards⁵, when a written language began to develop in the southern

---

³ This means ‘The Wachtendonk psalms’; Wachtendonk is a place name.
⁴ This means ‘Willeram from Leiden’; Willeram is the name of a male.
⁵ *De Servaestegende* (‘The legend of Saint Servaes’), from around 1171, by the southerner Hendrik van Veldeke is often considered the earliest preserved running text in Dutch. Its Germanised nature is the reason why the linguistic origin of this manuscript is still a point of debate, but it is a convenient start of the observable history of Dutch.
province of Flanders, and texts from the north-western (Holland) area also started to be preserved around this time. These two areas had by that time developed some economic and cultural appeal within the larger area. To a degree, therefore, the first stage of standardisation was initiated, i.e. the selection of the language varieties that could potentially become the basis of a future standard language.

The Middle Dutch period is represented overwhelmingly by texts from Brabant and Flanders. The (north-)eastern provinces were furthest away geographically and linguistically from these southern areas, and the standardising tendencies that were taking place in the southern and western area reached the north-eastern and other peripheral areas at a considerably later stage. Any (weak) linguistic norm that was starting to come to existence lay in the trade cities of importance, i.e. Brussels, Bruges, Antwerp, and others. People from all classes tended to speak the variety of their own area, but in documents of those days that were aimed at a wide range of readers certain strongly regional features were avoided. Texts from that age even exist that are not clearly assignable to a certain region. It can be assumed that the aim for mutual comprehensibility was an important motive for this, rather than the various factors in the standardisation process that exist today, such as prestige.

The importance of non-regionality in language was recognised by several mediaeval writers. One writer in particular endorsed this idea. In the times when there was a wide blend of dialects, the poet Van Maerlant (c1230-c1300) advocated uniformity in language. In his writings, he used aspects of several dialects of his time. He possibly used features he considered dialects in the Dutch-language area to have in common. Van Maerlant not only favoured regularity in spelling, he also envisioned a widely comprehensible spoken language within the Dutch-speaking area.

The adaptation of documents as a result of the awareness of the possible existence of non-regional features can be considered the first visible form of codification (the second stage of standardisation). However, the difficulty of interpreting the absence of a clearly local style in texts is that texts that were copied were sometimes influenced by the language variety of the writer doing the copying. Some copies were influenced by different writers, leading to a confusing mixture of linguistic forms. Some of this codification therefore happened coincidentally.

Printing

In the Netherlands, the potential of printing was exploited in the earliest stages of its invention in the late 1400s. It was an important force in the standardisation of the written language. It brought knowledge to a wide reach of people, and with it a new age in the development of vernaculars in Europe started. It became easier to spread writings over a larger area, and the need for a widely intelligible standard language became an issue. A widening range of people was aimed at, and words and phrases that were estimated to be exclusively local were increasingly frequently circumvented, and instead linguistic forms were preferred originating from the population centres and social classes that prevailed culturally, politically, and economically. As the city of Antwerp started out as the most important centre of
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printing, the earliest printed books were in Antwerpian Dutch, while Brabantine Dutch was also regularly used. Holland, and the city of Amsterdam in particular, gradually arose as an important centre of printing in the north, but Antwerp was the printing capital (even from a European point of view).

Not until the end of the Middle Dutch period did the Burgundians unite the smaller political entities of the Low Countries into a larger unity - through strategic marriages and diplomacy. With the growth of cities in the Middle Ages came the expansion of more elementary and practical types of education. School subjects were increasingly taught in local and regional Middle Dutch. Towards the end of the Middle Ages, the use of folk languages in official documentation and literature increased. The conviction grew that the folk languages in the Netherlands had been neglected long enough. The replacement of Latin with Middle Dutch was considered practical, as it made official documents legible to a larger audience of people.

The earliest stages of standardisation took place in the Middle Dutch period, but no widespread national standard language was defined by the end of the era. By the close of this period, the majority of Dutch speakers were still the peasants, living on the land and isolated from linguistic developments taking place in the urban areas. The earliest standardisation efforts, and the influences that language varieties were having on each other in the process, all passed the peasants by - and would for centuries to come - all because of illiteracy. Any standard language was within the reach of certain classes of speakers only and in certain areas.

2.4 THE 16th CENTURY

Although some blending of dialects had been taking place, the Netherlands were still an area of great dialectal diversity by the middle of the 16th Century. Across the area, in both the north (today’s Netherlands) and the south of the area (today’s northern Belgium), tentative steps towards standardisation started to become visible. The strong position of Holland turned the spoken language of statesmen and other important citizens in the major cities in Holland into a widely accepted spoken variety. There were noticeable southern influences on the pronunciation of the Holland variety, due to mutual trade and frequent travel between the south and Holland. Holland became a melting pot for tradesmen from all over the Low Countries, the exploration of the seas started, and thus Dutch was shipped abroad. Major cities in this area, such as Amsterdam and the Hague, in particular benefited from new incoming wealth, and these cities soon started to dominate the Low Countries economically and linguistically. Holland was attracting a growing number of people from all over the area, while the south increasingly focused on Spain, which country had started to establish a serious hold on parts of the region. The written standardised language remained mainly southern, as the centres of printing were strongest in the south.

The most important steps towards the establishment of Dutch as a cultural language were made in the 16th Century; in the south, the cultural focus at the time. The language of the centres of civilisation, which lay mainly in the province of
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Brabant, was well on its way to becoming the cultural language. For the written language, a Flemish-Brabantine standard had in fact to some degree been accomplished, and ideal circumstances existed for this variety to become the cultural standard all over the area.

The Renaissance did not undermine the interest in the Dutch language. In fact, a revived interest in Latin led to translations of Latin into Dutch in the 16th Century, so that more Dutchmen could read the Latin classics. The 16th Century Reformation ideology entailed the use of the folk language in writing and in sermons, so as to reach the ordinary folk. The Dutch language increasingly started to be advocated on the basis of the allegedly outstanding and superior qualities it possessed. It was no longer thought of as a second-class vernacular and was thought to carry the potential to be on a par with any international language. The idea was that the Dutch language should be accepted as equal to Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. Foreign influences, especially lexical ones, were to be brought to a minimum, and Dutch was to grow beyond its function as an everyday means of communication.

In the light of this new language perspective, the Dutch parliament in 1582 decided to write the majority of their documents in Dutch. The first important work that tried to propose a national spelling that stood above the individual dialects was De Heuter’s *Nederduytse Orthographie* (‘Dutch Orthography’, 1581). The first Dutch grammar appeared in 1584 and was known by the name of *Twe-spraack vande Nederduytse letterkunst* (‘Dialogue of the Dutch Language’). It was written by Spiegel in cooperation with other members of one of the so-called Chambers of Rhetoric in Amsterdam and was called *In Liefd’ Bloeyende* (‘Flourishing In Love’). In these Chambers of Rhetoric, the study of literature and the care for the glorification of the mother tongue were the main objectives. The purification of Dutch, which was by certain writers considered a superior but neglected language, was advocated. Many of the works on the Dutch language were not only descriptive but also of the prescriptive and constructive kind.

*The Fall of Antwerp*

Signs of the northern desire to be an independent republic were starting to show in the 16th Century. Uproar, amongst others religious, characterised this century. The dramatic split in the Dutch-speaking area that was about to take place interrupted with the formation of a single type of Dutch for the entire area and cut off an important part of the area from the standardisation process.

In 1585, the southern city of Antwerp, which by the middle of the 16th Century had developed into one of the leading cities of trade in Europe, fell into the hands of the Spanish. The northern part of the Dutch-speaking area, led by Holland, opposed the Spaniards, and the cultural focus abruptly shifted northwards to the Holland area (in today’s Netherlands). A mass migration northwards of wealthy, respectable burghers took place for religious, political, cultural, and economic motivations. This migration accelerated the mixing of southern and Holland speech. The language of

---

6 According to some estimates, after the Fall of Antwerp in 1585 about half a million of
CHAPTER 2

southern immigrants enjoyed considerable standing, all the more so since most of the written language was already distinctly southern in character. Southern lexical items in particular were adopted in the northern Dutch standard language, while the pronunciation remained largely Holland-like. Amsterdam became the main focus of the north, and the influence of the variety of this city on the standardised language under construction was paramount.

The separation of the northern and southern part of the area in 1585 signified the end of the standardisation in which the whole area was involved. Holland went on to develop into a strong sea-faring power and flourished economically. The urge to unify internally was strong. The growing number of contacts between various regions in the country, and a growing national pride, caused a need for a language that was acceptable inside as well as outside Holland. By the end of the 16th Century, the dominance of Hollands (‘the language of Holland’) had tacitly been acknowledged across the higher social layers in the northern area. In the south, the opposite took place; after the split, continuous foreign occupancy caused economic decline there, and the Dutch language outside the local and regional level fell into decay.

The Fall of Antwerp was an important and dramatic event that signified the end of the Middle Dutch period. It constituted a partial restart in the Dutch standardisation process, and it was the beginning of the Modern Dutch period. Haugen’s (1966) first requirement towards standardisation was immediately fulfilled after the Fall of Antwerp, namely selection. For after the definite split between the north and the south, the Holland dialects naturally became the basis of a unifying language in the north. The second requirement (codification) had already been put into motion on a broader scale in the Dutch-speaking area as a whole. After the split, the path was cleared for the construction of grammars based on the Holland variety, and much needed to be done still to formalise the Holland language. Further codification took place after the Fall, and the next requirement (elaboration) was beginning to be realised through a growing use of Dutch outside informal situations. Scientific reports started to be written in Dutch, as for instance. Latin remained important in science and in the churches, and French was usually spoken in vice-regal courts, but in government circles the use of Dutch as an official language became a point of prestige.

2.5 THE 17TH CENTURY

After the split, further moves towards standardisation took place in the north. The most influential bourgeoisie of the Dutch-speaking area resided in the Holland cities, and the power and wealth of these cities grew steadily. The supremacy of Holland was a fact, the new city varieties gradually started to share certain features. To some

the two to three million inhabitants of the southern provinces moved northwards. The Antwerp population of about 150,000 people fell by almost 50%, the population of Amsterdam (70,000) almost doubled, and the Leiden population (12,000) more than tripled.
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degree, a Holland variety was discernable, although the distinctive big-city dialects largely remained recognisable. Van den Vondel (1650) wrote about Dutch being spoken most perfectly in the Hague and Amsterdam, by people of good upbringing, and it is true that Dutch pronunciation today is based largely on the speaking habits of the 17th Century wealthy middle classes of Amsterdam and the Hague.

The sudden dominance of Holland met with some resistance but only in its earliest stages. The southern prestige was high and was generally welcomed as an influence. Van den Vondel (1650:40) considered old Amsterdam speech too silly, and ordinary Antwerp speech too awkward, and not precise enough. He indicated that mixing the languages was required. Van den Vondel was speaking of a common language, constructed from the language of the leading classes in the large Holland cities, in which southern elements should be allowed.

In 1648, the Republic of the United Provinces was founded. The belief in the exceptional quality of the Dutch language, and Germanic languages in general, was more alive than ever. In the new and self-assured Republic, publications continued to be printed in which the quality of the mother tongue was emphasised. The continuous construction of a written standard language was also actively encouraged, and successfully so. The people who occupied themselves with this were generally those who somehow had an interest in the language; traders, printers, scientists of various disciplines, and publishers. Work started on the first proper grammars. Choices were made for certain forms over others, and the zeal of individual forerunners played an important role in this process. The two most celebrated and influential writers of the 17th Century were Van den Vondel and Hooft, and they helped to establish and expand a general written language. They helped to make plausible the idea that Dutch was a fully-fledged language.

The Statenvertaling

The Authorised Version of the Bible (1625-1637), the Statenvertaling, was crucial in the construction process. Its translators came from all over the Netherlands, and they took decisions on the shape and use of numerous controversial language issues. The language of the Statenvertaling exerted a great influence on the development of the Dutch language, as passages from this book were to be used in churches, families, and schools in the centuries that followed. Many of today’s idiomatic phrases and expressions in Dutch are from the Statenvertaling.

Despite internal and external conflicts, the united provinces experienced a period of great economic growth in the 17th Century. By the late 17th Century, uniformity in the spoken language was still largely lacking, and a dispersion of the written and spoken language was taking place. The spoken language was no reliable basis of rules due to the diversity of spoken, living, varieties in the Netherlands. Ten Kate (1723) acknowledged the existence of ‘some dialectal diversity’, and that every province and city had a particular dialect or tongue. In addition, he claimed that there was a general written language nevertheless. The written language was infected by archaic uses of case and artificial distinctions that were not actually used in the spoken language. Latin and French were widely used, but the newly arisen
written standard of the Holland cities spread geographically and socially, across other provinces and across social layers. In the second half of the 17th Century, much of the local written dialectal traditions started to be taken over by standardised textual conventions, and Van den Vondel’s Dutch in particular became the norm. By the end of the century, unity in the written language became more common in Holland and also in the neighbouring provinces of Zeeland and Utrecht. The other provinces lagged behind in this respect.

2.6 THE 18th CENTURY

After the Dutch Golden Age of colonialism and economic success came a period of economic stability in the 18th Century. The construction of the Dutch language progressed, and further codification and elaboration took place; norms became more fixed and widespread. The writings of authors such as Hooft and Van den Vondel remained authoritative. The grammatical works of Huydecoper (1695-1778), too, were influential, and remains of his language rules can still be found today. These writers were amongst the earliest to discuss the *ben/hun* difference and the *als/dan* difference7, which are still two popular points of debate today.

Rationalism flourished in the 18th Century. The rebellious resistance to external linguistic influences died down, but at the same time nationalism remained. The aim for non-regionality and a fixed norm reflected this: the nation was one, and people should not be recognisable as coming from an area within this unity; they should all speak one language. This interest in the language was underlined by an academic interest in the language. Leiden University, at the end of the 18th Century, finally established a chair of Dutch; the foundation professor was Siegenbeek (1774-1854). Chairs at other universities soon followed.

*The Batavian-French Age*

In 1795, the so-called Batavian-French Age began, when the French entered and incorporated the Dutch Republic. In this period, the French helped to turn the Netherlands into a unified state. The - largely autonomous - unities from the period of the Republic started to move towards each other economically, politically, and culturally. The influence of French ideas on the democratisation process in the united Netherlands indirectly influenced the standardisation of Dutch, although French was put forward as the superior and most refined language. In certain circles in the Netherlands, French culture bore a high prestige, and the Holland bourgeoisie eagerly adopted French words. The French invaders did not impose the French language on the Dutch. Instead, they made successful efforts to further standardise Dutch spelling and grammar.

---

7 The accusative plural personal pronoun *hen* and the dative plural personal pronoun *hun* were and are often confused. Huydecoper discussed the use of Dutch *als* (‘as’) and *dan* (‘than’). A high number of Dutchmen today allow *als* in constructions like ‘better than/as’, while others feel only *dan* is correct in this context.
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2.7 THE 19TH CENTURY

After the Batavian-French period (1795-1813), a short-lived reunification took place of the Republic and the south. Dutch became the official language for the whole area. The early 19th Century also saw an increasing influence of German on the vocabulary of Dutch, because of the important role of Germany in various scientific fields, including linguistics. An enormous amount of new vocabulary found its way into the language, either in the form of loan words or new compounds of indigenous words, to cover the wide range of social, political, and scientific developments that the French Revolution and the Industrial Revolution brought about. The written language was largely unified by the early 19th Century. The spoken language of the elevated classes was still highly regionally coloured at the beginning of the century, including in Holland, as attention was paid to the written language mainly.

The serious scientific study of Dutch started in the 19th Century. The two most important Dutch writers on modern linguistics of the early 19th Century were De Vries and Te Winkel. In 1863, they published a spelling system, which became an important contribution to the codification of the Dutch language. Although these writers did not break completely with the spelling traditions of their predecessors, they did apply certain historical principles that had so far been ignored or not thoroughly understood. Some of these principles are still visible today. Writers such as Siegenbeek and Weiland were important in strengthening the position of the written language. Their proposed spelling and grammatical rules were adopted on a wide scale. Siegenbeek in his 1804 *Verhandeling over de spelling der Nederduitsche taal ter bevordering van eenparigheid in dezelve* (‘Treatise on the spelling of the Dutch language for the furtherance of standardisation’) advocated that *aa* is not written as *ae*, that *a* and *u* should not be doubled in open syllables, and that *e* and *ee*, as well as *o* and *oo*, alternate in open syllables in accordance with the etymology of the words concerned. Much of the above writers’ systems still exists today.

Realism

The efforts to standardise Dutch throughout the centuries led to a highly archaic and unnatural style in writing, and this unnaturalness came to a peak in the 19th Century. This style was typical of government papers, newspapers, and scientific journals, and even in personal letters it was maintained. This ‘bastardisation’ of the written language sparked off much opposition, for instance by the poet Bilderdijk (1756-1831), who objected to the written style that was current in his time. He felt that the Dutch language did not consist of letters but of sounds.

By the mid 19th Century, romanticism turned into realism, and in the second half of the century efforts were made to deal with the discrepancy between the written and the spoken language. Important and influential contemporary authors that were behind this were Beets (1814-1903) and Dekker (1820-1887). Beets (alias Hildebrand) in his novel *Camera Obscura* (1839) attempted to produce real-life language. But the greatest effort in this respect was Dekker’s (alias Multatuli) novel *Max Havelaar* (1859). Multatuli was one of the most radical style innovators of the
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19th Century. A passionate believer in a written language that reflects the spoken language, he used spoken-language items in his writings, and he implemented lexical innovations. However, the most noticeable feature in his works were the apostrophes replacing letters not actually pronounced in naturally spoken Dutch. Examples of these were ‘n for een (‘a’), and ‘m for hem (‘him’). Roorda (1825-1887), another 19th Century writer, stated that language that did not agree with the living spoken language was in fact dead. The consensus at the time was still that simplification in the inflectional system involved a deterioration of the quality of the language. Roorda, instead, proposed a loss of the endings behind the indefinite article, and he also questioned the use of the masculine/feminine distinction. Roorda’s ideas on written expression were to become the norm in the 1880s, when the literary movement known as the Beweging van Tachtig (‘Movement of the Eighties’) started. The followers of this movement believed in realism and an absolutely natural use of language in writing. From this time dates the type of written Dutch more or less as we know it today, i.e. relatively close to spoken Dutch.

Another force that helped establish today’s written language was the educational reform of the late 19th Century. Realism was introduced in language teaching at schools. The idea was supported that knowledge of language should be passed on to students. Many educators started to express the view that individual growth entailed a degree of freedom of expression in written language and a systematic awareness of grammar. Followers of these reforms were the editors of the Taal en Letteren (‘Language and Letters’) magazine, which started in 1891. In its earliest stages, this magazine aimed at highlighting educational issues, and the preference was expressed for a less dominant role of the written language. The writers that contributed to this magazine were not only inspired by the Beweging van Tachtig but also by the up and coming German neo-grammarians, who dominated linguistic theory in the last decades of the 19th Century. These linguists were interested in living contemporary spoken language. The editors of Taal en Letteren also believed that change was not negative per se; only if it involved a deterioration of the functionality of language. It was believed that if a change involved a simplification, then that in itself was an improvement. The most extreme pleas for simplification of the written language were expressed by Kollewijs (1857-1942), who in 1892 founded the Vereniging tot Vereenvoudiging van onze Schrijfspraak (‘Society for the Simplification of our Written Language’). Kollewijs, who was one of the Taal en Letteren editors, initiated a debate on spelling reform and even on reform of the written language as a whole. He considered it desirable to abandon distinctions in the written language not made in the spoken language. However, despite the efforts of people like Kollewijs, it remained common for the written language to be archaic.

Pronunciation

Although considerable agreement on written norms existed, there was not as yet a highly fixed spoken standard by the end of the 19th Century. Codification of
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pronunciation was, naturally, more difficult to establish than writing was, because there was not yet a standardised and uniform means of communicating in writing what a certain word or phoneme exactly sounded like (i.e. a phonetic alphabet). An interest in pronunciation existed, and several works on pronunciation were written, such as Bosdijk’s Korte uitspraakleer der Nederduitsche taal (‘Short pronunciation course of the Dutch language’) (1844) and Bomhoff’s Uitspraak der letters in de Nederlandsche taal (‘Pronunciation of the letters of the Dutch language’) (1854). However, these booklets did not have any widespread or lasting influence. The accepted civilised pronunciation was not established by active linguists such as Bosdijk or Bomhoff but still by the ruling Holland middle classes of those days.

At the end of the 19th Century, the term Algemeen Beschaafd Nederlands (‘General Civilised Dutch’, see Section 3.3) to refer to Standard Dutch was introduced by the Taal en Letteren editors. According to Van der Horst and Van der Horst (1999:358-359, 361), the reason that this naming of a standardised language variety had not happened earlier was that by that time there was not considered to be a general civilised spoken Dutch.

Several important technical events occurred in the 19th Century that seriously helped the establishment of a pronunciation norm. For instance, there was the possibility of recording sounds. The first steps towards sound recording were made in 1830, but it was not until 1877 that Edison made the first recording of a human voice on a ‘speaking machine’. The oldest existing recording dates from 1888. The oldest Dutch voice recording is said to date from 1901. Another event was the onset of radio broadcasting, and in 1896 the first wireless transmission took place. Furthermore, in 1839 the first train in the Netherlands drove (between Amsterdam and Haarlem). These innovations, at last, cleared the way for knowledge of Dutch pronunciation to spread, especially to the areas outside the west.

2.8 THE 20TH CENTURY

From around 1900, the spreading of the standardised spoken language accelerated. The cultivated language of the Holland middle classes started to take on a more definite shape in the early 20th Century. Indeed, it moved towards the written language, just as the written language had noticeably moved towards the spoken language by this time.

Education became more accessible to common people. In 1900, the Compulsory Education Law was passed, helping the elaboration of standardised Dutch. The rise of radio (1920s) and television (1950s) broadcasting provided growing groups in society with exposure to speech from areas other than their own. In the 1920s, four Dutch radio-broadcasting companies were established, which are still active today on radio and television.

The Second World War

In 1940, the Second World War broke out, and in the five years that followed the Netherlands were an occupied country. Daan (1983:474-475) had the impression
that around the Second World War norms concerning Standard Dutch were not all clear. From her anecdotal evidence, it seems that the assumption at the time was that the pronunciation of Standard Dutch was relatively fixed, until investigators showed that different people had different ideas as to what constitutes Standard Dutch. According to Van den Toorn (1992:11), the Second World War has had no clear direct influence on the Dutch language. He indicated that after 1945 old habits were continued, that the Dutch language changed as little as did Dutch society. He considered this mentality an important factor in later post-war changes in Dutch.

Starting in the mid-1960s, the generation born in the period just after the war rebelled against the members of the pre-war society. Van den Toorn (1992) considered the grown tolerance towards pronunciation, dialectal variation, and informal uses of language to be a result of the changes that this post-war generation brought about. He considered this tolerance a reaction to the older generation, the establishment. It reflected resentment to discrimination on the basis of pronunciation and choice of words, and therefore it constituted the start of a new period of linguistic tolerance, so he claimed. Daan (1969:14), in line with this, felt that before the Second World War regionally coloured Dutch was in a stronger manner rejected, and by more people, than after the war. All in all, the effects of the war seem to be indirect for the most part.

Grammar and spelling

After the Second World War, a new spelling (which was really a revised De Vries and Te Winkel (1851) spelling) became the official spelling. In 1954, the first edition appeared of the Woordenlijst van de Nederlandse Taal (‘Glossary of the Dutch Language’). Besides studies of spelling, extensive descriptive grammatical works appeared, which unfortunately did not satisfy the existing need of speakers to have straightforward and clear-cut language regulations. This need was satisfied by so-called ‘language-polishing books’. The earliest releases of such books aimed at clarifying how things were supposed to be said or written, but from the 1960s onwards these works were more concerned with giving hints as to how clarity in communication was achieved.

Not until 1984 did a fully-fledged grammar appear; the Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst (‘General Dutch Grammar’). This massive work is a reference for teachers, journalists, and other professionals but also non-professionals who need to produce ‘correct’ language. It is not an explicitly normative work, as it presents various options in many instances, leaving the choice between forms up to the user. The largest Dutch-language dictionary today is De Vries’ Woordenboek der Nederlandse Taal (‘Dictionary of the Dutch Language’), whose first part was printed in 1882. This dictionary is mainly a historical work. It is not well known to the average speaker of Dutch and has little authoritative power amongst ordinary users. The most authoritative and established Dutch dictionary in the 20th Century has been Van Dale’s Groot Woordenboek der Nederlands(ch)e Taal (‘Extensive Dictionary of the Dutch Language’), the first edition of which was printed as far back as in 1872. It is today a dictionary of a relatively normative nature, based on
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historical evidence of approximately the last century. This work carries a high, almost exclusive, prestige amongst speakers of Dutch today. These dictionaries and the *Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst* are widely considered to constitute a near-complete description of the basic structure and elements of contemporary written Dutch.

*Elaboration*

In the 20th Century in particular, language elaboration was finally realised. The standard language became common in an increasing number of usage contexts. Knowledge of both the written and spoken forms of the standard language spread from the elite to other social layers and from Holland to the more peripheral areas. The standardised spoken language took a leap in the 1950s and 1960s, not only due to the spoken media, but also the telephone, train, the car. The enormous popularity of the bike has made it easier for people of all layers of society to visit neighbouring towns and villages that were beyond walking distance. This way, the mutual blending of dialects accelerated, thus reinforcing the homogenising process. Many other such factors have caused the dramatic changes in language use and attitudes in the post-war 20th Century. People at last became highly aware of the existing speech variation. This awareness stimulated the standardisation process, but it also sparked off opposite reactions (see Section 3.6).

2.9 THE SITUATION TODAY

There is now agreement on the written standard language in the Netherlands, although disagreement remains on the comprehensibility of certain spelling rules. In addition, changes in the spelling system have met with serious discontent amongst users, and several Dutch newspapers have even refused to apply the new rules of 2005. The final stage of standardisation (elaboration) has been achieved, but complete homogenisation has not. Van den Toorn (1974:267) claimed that the standardisation of Dutch will be finalised once it is used without any functional necessity, in which case it will lose its function as a medium of communication in secondary relationships and when speakers do not have to make an effort to use it but use it as matter of course. However, the urge to distinguish oneself linguistically is likely to delay the final stages of full standardisation (Van Haeringen 1949b:2-3; De Vries 1979:227). Today, in the early 21st Century, Dutch may be at the furthest possible stage of standardisation already.

---

8 The blending of dialects and linguistic standardisation are not the same tendency, but they have in common that they enhance homogenisation.
3. THE DUTCH LANGUAGE SITUATION

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The present chapter discusses the contemporary language situation in the Netherlands, specifically with regard to Standard Dutch. The historical perspective provided in the previous chapter and the situation described below together provide the information necessary to contextualise the research described in subsequent chapters. Much of this chapter has an introductory nature and is mainly informative to readers with a limited knowledge of the language situation in the Netherlands.

Chapter overview

In Section 3.2, the Dutch language is introduced; where it is spoken and the names with which people have been referring to it. Various names are current to denote Dutch, and they all have their own connotations. Section 3.3 introduces Standard Dutch, and attention is paid to Dutch from the north of the Dutch-speaking area and Dutch from the southern part. The controversial term *Algemeen Beschaafde Nederlands* (General Civilised Dutch) is discussed in that section too. Section 3.4 introduces languages spoken in the Netherlands other than Standard Dutch. Besides the type of Dutch from the western part of the Netherlands (often referred to as *Randstad Dutch*) and posh Dutch, there are dialects of Dutch. Finally, non-indigenous languages in the Netherlands are discussed, including immigrant languages. These are widely used as a first or second language by immigrants and their offspring.

Dutch is often said to be under threat, and this is discussed in Section 3.5. The two most well-known languages that have been considered a threat to Dutch are German and English. Besides these languages, Dutch is also said to suffer from a changed attitude amongst its users towards correctness and norms. Section 3.6 discusses the future of Dutch. Dialects and their future are an important part of that section, as well as the de- or re-formalisation of Dutch. Media speech and its effect on the development of Dutch are also discussed in that section. Section 3.7 looks at the pros and cons of Standard Dutch. Dutch has standardised to a high degree, and the question now is how desirable the effects of this standardisation are. Section 3.8 concludes the chapter.

---

1 Most of the information in this chapter is from De Vries, Willems, and Burger (1995), De Vries (1999), Vandeputte, Vincent, and Hermans (1997), Van der Horst and Van der Horst (1999), De Jong and Burger (1991), and Van der Toorn (1992). Information is used that is considered general knowledge. Furthermore, various smaller publications have been used, which are given in the text.
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3.2 DUTCH

The very western part of the West Germanic language area, in the north-west of Europe, is popularly referred to as the Low Countries. In this area, Dutch is the dominant language, and in fact the Dutch-language area has become more or less synonymous with the Low Countries. The area borders on the North Sea in the north and west and connects to the German-language area in the east and the French-language area in the south. These language borders more or less agree with today’s national border in the east between the Netherlands and Germany and, in the south, the border that divides northern (Dutch-speaking) Belgium from southern (French-speaking) Belgium. The Dutch-language area comprises the northern part of Belgium and all of the Netherlands. The area houses over 21 million speakers of Dutch, approximately two thirds of which live in the Netherlands. Varieties of Dutch can be found in places just beyond the Dutch and Belgian borders, such as in the northwest tip of France. As for size, Dutch is a member of a large intermediate group of languages in the world. It is insignificant compared to English, but it is more prominent than the hundreds of small lesser-known languages in the world.

In areas outside its historical place of origin, remnants of Dutch can be found, and in places it functions as a living language outside the Low Countries. As the language of a once-important seafaring nation, it has left traces in several of the languages of the countries that were called at or colonised. Varieties of modern Dutch are now spoken in some of the (former) colonies of the Netherlands. Dutch is an official language of the Dutch Antilles (South America), the last remaining colony of the Netherlands. Dutch is also spoken in the former colony of Surinam (South America), where Dutch is an official and living language. Relics of Dutch can be found in the Republic of Indonesia in Southeast Asia, as many of the older inhabitants of this former Dutch colony know how to speak it or at least understand much of it. Bahasa Indonesia (the standard language of the Republic of Indonesia) has borrowed a great many lexical items from Dutch. In South Africa, another former colony, Afrikaans is spoken, which strongly resembles Dutch, as it is based on 17th Century Dutch varieties. Today, Dutch is taught at more than two hundred universities in the world, mostly as a foreign language.

Nomenclature

The coming to existence of the name for the language in the Low West-Germanic area was a historical process throughout which more than one name was in common use. There was variation in the political and linguistic entity these names referred to, and it was only over the centuries that the language and area referred to became restricted and finely outlined. The Dutch-language situation is often misunderstood because of today’s inconsistent nomenclature.

The names Diets and Duuts started to be used to refer to a group of West-Germanic vernaculars spoken north of the border dividing the Germanic and Romance dialect areas, after this border became relatively fixed in the 7th and 8th Century AD. By the Middle Dutch period (1100-1500), these names were
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increasingly used to refer to the language in a smaller area, namely what is roughly the Dutch-speaking area today\(^2\). These two names are derived from the Dutch word 

The term *Duysts(ch)* was in the 16\(^{th}\) and 17\(^{th}\) Century used to refer to Dutch dialects, a group of neighbouring German dialects, or to both groups of dialects. By the same time, two names to refer to these same dialects were in frequent use too, namely *Nederlands* (for the dialects to the west) and *Nederduits* (‘Low German’, for other dialects in this flat/low area). The first of these is the same as today’s Dutch name for the Dutch language. The word *Nederlands* translates as ‘Netherlandic’ (‘the language of the low land’). In the 18\(^{th}\) Century, *Nederlands* started to gain popularity over other terms within the Low Countries. According to Kloeke (1951:6), the use of this term did not seriously take off until as late as 1945, as before this time it was restricted to writings and to the school environment.

So, nomenclature has moved from a general typification of a group of dialects and its speakers to a description of the landscape these speakers live in. The shift in nomenclature roughly coincided with a growing national awareness in the West-Germanic area and the subsequent establishment of political and geographical boundaries between what are today the Netherlands, northern Belgium, and Germany.

Today, the language of the Netherlands and northern Belgium is in the area itself referred to as *Nederlands*. Popular nomenclature has come to existence within the area to deal with the distinction between the northern and southern variety of Dutch. Both in the case of the Netherlands and of northern Belgium, the once most influential area grew to become associated with the whole speech community; the term *Hollands* (‘Hollandic’; ‘the language of Holland’) for the language of the Netherlands, and *Vlaams* (‘Flemish’; ‘the language of Flanders’) for the language in northern Belgium. From a literal point of view, this is incorrect; *Holland* is the name to refer to only two of the provinces in the Netherlands, namely North Holland and South Holland. Speakers from these two provinces are more likely to use *Hollands* to refer to Dutch than those from the other parts of the Netherlands. The same phenomenon exists in Belgium, where *Vlaams* is frequently used to refer to the variety of Dutch spoken in this area, although *Vlaanderen* (‘Flanders’) comprises only part of northern Belgium, namely the provinces of East and West Flanders.

The terms *Hollands* and *Vlaams* also serve a wider purpose in the area. Belgians tend to use *Hollands* to refer to the language of their neighbours to the north, and people from the Netherlands typically refer to Dutch in Belgium as *Vlaams*. The distinction between these two areas is in linguistic circles usually made through *Noordnederlands* (‘northern Dutch’), to refer to Dutch in the Netherlands, and *Zuidnederlands* (‘southern Dutch’), to refer to Dutch as it is spoken in northern Belgium.

Today, nomenclature regarding Dutch and the Dutch-language area is in other languages oftentimes based on a situation of an earlier period. A confusing

\(^2\) These two terms are generally explained this way, but some variation in their uses exists.
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collection of references to the Dutch language exists across the world, either referring to Holland, to Duuws/Diëts/Duyts(ch), to the Netherlands, or to something else. In Welsh, as for instance, the name for ‘Dutch’ is is-almaeneg, meaning ‘lower German(ic)’. Dutch can also be translated in Welsh as Holandaidd, referring to the Holland area. Swedish refers to Dutch as nederländska (‘Netherlandic’) or holländska (the language from Holland), Italians call this language olandese (‘the language of Holland’), while the French use both néerlandais (‘Netherlandic’) and hollandais (‘the language of Holland’). So, countries either refer to Holland or the Netherlands, to both, or to the larger area.

The English language, due to its wide range of uses in the world, can be considered a source of the continuing confusion regarding the language situation in the Netherlands. English refers to the language in the Low Countries as ‘Dutch’, which is obviously derived from Duuws or Duysts(ch). Some wish that the name ‘Netherlandic’ be used in English instead of ‘Dutch’. However, despite its theoretical accuracy, due to a chain of historical events, this name today creates a strong association with the Dutch name of the northern part of the area, namely Nederland (‘the Netherlands’). The term ‘Dutch’, on the other hand, is not phonetically similar to the name of either the Netherlands or northern Belgium (or Holland or Flanders). The term ‘Dutch’, although it resembles today’s Deutsch (‘German’ in German), makes sense if it is interpreted as a reference to the language in the Low Countries as a whole. More importantly, it is relatively uncontroversial, both internationally and in the area, as it does not provide an immediate association with one part of the area, more than with the other. Due to the absence of a good alternative, the term ‘Dutch’ seems the best option.

3.3 STANDARD DUTCH

Standard Dutch as a phenomenon had become widely recognised by the 19th Century and received the name Algemeen Beschaaft Nederlands, which is commonly abbreviated as ABN. Opposition to the term arose after it became widely popular, and this opposition continues today. Daan (1983:476) considered ABN difficult to define linguistically. To her, it was not a language norm but more of a social norm. According to De Vries (1980:223), the term ABN was simply never in accordance with any reality, implying a unity and generalness that never existed. But, by far the most commonly used criticism was expressed by Van Haeringen (1949b:1). He called the term beschaafd (‘civilised’) ‘unpleasant’, as it suggests that those using the term to refer to their own variety call themselves civilised, which automatically turns those not speaking it into speakers that are less than civilised. Descriptions by other writers support this. Kloos (1951:3-4,9), as for instance, referred to beschaafden (‘the civilised’) as the opposites of dialect speakers, whose speech he

---

3 Welsh nomenclature regarding speakers contains even more irregularity. Someone Dutch is an Iseldiurw; a ‘Lowlander’, which can be interpreted as referring to the whole of the Low Countries, i.e. the Netherlands and northern Belgium, or even the whole Low German language area.

4 The Netherlands, on the other hand, are ‘the Low Countries’ (Pays-Bas).
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called ‘vulgar’. In disagreement with this view, Goudsblom (1964:112) emphasised that not everything that the members of the elite do is necessarily civilised.

There is some dispute on the meaning of the word beschafid within Algemeen Beschafid Nederlands. Donaldson (1983:5) used the term ‘cultivated’ to translate beschafid, and according to the most influential contemporary Dutch dictionary (Van Dale) it translates as ‘educated’. Some writers have over the years described the term as inherently incorrect. Hellinga (1938:345), for instance, felt that the term beschafid (‘civilised’) is already closely connected to algemeen (‘general’). According to Goudsblom (1964:119), the ‘general’ and ‘civilised’ aspects of ABN are connected through the ‘secondary relations’ factor. This language variety, according to Goudsblom, developed from an elite language to a language with which secondary relations are entered. In this view, it is part of a behavioural code that is applied when such relations are entered.

Amongst modern linguists, the use of the term ABN is uncommon, and they use other terminology instead to refer to the standard language in the Netherlands. Van Haeringen (1951:317, 320) mentioned the growing use of alternatives such as ‘Standard Dutch’, and he himself was an early example of a linguist using this term. Weijnen (1967:18) talked about ‘the cultural language’, and Haeseryn (1997:16) mentioned ‘general usable Dutch’ and ‘general Dutch’. In recent years, linguists have more or less replaced ABN with ‘Standard Dutch’ (Standaardnederlands). The advantage of this term is that it creates a link with other languages with a similar status in their own speech community. In the same way, the term ‘Received Pronunciation’ in Britain as a name to refer to a type of widespread standard or model language is slowly being replaced with ‘Standard English’.

In recent times, a new development regarding the use of ABN has been taking place, namely the tendency in the Netherlands (and Britain) to use the ‘old’ term ABN (and RP) to refer to the highly homogenous, almost elite-type, varieties that they used to refer to but that can no longer make a claim to being models that a wide range of speakers adhere to (Stroop 1998). Standard Dutch (the standard variety) and ABN (the old elite variety) in this view exist side by side and do not actually refer to the same variety or ideal. Many ordinary Dutchmen nevertheless continue to refer to standardised Dutch as ABN. Many ordinary Dutchmen nevertheless continue to refer to standardised Dutch as ABN.

Northern versus Southern Standard Dutch

The Dutch-language area consists of the Netherlands in the north and the northern part of Belgium in the south. Officially, the same language is spoken on both sides of the border. Vandepitte, Vincent, and Hermans (1997:40) claimed that it would be quite wrong to speak of two languages. At most, there are two versions of the same

5 The only inconsistency is its spelling in Dutch. Van Dale dictionary says: Standaardnederlands. Examples of other spellings are: Standaard-Nederlands, Standaard Nederlands, and standaard-Nederlands.

6 The Flemish have been more progressive and since the 1970s they have generally referred to their standard language as Algemeen Nederlands.
language, they said. Indeed, there is one official grammar of Dutch, but the
differences between northern and southern standardised Dutch are quite distinct.  
Lexically and grammatically, there is some variation, while on the articulatory level 
the differences are considerable, much like the obvious pronunciation difference 
between English spoken in England and Scottish English.

Perhaps one of the most profound differences between the two varieties of 
Standard Dutch is their position in society. The elaboration stage of standardisation 
has progressed further in the Netherlands, where some standardised form of Dutch is 
the everyday language of most speakers, who use it in a broad range of usage 
contexts. The majority of Dutch-speaking Belgians, on the other hand, have a 
profoundly regional or local variety as their native tongue, and many only in 
exceptional circumstances use the standard language. In the south, standardised 
Dutch is often not acquired until after entering school. De Vries (1980:228) felt that 
although in Flanders there is a standard language, its functionality is constrained 
because many Flemish are less familiar with its wide range of uses. As a result, 
insecurity as to how to speak Standard Dutch is widespread in the south, while in the 
north having mastered some sort of standardised version of northern Dutch in a 
native manner is largely a matter of course.  

The stereotypical image that exists concerning the linguistic abilities of Dutch-
speaking Belgians is not in agreement with this situation. A popular claim is that 
Belgians are more eloquent speakers of Dutch than are speakers from the 
Netherlands, who are stereotypically sloppy in the use of their native tongue. 
Jespersen (1925:60), in line with this, wrote about the phenomenon of a language 
being used in its greatest purity in districts outside the linguistically dominant area. 
He claimed that Irishmen speak on average better English (‘nearer to the literary 
standard’) than people of a corresponding class in England. An explanation for the 
care with which Belgians supposedly speak Standard Dutch is that it is generally not 
the most frequently-used tongue for speakers, and it therefore requires extra care. In 
this view, the listener picks up on this additional effort and interprets it as linguistic 
meticulousness. Daan (1983:476) felt that if Dutch as Belgians speak it is superior to 
that of speakers from the Netherlands, then this is merely an indication of Belgian 
Dutch being closer to the norms of the written language.

The grounds for considering language varieties to be separate entities are to an 
important degree of a political nature. Loyalty of speakers plays an important part in 
this. There are several languages that are linguistically quite distinctive but 
recognised as one language nevertheless. Examples are: literary and colloquial 
forms of Arabic used in Iraq, Morocco, and Egypt; Welsh in north and south Wales 
(North Walian Welsh and formal Welsh); and the local dialects of Rajasthan and 
Bihar in northern India. The opposite situation also exists, and in former Yugoslavia

---

7 Dialects, on the other hand, run across the border between the Netherlands and Belgium. 
Gerritsen (1999:64) found that this border has not led to a sharp separation of some of 
these dialects.

8 This shows in the fact that dialects in the Netherlands obtain government protection, 
because it is felt that they are disappearing, while southern dialects that are similarly 
deviant from the standard language are the native tongue of a majority of speakers.
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both Serbs and Croats contend that they have their own language, while the two varieties are fully mutually comprehensible and are even largely identical.

The accentual differences between the two types of standardised Dutch are substantial. Grammatical and lexical differences are quite noticeable. Geeraerts, Grondelaers, and Speelman (1999:9) agreed that the southern move towards northern Dutch is not complete, as obvious differences remain. Linguistic loyalties are clearly separated, with northerners adhering to a northern norm and southerners to a southern norm. Vandeputte, Vincent, and Hermans (1997:40) claimed that a number of factors will in the long run inevitably bring about the unity of the Dutch language. They specifically mentioned the increasingly close personal contacts between the Netherlands and Flanders, the role of the mass media, Dutch-language education in Flanders, the continuing activities of cultural organisations in both Flanders and the Netherlands, and the growing use of Standard Dutch in young families in Flanders. Vandeputte et al. expected that, in the process, the relative contribution of Flanders to the common tongue will increase.

Although there are practical grounds for linguistic convergence, such as mutual intelligibility, Flanders continues to preserve and consolidate its own pronunciation norms (Goossens 1973, Taeldeman 1992, Van de Velde 1996). Van de Velde (1996) even observed a growing difference on the pronunciation level between Dutch in the Netherlands and in northern Belgium. This is mainly due to the changes that northern Dutch is going through, changes that Flanders does not adopt. Preserving an identity may be the reason for the conservative course of southern Dutch pronunciation. Deprez (1981) suggested that the Flemish are looking for a type of Dutch through which their identity shows. The two pronunciation norms, which can be heard on radio and television in the two countries, are now well-established, and each variety seems to be highly unmarked in the country where it is broadcast. They have achieved considerable prestige in their own right in their own territory. Daan (1983:482) even raised the question as to which of the two pronunciations should be taught in Dutch as a Second Language courses, thus indicating that both are prestigious.

It seems doubtful whether the blending of northern and southern Dutch will ever be completely fulfilled. While grammatical and lexical norms indeed continue to converge, a common pronunciation norm is not likely to arise. Most importantly, there is no neutral linguistic norm that both sides could focus on; no neutral geographical area that could function as the norm area and no linguistically homogenous group of speakers that could impose a norm to speakers on both sides. There are, furthermore, no reasons to assume that speakers on either side are willing to accept an exterior norm, and either community seems quite accepting towards being somewhat different from the other, especially regarding pronunciation. There are subtle cultural differences between the Netherlands and Belgium9, and these contribute to this apparent need to maintain differences.

---

9 Stereotypically, Dutchmen, for instance, tend to focus more on the financial side than on the interpersonal in business, and the Dutch tend to be more egalitarian than the Flemish.
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3.4 OTHER LANGUAGES IN THE NETHERLANDS

Regional varieties of Dutch

Based on their function in society and their size, the languages in the Netherlands can be categorised into majority and minority varieties. There is one majority variety, namely Dutch. Official documents are written in this language, it is the official main language of education all over the country. All native Dutchman can be said to understand Standard Dutch and to have some variety of Dutch as their mother tongue.

The standardisation over the years of Dutch in the Netherlands runs parallel to the development of other varieties, the so-called minority languages. They are non-standard in the sense that they do not constitute a norm that increasing numbers of speakers all over the country adhere to. There is today a growing concern for the existence of these smaller languages. Particularly from the 1970s onwards, when the Netherlands took on a more active role in Europe, steps have been taken towards their preservation. These minority languages can be subdivided into those that are officially recognised and those that are not. There are five minority varieties that have officially been recognised as such. Three of these are varieties the origins of which lie in the area itself, namely Frisian, Low Saxon, and Limburgian. The other two are Yiddish and Romany, two non-indigenous languages. Finally, a large number of languages are used that have not been recognised officially or receive relatively little protection, such as certain groups of dialects and immigrant languages.

Frisian

The Netherlands are officially bilingual, as Frisian is recognised within the Friesland area besides Dutch. Frisian coexists with Standard Dutch in this province. It is not a regional variety of Dutch; in the family tree of Germanic languages, it is placed beside English and Dutch in the West-Germanic branch. Frisian and English have common ancestors, namely the Inguaeonic dialects. Dutch is not from this group of dialects. However, nowadays Dutch and Frisian are considerably more alike than are Frisian and English, and in fact there is considerable mutual intelligibility between Dutch and Frisian.

The borders of the Frisian language area largely run parallel to those of the northern province of Friesland. This province has about 600,000 inhabitants. About two thirds of these speak Frisian, and over half of the Frisian population have Frisian as their native tongue. Gorter and Jonkman (1995) showed that 94% of all the inhabitants of Friesland claim to understand Frisian. They also found that 74% of all Frisian know how to speak it and that 65% are able to read it. On the other hand, less than one in five Frisians claim to be able to write it. All in all, the Frisian language has firm roots in Frisian society.

Frisian is protected under the Council of Europe’s Charter for Regional or Minority Languages. This is an official European standard in which languages are
classified on the basis of the nature and extent of their use within societies, and this standard is recognised by the Dutch government. Frisian has by constitution been acknowledged as a means of communication in administration and courts in Friesland. In this sense, the degree of recognition of Frisian surpasses that of any other minority language in the Dutch language area. On the other hand, Frisian is almost exclusively spoken in and near the thinly populated province of Friesland. Its practical importance within the Netherlands at large is therefore limited, but as a linguistic and cultural statement the Frisian language bears much importance.

*Other regional languages*

The other two indigenous varieties that have been assigned an official status in the Netherlands are Low Saxon and Limburgian. They are dialects spoken in the (north) eastern and south-eastern regions of the Netherlands, respectively, and they have hardly at all contributed to the standard language in the Netherlands. Both Limburgian and Low Saxon refer to a group of related dialects rather than to a standardised variety. These two varieties have been given a much ‘lighter’ official status than Frisian.

There are also dialect groups within the Netherlands that deviate to a high degree from Standard Dutch but that nevertheless do not have an official status of any kind. An example of such a dialect group is the collection of Zeeland dialects in the very south-west of the country. Whether other dialects will in the future be acknowledged depends to a high degree on the precedents set with regard to the recognition of other dialect groups. Persistent lobbying initiatives by speakers of dialects themselves are a decisive factor in this process.

*Randstad Dutch*

*Randstad* is the name to denote the area in the west of the Netherlands that houses the largest cities of the country: Amsterdam, Haarlem, Rotterdam, the Hague, and Utrecht. The term *Randstad* (lit. ‘Rim City’) refers to the cities in this area, as if they together form one city. The large cities are linked by smaller cities, such as Leiden and Delft, and together they form an urban agglomeration10. These cities lie in the provinces of North Holland (Amsterdam and Haarlem), South Holland (Rotterdam and the Hague), and Utrecht (Utrecht). This urban area is associated with the origins of Standard Dutch, especially the Holland cities.

It would be incorrect to claim that a separate language is spoken in the *Randstad*, but sociolinguistically speaking it is safe to say that this area is an entity of its own. This is in particular true in the minds of many people, both those from inside and from outside the area. The *Randstad* receives most of the media attention in the Netherlands, which is largely due to this area having a large and dense

10 The name *Randstad* is said to have been invented in the 1930s by Albert Plesman (1889-1953), the founder of the Royal Dutch Airlines. From an airplane, he pointed out to his guest passengers the horseshoe’s shape of the urban area wrapped around the green area in the west of the Netherlands, and he called out “Een randstad!” (“A rim city!”).
CHAPTER 3

population and to the fact that it contains the economic and political centres. Moreover, much of national broadcasting takes place from the north-eastern periphery of this area, and much of Dutch media speech has a distinct *Randstad* ring to it. Hagen (1990:34) even referred to Dutch media speech as broad *Randstad* speech\(^\text{11}\). Due to these historical and contemporary circumstances, *Randstad* inhabitants traditionally possess a certain self-assurance and pride. This is said to show in their evaluation of language too. Daan (1969:13), for instance, said that the idea that dialects are uncivilised is most common in the minds of people from the *Randstad* area, while Kloke (1937:7) talked about ‘Hollanders’ not being able to recognise their own deviations from the standard language. A similar comment was made by Van Bree (1981:421), and he added that many westerners will simply feel that they speak the standard language.

Today the *Randstad/non-Randstad* division in the Netherlands is still prevalent. Daan (1969:13), however, felt that, due to the growing confidence of people from outside the *Randstad*, the named opposition is slowly subsiding. She believed that the relationship between the *Randstad* and the rest of the Netherlands is in fact improving. Kloke (1954:811-812) felt that civilised speakers from Holland had generally grown tolerant towards non-standard features, as long as they were not broad. He even sensed a critical attitude in Hollanders, saying that civilised Hollanders were most critical towards deviations from the standard language that are typical of local Holland speech.

**Posh Dutch**

The final indigenous variety discussed here is the posh variety, which is an illustrious kind of variety. Voortman (1994:24) said that posh Dutch cannot be defined with any precision in general terms. Hagen (1990:34-35), in line with this, simply called the posh variety the ‘super standard’, indicating that this variety cannot be placed amongst traditional non-standard varieties. Posh Dutch is different from other non-standard varieties in that it is associated with the elite exclusively, whereas dialects are associated with a broader range of social classes. ‘Poshness’ is also referred to as ‘artificial’, ‘stuck-up’ (*Van Dale* Dutch-English dictionary 1986), ‘vane’, ‘haughty’, ‘distinguished’, ‘hypercivilised’, ‘exaggerated’ (*Van Dale Handwoordenboek Hedendaags Nederlands* dictionary 1996), ‘arrogant’ (*Van Dale* dictionary 1976, Stroop 1998:95), or, for instance, ‘affected’. So, poshness is not always viewed positively.

This variety is not strictly confined to an area, but it is non-standard nevertheless (Van de Velde 1996:30). There is some disagreement on the regional origin of posh Dutch, if there is one. Daan (1969:15) called ‘hypercivilised’ Dutch a variety the origin of which lies in the area around the western cities of Leiden and the Hague. Van der Wal and Van Bree (1992:359) and Stroop (1998:93) pointed also to the Hague and Leiden. Van Donselaar (1987:82) linked posh Dutch to Biltoven-Noord, Wassenaar, and Aerdenhout, all of which are towns in the western

---

\(^{11}\) The Dutch term he used was *randstadplat*. 
and central Netherlands that are known to house a high percentage of wealthy inhabitants. The higher social classes of these places allegedly maintain this type of Dutch to distinguish themselves from ordinary people. In any case, any roots of posh Dutch lie in urban circles in the west of the Netherlands.

Posh Dutch is by no means widely used or adopted in the Netherlands, and it has an almost enigmatic air about it. Unlike in some countries (most notably England), in the Netherlands this type of speech does not have strong foundations in society. The average Dutchman hardly ever hears it, either in real life or on television or radio, although there are a few well-known speakers of posh-like Dutch, for instance, the politician Frits Bolkestein (born in 1933) and the writer Adriaan van Dis (born in 1946). The degree of poshness of these speakers does not compare with the typically aristocratic posh speech style of England. Van Haeringen (1949a:3) considered the language of the aristocracy too small to bear any widespread influence. Van der Toorn (1992:12-13) even believed that this ‘ceremonious’ type of language has more or less disappeared in the Netherlands. Many consider posh speech to be odd, and according to Hagen (1990:35) posh speech is viewed as critically by people as broad speech is. In that sense, posh speech is on a par with other non-standard languages.

The word ‘affected’ translates as ‘not natural’, and it is true that posh speech is sometimes perceived as unnatural. Van der Wal and Van Bree (1994:359) believed that posh speech is a result of the need of certain speakers to distinguish themselves from speakers of Standard Dutch. Stroop (1998:94) also believed that posh speech is a reaction, not to standard speech but to something ‘below’ Standard Dutch, namely a more common and general type of Dutch. Van Donselaar (1987:82) emphasised that the qualification ‘unnatural’ wrongly suggests that people who speak this variety only use it in certain situations and that they have to make an effort to speak it because they really speak another language. The alleged unnaturalness of speech from the higher social classes, and the additional effort some speakers make to achieve a certain type of speech, was encountered in several investigations, and it regularly surfaces in the literature. Kroch (1979) found that the highest social classes in Philadelphia expend a more or less unnatural effort and energy to achieve the desired distinctive speech. Kloeke (1951:47) talked about the tendency of the civilised to go against that which can be considered authentic and general in the Dutch language.

Salverda de Grave (1938:149), Galiaard (1967), Van Gaalen (1985), and Hagen (1990:35) suggested that an additional tightening of the articulatory muscles takes place when producing posh speech, accompanied with an extra energy when speaking. Yet, this increased tightening of muscles is not as a rule true. Van Haeringen (1949a:6), for instance, talked about an aristocratic speech style that became temporarily popular in the early 20th Century, namely a general nasalisation.

12 There used to be a programme on Dutch television, called Glamourland (‘Glamour Land’), which ran mainly in the 1990s. This programme featured posh Dutchmen and their speech and had a banterish nature.
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It involved a sagging velum, and it was part of a generally ‘weak’ pronunciation, with lax muscles.

Within the Netherlands, certain standardised features of posh Dutch may exist, but it cannot be assumed that the communities where it is spoken tend towards one type of non-regional posh Dutch. One distinguishing feature is the lexicon, and posh speakers are said to refer to their piece of pie as taartje rather than gebakje, to their car as auto rather than wagon, and they call their refrigerators ijskast, not koelkast. All of these are synonyms, although irregularities exist as to the exact objects they refer to. Posh Dutch is, furthermore, said to possess segmental properties that distinguish it from Standard Dutch, but there is no systematic description of it. Voortman (1994) described posh Dutch in some detail, but mostly miscellaneous comments have been made. Salverda de Grave (1938:149), for instance, mentioned the tendency of posh speakers to monophthongise instead of diphthongise. Van Gaalen and Mosselaar (1985) said that the articulation places of the phonemes of posh Dutch are close to one another, around the central position of the mouth. Furthermore, they claimed, only a limited number of phonemes in posh Dutch are deviant from standard speech. Stroop (1998:94) put forward, amongst others, the raising of certain vowels as the most important feature of posh Dutch. He (1996:38) also described the Gooise (r) (a type of approximant (r)) as posh. Van Donselaar (1987:82) and Van der Wal and Van Bree (1992:359) named several segmental features of posh Dutch too. The nature of the segmental and various other articulatory features of posh speech remains debatable.

Non-indigenous languages in the Netherlands

Alongside the varieties that have their origin in the Dutch-language area, the most notable of which have been discussed above, languages exist in the Netherlands that are of a more exotic nature. Two of these have been given a special status by the European Council, namely Yiddish and Romany. Yiddish is a German-based language, traces of which are found in the speech of the Jewish population of the Netherlands. Romany is a gypsy language. These languages hardly bear any historical linguistic relationship to Dutch.

There is, finally, a large number of foreign languages13. Examples are the languages of immigrants, the most quantitatively dominant of which are Turks, Moroccans, and Chinamen. Extra (2002) named no less than 23 important language groups in the Netherlands. The presence of these groups in Dutch society is notable, and there are, for instance, more speakers of Turkish than of Frisian in the Netherlands. Measures are taken to incorporate these languages into Dutch society, and some steps have been taken to protect and further some of them.

---

13 Unfortunately, all available nationality statistics are in some way biased (Broeder & Extra, 1999:5), and therefore it is difficult to determine the number and size of nationalities. This makes quantitative estimates as to the languages actually spoken in the Netherlands difficult.
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3.5 DUTCH UNDER THREAT

Stroop (1993:180) believed that, now that there are no longer strict norms regarding Standard Dutch (so he claimed), this variety is bound to disappear. The fear for the deterioration and even disappearance of Dutch is of all times. The unsettling feeling that decay is taking place is likely to be a result of ongoing linguistic and other changes in the world around us. Vallen (2000:6) talked about technological developments having a great influence on the language-variation situation in the Netherlands as well as the internationalisation of Dutch society and the increasing number of migrations. This way, although varieties are disappearing, people are now confronted on a daily basis with a dynamic multitude of language varieties, more so than earlier generations. This (feeling of) instability in the language situation may stir protectionist sentiments.

Influences from abroad

Several languages have influenced Dutch. Because of the Spanish influence (16th Century in particular), Spanish words have entered the Dutch language at all levels of society. Luther’s writings (early 1500s) and the proximity of Germany have over the centuries led to the adoption of German lexical items, and scholarly Latin added its own words. In the 17th and 18th Century, French culture bore a considerable prestige in the Netherlands, and French words were eagerly adopted. Other languages, such as Italian, Hebrew, Portuguese, and the Slavonic languages, have also contributed to the Dutch lexicon, while serious English influence began in the 1800s. In the period after the Second World War, and in the last few decades in particular, the influx of English words in Dutch has boomed.

Van der Sijs (2001) found that the great majority of loan words in Dutch come from neighbouring languages such as French, English, and German, as well as from Latin. She found that most of the French loan words were borrowed in the 19th and 20th Century. She claimed that the influence of German was great in both the 19th and 20th Century but that most 20th Century German loan words date from before 1950, while most English loan words were borrowed after that date. Today, about two thirds of all borrowings in Dutch are from Romance languages, about ten percent are from English, and about six percent are from German. The influence of English is topical today, the German influence used to be until relatively recently, whereas the influence of other languages on Dutch has generally passed ordinary speakers by.

The dramatic effects that French has had on the English language show that foreign borrowings may be incorporated on a large scale, remain recognisable as such, but obtain a pronunciation that over time nevertheless allows the word in question to come to be considered native. Words borrowed are after a period of time not distinguishable as foreign anymore, due to, for instance, affixation and to spelling and pronunciation adjustments. This is true for Dutch as well. Van der Sijs (1998, 2001) felt that the large number of borrowed words in Dutch has not caused or accelerated any form of decay of the language. Van der Sijs (1998, 2001:29) gave
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examples of new words that have come to existence (and in some cases have disappeared again) and thus illustrated the dynamic nature of linguistic (lexical) change, in which the idea of decay is not likely to find support in scientific evidence. The borrowed words Van der Sijs (2001:57, 63, 939, 1126) presented can indeed be considered unmarked Dutch words today: for instance, the Romance word fabriek ('plant', 'factory') and the Latin word zolder ('loft', ‘attic’). Words that seem exotic, because they are foreign or archaic, can apparently be accepted relatively quickly in Dutch. Witteboon (1960:27) spoke about the word lokasie ('place', ‘location’), which at the time was by him considered a widely unknown word. Another word, which was (re)introduced by a small social group, namely feest ('party', 'celebration'), was considered archaic by Van Haeringen (1949a:3) in the late 1940s. Today, the words locatie en feest are common words in the Dutch language.

It is today difficult to produce a normal-sized sentence with only words originating from the Low Countries, but there are no reasons to assume that Dutch borrows more from abroad than other languages do. The main difference between borrowing today and borrowing in earlier times lies in the fact that today there is a stronger awareness of borrowing than before due to modern communicational facilities, foreign-language education, and a generally higher level of education of people. Moreover, complaining language puritans can be heard, read, or seen in the media. Ordinary Dutch speakers are increasingly conscious of the entrance of new words into their language and of the origin of these words. This will have reinforced the idea that Dutch disproportionately borrows from abroad.

The German threat

Attitudes towards the Dutch language within the Netherlands have to an important degree been shaped by its position as a relatively small language amongst larger and more charismatic languages. Its close connection with German in particular has in the past aroused feelings of pride and protectionism.

It is common for geographically adjacent languages to be genetically close. Dutch and German are a good example of this, as they both belong to the West Germanic branch. Today’s Standard Dutch and Standard German are different in vital respects. The historical origins of Standard Dutch and Standard German lie hundreds of miles apart, and these two languages are obviously distinct. It used to be true that in the border area dialects of the local varieties of Dutch and German were as a rule largely mutually intelligible, but the political boundary between the Netherlands and Germany has increasingly led to dialect boundaries. For younger speakers in particular, the dialects on the ‘other’ side are becoming more difficult to follow, especially from a lexical point of view (Gerritsen 1993, 1999:6).

Looking at their history, German and Dutch cannot be compared to pairs of languages that have the same origin but are artificially separated on political grounds, like Hindi and Undi (Asia), and Serbian and Croatian (Europe). A more instinctive ground for considering them to be independent languages is that Dutch is
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difficult to comprehend for native Germans without any instruction, especially when spoken\(^{14}\).

The German influence on Dutch was most current from the 19\(^{th}\) Century to the mid 20\(^{th}\) Century. The 19\(^{th}\) Century Dutch writers Beets and Van Lenep publicly condemned the German effects on Dutch. Such feelings intensified around the First World War, in the subsequent century. In 1931, the Genootschap Onze Taal (‘Society of Our Language’) was founded. This society and its magazine Onze Taal (‘Our Language’) still exist today. The alleged deterioration of the Dutch language was an important ground for the establishment of this society and the magazine. In particular, the widespread adoption of German-sounding words was an important impetus of the editors. The growing international opposition to Germany in the 1930s made the urge to openly distinguish Dutch from German a matter of importance. In 1939, just after Poland was invaded, the Dutch diplomat Groenman made a plea in Onze Taal magazine: “keep your language independent, like you keep your country independent”\(^{15}\) (as cited in De Jong & Burger, 1991:34). Around this time, voices could be heard coming from Germany, saying that Dutch was not a fully-fledged language in its own right. The German writer Karl Haag even labelled Dutch as a dialect of German (and a mere ‘historical curiosity’\(^{16}\)) (as cited in De Jong & Burger 1991:32). The Second World War brought about the issue of the disappearance of Dutch. Nevertheless, no noticeable efforts were made by the oppressors during this time to implement this intention, and this threat remained unknown to ordinary speakers of Dutch.

The interest in the protection of Dutch against German became less once the dangers of German political tyranny faded. The circulation of Onze Taal narrowed from around 6,500 in 1945 to about 4,500 in 1952. Today, an aversion against German linguistic influences on Dutch is not a serious issue any longer, not in magazines such as Onze Taal and not in Dutch society.

The English threat

Unlike the German influence, the influence of English on Dutch is topical today. The lexical influence of English on Dutch is obvious, and modern technical terms in particular are readily borrowed. There are numerous examples of English borrowings that today have only a small degree of foreignness attached to them, and to younger speakers of Dutch in particular they are likely to sound indigenously Dutch (for instance the noun interview). The Dutch business-related word uitbesteden is as common as the English equivalent to outsource (resulting in the

\(^{14}\) Whether the reverse is also true is difficult to say, because German is taught in Dutch schools, and Dutch speakers are regularly exposed to German through television. Dutch is not a common school subject in Germany, and Dutch programmes on German television are usually fully ‘dubbed’ (no Dutch can be heard, not even in the background) and are not subtitled. Things may be changing; the exposure of Dutchmen to German media is decreasing, and so is German-language teaching in Dutch schools.

\(^{15}\) Original Dutch citation: Houdt Uw taal vrij zoals gij Uw land vrij houdt.

\(^{16}\) Original German citation: geschichtliche Merkwürdigkeit.
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Dutch verb *outsourceren*). The trendy Dutch expression *er voor gaan* seems a direct translation of *to go for it*. More recent controversial borrowings may follow the same path.

The only obvious influence that English has had on Dutch is lexical. There are, for instance, no indications that Standard Dutch pronunciation has been moving towards English pronunciation. Systematic grammatical tendencies towards English are also not visible. This would mean that the effects of English are marginal, as the basic Dutch language structure remains intact. Despite this, the English threat is widely felt to exist and causes continuous concern.

Many recent borrowings can be considered an opportunity missed to create a new Dutch word, yet despite complaints about the adoption of English terms in Dutch such borrowing keeps occurring. It seems that the swift habituation to upcoming English terms obstructs efforts to find such alternatives. In fact, efforts to construct a Dutch equivalent often seem more of an idealistic after-effect than a viable attempt to deal with Anglicisation. The Dutch do not seem entirely dedicated to this fight, as English is a language that many of them find appealing and that they readily use and listen to. The Flemish linguist Beheydt (1996) talked about the blatant admiration for the functionality and the international emanation of English of the Dutch, and he suggested this will have enhanced this lack of resistance. De Bot (1994:11) considered it inevitable that the role of English in Dutch society will grow at the expense of Dutch, although it may remain restricted to certain usage domains. The reasons for the influence of English are the international role of this language and its function as a lingua franca in many situations. De Bot, Van Ginneken, and Weltens (1999:11) named the increasing number of internet connections in the Netherlands as well as the growth of bilingual education as reasons why this influence will continue to grow in the Netherlands specifically.

The fear of the effects of English, contrary to the former fear of German, may be lasting, due to the increasing global importance of English but also due to the eagerness of Dutch speakers to introduce it as a default language in communication with foreigners. The Dutch are increasingly becoming comfortable with using English as a second language. A distinctive Dutch-sounding English has developed, with a limited grammar and vocabulary, which functions as an efficient means of communication in situations where Dutch is not sufficient. This way, the use of English may expand without seriously affecting the Dutch language. Dutch and this type of English may increasingly exist side by side in Dutch society, complementing each other and each having their own specific practical function.

---

17 English increasingly has a lingua franca function in Europe. Kroon and Vallen (2000) suggested that a type of English is coming to existence that is typical of Europe (see also Kroon, Roselaar & Vallen 1999).

18 Some speakers nevertheless typically use a hybrid form of English, nicknamed ‘Dunglish’ (Burrough-Boenisch 1998); English with strong Dutch lexical and grammatical influences.
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The threat from within

The previous section illustrated that an important threat to Dutch is believed to be internal (caused by speakers) rather than external (caused by circumstances ‘outside’ speakers). The Dutch stereotypically show a lack of care towards their language (Beheydt 1996). This sentiment is not something of contemporary times only; earlier writers have commented on this phenomenon as well. Even as early as three centuries ago (1674), the governor-general of the Dutch East Indies, Maetsuyker, said: “We have continuously looked after the continuation of the Dutch language, [...] however, until today this all seems to have been in vain [...]”[19] (as cited by Groeneboer, 1993:47). Well over a century ago, Veth (1883) wrote that “no other people give such a strong impression of disregard towards their own language”[20]. Amongst some modern linguists, a more optimistic attitude is current, for instance, Weltens and De Bot’s (1999:13, 1995), according to whom the position of Dutch is quite secure in the Netherlands. They said that it is not quite the threatened language it is sometimes believed to be. Dutchmen, their research suggests, appreciate and value their language as much as Germans and, for instance, Englishmen do their languages. Van der Wal and Van Bree (1994:376), in addition, said that there are simply too many people speaking Dutch, in a clearly demarcated and relatively homogenous language area, for it to disappear. They also emphasised that Dutch is strongly linked to a historical, cultural, and national identity. They did feel, however, that its prestige may be declining. De Bot (1994:13) indicated that there are no indications that Dutch in informal domains is threatened by English, despite considerable English (lexical) influences, and that in many formal domains Dutch is still firmly the common language. In the media, education, international relations, trade, and industry, he did notice an anglicising tendency. Presumably, he was referring to the lexical and idiomatic level.

The Dutch are notorious for switching languages in conversations with foreigners. Complaints can be heard about Dutch speakers changing languages at will when addressed in foreign-sounding Dutch. English is treated as the obvious alternative in these situations, although German is also a popular option in the regions bordering on Germany. A cause for this behaviour lies in the accustomisation in the last few centuries of the Dutch to accommodating their language to foreign trading counterparts. Maetsuyker (1674) already spoke about Dutchmen taking such pride in being able to speak a foreign tongue. There is not necessarily a causal connection between this linguistic flexibility of speakers and the care for the mother tongue. Weltens and De Bot’s (1995) research even suggested that the Dutch are quite fond of their language. They may, however, be similarly fond of efficient communication and proud to show their command of English, and this is likely to lie at the heart of their ready use of English. The prominence of practical English in education in the Netherlands enhances this leniency towards the

19 Original Dutch citation: Het voortzetten van de Nederlantse tale [...], hebben wy doorgaens behertigt, [...], dogh to nogh toe, soo het schyn, alles te vergefys.

20 Original Dutch citation: Geen ander volk [...] neemt soozeer den schijn aan alsof het zijn eigen taal minacht.
use of English (De Bot 1994:18). Even in official circles, this pro-English-language attitude has met with acceptance, and there have in the past been discussions in Dutch Parliament about whether tertiary higher education should take place in English alongside Dutch, and even instead of Dutch.

### 3.6 THE FUTURE OF DUTCH

#### The dialect situation

Several tendencies are visible in the Netherlands today that provide a glimpse of the future. One of the most noticeable ones is the uncertain position of dialects. There is disagreement on the rate of disappearance of dialects in the Netherlands as well as the degree to which their structure and function decline. Van den Berg (1984:101) considered it inevitable that dialects will disappear. According to Van der Wal and Van Bree (1994:356), on the other hand, the ongoing process of dialect loss may take place at a lower pace than is often claimed. They referred to articles by Van Ginneken (1913, 1914), in which the disappearance of dialects within a short period of time was announced. Van Ginneken’s prediction has proven to be incorrect.

Dialects in the Netherlands are subject to a loss of structure and function, especially those that are linguistically furthest removed from the standard language. Larger, regional varieties are coming to existence and are gaining ground. These are likely to survive longer than each of the dialects that they used to consist of. The same thing is happening in Wales. The dialects of Welsh are making way for a general non-regional variety that is taught in schools (called *Cymraeg Bywyd*; ‘Welsh for living’). Its emotional value is considerably different from the original regional and local varieties in Wales. It is considered less authentic and not typical of the countryside, but rather has a cachet of modernness about it and is typical of Wales as a sophisticated and forward-looking nation. It is believed that it is the only way for Welsh to survive as a language alongside English. Possibly, then, the regionalisation of dialects is the way to secure non-standard Dutch.

Today, dialects are still widely spoken in the Netherlands, and a revival of dialects has even been suggested (Oostendorp 2000). Nevertheless, the changes in the social structure in the Netherlands suppress their usage. Van den Berg (1984:101) named the increased mobility and the developments in the media in the 20th Century as important factors in the disappearance of regional varieties. Another factor is that non-standard varieties survive best in thinly populated areas, i.e. outside cities (Janssen 1943, Daan & Weijnen 1967:29), while many rural areas in the Netherlands are urbanising.

Besides the above-named tendency, another sentiment is active. Van Haeringen (1924a:66) believed that people do not want to be linguistically conspicuous. Consequently, young parents seem to be choosing the standard variety for their children, he said. Van Haeringen considered this an important force in the disappearance of language varieties and in the move towards one single language.

Goudsblom (1964:109-110) indicated that regional habits and folk habits are disappearing and that time is pressuring us to register the old customs. Dialects are
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part of these old customs, he said. Van den Berg (1984:101) made similar comments. In sociolinguistic circles, one is expected to look after dying languages, said De Bot (1994:13). The European Bureau for Lesser Used Languages has as one of its aims the protection of small languages. It is one of the goals of the Bureau to call to the attention of every European citizen the diversity and richness of the languages spoken in the European Union. The motivation behind this protection is the conviction that cultural identities that are threatened ought to be protected. It appeals to a common feeling that what is small requires special care and should be given the opportunity to survive. There is also a practical reason to protect dialects, namely to give (especially monolingual) speakers of these varieties the possibility to use their native tongue in official situations, besides in informal situations.

Besides those that are professionally concerned about language, speakers themselves could also be expected to protect their linguistic heritage. Edwards (1994:111) noted, however, that the active desire to prevent or arrest decline is usually found only in a small number of people, and they are generally not the ordinary souls whose language is at risk. Van Haeringen observed a similar tendency and said that only those that do not run the risk of being affected by dialects actually admire them. This small group of people would not consider starting to speak them, and regional and local features are thus slowly reduced to folklore curiosities. In other words, those who speak an endangered language are not necessarily the same as those who wish to protect them. The argument to protect and further small language varieties is in that case not practical but founded in social, academic, cultural, and emotive grounds.

The literature tends to emphasise that with the disappearance of the old dialects linguistic variation decreases. This is true, but the other side of the coin is that simultaneously new varieties arise. Vallen (2000:1) stated that variation is an essential feature of linguistic communication in any society. Speakers themselves seem aware of this need for variation, and instead of using dialects they tend to create new varieties, mostly in urban areas. According to Inoue (1991:3), new language varieties are coming to existence all the time in Japan. Similar tendencies are noticed in the United States and Great Britain. It is likely that Dutch speakers will also keep finding ways of distinguishing themselves linguistically, without reverting to using the old dialects. Dialect formation through street language is one option in this sense.

Concerns over a linguistically colourless future remain. A reason for this may be that new language varieties are generally linguistically closer to Standard Dutch than the old dialects. In that sense, the claim that linguistic variation is decreasing is correct.

Linguistic decentralisation

The decentralisation of the socio-economic focus in the Netherlands is another factor in the changing language situation in the Netherlands. The appreciation of non-western language varieties is as a result growing, and the interest in Dutch dialects has grown outside their region of origin. New local and regional radio
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stations have come to existence. On national television, the geographical focus also seems to be becoming more dispersed. Stroop (1992:181) felt that radio and television used to be the pillars of polished Standard Dutch but that this has changed. Anyone with any degree of an accent was not hired in the past, whereas the non-regionality demands for presenters seem to have been cast off, according to Stroop. Van den Toorn (1992:12) made a similar comment. As for music, broad Amsterdam speech was always the only popular language variety used. Van Gaalen (1989:35-37) pointed out that for a long time the Amsterdam city variety (a western variety) had been the main carrier of musical tearjerkers, while singing in any other regional variety was not done. In popular music in the late 1980s, and even more so in the 1990s, non-western varieties became popular outside the area where they were spoken, and this tendency continues today.

Kloeke (1954:813) already noticed the tolerance towards light regionalisms. He (Kloeke 1957:10, 11), in addition, said that civilised Hollanders find certain features of eastern Dutch pleasantly civilised, including the monophthongal pronunciation of (ee) and (oo) and the (s)/(z) distinction. Van Haeringen (1954:13), too, emphasised the positive appreciation of certain eastern Dutch features. But, the east is not the only area that has some linguistic status. Southern voiced (‘soft’) (g) is sometimes also appreciated positively, because maintaining the voiced/voiceless distinction in Dutch is reminiscent of a past situation. What the actual influence will be of non-western speech traits on the standard language remains to be seen. It seems doubtful whether the influence of any of them is strong enough to overrule the western dominance, but the emancipation of regional traits seems to take place anyway and to a small degree helps to maintain language variation in the Netherlands.

Deformalisation

Van Haeringen (1924a:82, 1954:13) in the early and mid 20th Century talked about the deformalising tendency in society having led to a high number of speakers with speech containing vulgarisms and provincialisms. In this tendency, those that stereotypically speak the standard language abandon it. A lessening of formal affected speech in the standard language has continuously been taking place since (Hagen 1990:34), and there is an increasing flexibility towards correctness (Stroop 1992:180).

In recent times, a strong wave of deformalisation has been noticed in the Netherlands, and new non-regional varieties are coming to existence. Stroop (1992:180) felt that General Civilised Dutch, or ABN (see Section 3.3), without any audible regional accent, does not exist anymore - as an ideal or as a reality - and that it has been replaced by a type of Dutch that is moving away from General Civilised Dutch. Stroop (1997:10-11) argued that there is in fact an overall loss of a uniform and clear norm. A little over a decade ago, Stroop (1992:181) expressly hinted at a move not towards one uniform standard language but towards several types of
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'social speech'\textsuperscript{21}, which will exist side by side: the new, deormalised Dutch, which Stroop called General Accepted Dutch.

Other writers also noticed the tendency that Stroop touched on, and various factors have been posed to explain it. Van der Toorn (1992:12, 13) put forward an increased tolerance towards showing emotions in public. He also spoke about a 'downward tolerance'\textsuperscript{22}, which is a general tendency in Dutch society to accept less cultured habits. Language is only a symptom of this tendency, he said. The deormalisation of Dutch is in line with the changes that have taken place in social relations in the Netherlands, and there has been a move away from 'speaking down on people' to 'speaking with people'\textsuperscript{23}, argued Hagen (1990:34). This development was reinforced by the egalitarian tendencies of the 1960s, he said.

The amateur linguist Ten Hagen (n.d.:4) referred to the lack of care and authority shown by those with academic credentials, blaming them for the deterioration of the language of ordinary speakers. This alleged unwillingness by those expected to show authority symbolises the changed mutual relationship of various groups in society. De Vries (1974:227) talked about the growing solidarity in the social layers that do not belong to the upper-middle class and the loss of authority of the highest social layer. Van de Velde (1996:30) considered Standard Dutch in the Netherlands to have lost its elite nature and he felt that it has turned into the sociolect of both the middle and the upper classes. Daan (1983:477) and Bakker (1982) made similar comments. Bakker thought that polished language is nowadays simply considered bad behaviour. He claimed that the discriminatory function of Standard Dutch is disappearing, causing a decreased socio-economic incentive to speak the standard language. Ordinary speakers such as Ten Hagen (n.d.) in particular feel affected by this tendency, wishing that a strict view on what is correct and what is not would return and that experts rather than just any user would determine what is correct.

So, the loss of authority of the elite in modern Dutch society has made possible the entrance of informal items in the standard language. This may have triggered reactionary behaviour of traditional speakers of the standard language. Gouwslom (1964:122) suggested that, due to the hypercorrect pronunciation of Standard Dutch by some Dutch learners, the mother-tongue speakers of this variety at times tend to do the opposite, namely to speak sloppily, so as to communicate that they are comfortable speaking the language. Kuitert (1955:28) noted a similar tendency, namely that an important section of Dutch intellectuals deliberately speak a type of Dutch revealing their regional origin\textsuperscript{24}.

The Second World War is another likely factor in the tendency to deormalise. Van den Toorn (1992:11-13) observed a grown use of non-standard varieties

\textsuperscript{21} Original Dutch citation: omgangstalen.
\textsuperscript{22} Original Dutch citation: tolerantie-naar-beneden.
\textsuperscript{23} Original Dutch citation: uit de hoogte spreken/toenaderend spreken.
\textsuperscript{24} A similar phenomenon occurred in the 19\textsuperscript{th} Century, when the standard language started to be adopted en masse by the bourgeoisie. This led to a counter movement, namely the decline of formal, emphatic, and posh speech. An informal and expressive variety arose and threatened the standard from below; a slangy type of Dutch.
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running parallel to the strengthening of the standard language, and he considered it a postponed effect of the war. He indicated that the generation born in the post-war period consciously or subconsciously rebelled against existing habits, amongst others in speech.

Stroop (1992:181, 1997:10-11), finally, gave two more reasons for the decline of old General Civilised Dutch, namely the general lack of knowledge regarding Dutch culture, including its language, and that speaking Standard Dutch is not an explicit aim at Dutch Teacher’s Colleges (for primary-school teachers).

Polder Dutch

A language variety that is said to demonstrate modern democratising tendencies in the Netherlands is Polder Dutch (Poldernederlands)25, which name was coined by Stroop (1998:1). Polder Dutch vowel features deviate from Standard Dutch in that the first element of Polder Dutch diphthongs is lowered. An earlier remark that is reminiscent of this observation is Zaalberg’s (1993), who said that Dutch ai was at the time often pronounced as aa by speakers of Standard Dutch, which largely comes down to (amongst others) a lowering of the first element. Stroop himself around the same time (1992:180) already hinted at the changes of ij to ai, i.e. the lowering of the first element of the (ei) diphthong.

Many speakers that would have been stereotypical speakers of the old standard language now supposedly speak Polder Dutch instead. Polder Dutch is a modern-day non-regional variety of Dutch. Young successful women26 are, according to Stroop, most likely to speak Polder Dutch27. A realm of intellectualism, commercialism, and pop culture surrounds Polder Dutch, and Stroop (1998:14) linked the female presenters of The Music Factory (a Dutch MTV-like television channel) to Polder Dutch as well as those on talk shows and other semi-intellectual television programmes. This variety is controversial in the sense that its actual existence is questionable. It may be that Polder Dutch is hypothetical rather than realistic, that this name artificially attaches a name to an old and known tendency and that it presents no new insights into the future of Standard Dutch. An important weakness of Polder Dutch is that it bears only on a specific pronunciation feature and does not incorporate a systematic description of a language variety (although the name suggests that). In any case, it has become associated with the future of Standard Dutch, and it has in recent years been the starting point of research and lively debates on modern varieties of standardised Dutch.

25 This name refers to the Dutch negotiation and compromise culture fails to clearly communicate the nature of this language variety.
26 Which Stroop referred to as ‘avant-garde’ women.
27 The idea that women are spreading a controversial modern feature of Dutch was mentioned earlier with relation to other linguistic features. Van den Toorn (1992:6), for instance, suggested that women are leading the way in the spreading of the so-called Gooise (ri), which is at the moment amongst the most controversial Dutch pronunciation phenomena.
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The question now is whether a variety such as Polder Dutch, or the tendency that it has come to represent, will push through and at what rate. Intelligibility may be a determining factor here. Van Haeringen (1924a:82) believed that phonetic changes that are not too radical may eventually be adopted in the standard language. Heestermans (1985:61) was convinced that changes that are too sudden may impair intelligibility, and Daan (1993:9) said something along the same lines, adding that the changes in the standard language should be halted if communication is hindered. Polder Dutch is a language variety with features that are not radically different from Standard Dutch. It is not likely to obstruct communication. In the long run, the characteristics of Polder Dutch, and other modern linguistic phenomena (for instance, Gooise (f}; see Section 10.2), may therefore gain acceptance.

Media speech

Obvious factors in the development of Standard Dutch and Polder Dutch are radio and television. The media have become reference points, partly also due to the increasing daily number of hours Dutchmen spend exposed to them. An increasing number of Dutch professionals are exposed to radio while car-commuting to their jobs, and the popularity of radio amongst young listeners is illustrated by Dutch DJ’s achieving star status. The considerable influence of the spoken media on the Dutch language is undisputed.

The first Dutch radio channels arose in the 1920s, and television channels came to existence in the 1950s. In the 1980s and 1990s, drastic changes took place in the world of television broadcasting in the Netherlands, including the commercialisation of the programmes of the established broadcasting companies, as well as the coming to existence and growth (and occasionally disappearance) of commercialised broadcasting companies. Radio, too, has become increasingly commercial. Nowadays, there are Dutch-language and foreign-language channels amongst the Dutch media. The Dutch-language television channels have Dutch as the language of communication; they are either in Dutch or subtitled in Dutch. On both radio and television, there are semi-commercial and commercial channels. Besides national broadcasting companies, there are 14 regional broadcasting companies (radio and television, usually). There are nearly 100 registered local companies (mainly radio).

So, an important distinction within Dutch broadcasting today is between the established (now semi-commercial) and the new (commercial) channels. The established Dutch television channels (Nederland 1, 2, and 3) and radio channels (Radio 1, 2, and 3) air programmes of broadcasting companies with reasonably well-defined religious and/or political convictions. They bring a mixture of informative, cultural, intellectual, and ideological programming, alternating with light entertainment. The commercial channels (six major ones in 2004) do not explicitly adhere to a faith or endorse a political movement, and their existence depends fully on commercial support. Commercial channels broadcast similar types of programmes as the established channels, but their emphasis is more on entertainment, including a high number of foreign productions on television (in particular American). Their programmes are generally less high brow. Commercial
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cannels today as a whole have more viewers and listeners than semi-commercial channels, but programmes on semi-commercial channels generally receive higher appreciation ratings than those on commercial channels. Regional and local channels also exist, and they air light informative programmes, with news of the region or town.

With the commercial channels, new types of media speech can now be heard regularly, alongside the old media standard. Presenters on commercial programmes are stereotypically more likely to speak with traces of the accent that is typical of the area where broadcasting takes place (the 't Gooi area, in the eastern tip of the North Holland province). The regional and local channels use both standard and non-standard (local and regional) Dutch.

3.7 THE PROS AND CONS OF STANDARD DUTCH

Unification

Nowadays in the Netherlands, many people apparently feel some need to adapt their language to the most widely accepted norms. The resultant collection of standardised varieties gives us an idea of the future language situation in the Netherlands. It is possible that non-regional varieties will be the future norm. This leads one to consider the merits and demerits of a highly homogenous language situation.

De Vries (1980:226) illustrated a specific function of a national language. He indicated that in the Third World in particular the development and spreading of a standard language is important in the process of unification. The existence of a standard language enhances this feeling of unity. Haugen (1972), Van den Toorn (1974:276), and Jansen (1988:208-210) described the standard language as an expression of national independence and unification. Furthermore, equality, equal opportunity, and mutual understanding have been posed as functions of Standard Dutch (Jansen 1988:208-210, Goudsblom 1964:119).

The high degree of standardisation in the Netherlands indicates that a need for linguistic homogeneity, and for mutual sameness, exists here. That way, the standardisation of Dutch fulfils a wish. In the Netherlands, there are, however, no compelling political circumstances to standardise. In the post-war era, the need to standardise in the Netherlands is no longer directly fed by national pride and protectionism. The identification of speakers with Dutch and the Netherlands is changing, as people increasingly think of themselves as individuals within an international context, rather than nationals within a local or regional community. To some degree, therefore, the standard language in the Netherlands exists for comfort and convenience grounds, one of which is efficient communication (Jansen 1988:208-210, Goudsblom 1964:107-108).
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Heterogeneous versus homogenous countries

Geerts (1987:171) estimated that a sharp definition of existing norms enhances the
tolerance towards pronunciation variation. Whether this actually works that way
becomes clearer by looking at societies where dialectal differences are great and
those where they are minor. The social and regional backgrounds of speakers are
relatively easy to determine in linguistically pluralised countries with a highly fixed
standard language, such as the Netherlands, Poland, and England. Listeners in these
countries are generally capable of registering subtle pronunciation variation and link
this with regional and social traits. In linguistically homogenous countries such as
New-Zealand and Canada, on the other hand, making distinctions based on such
differences is hard; language variation in these countries cannot as easily be used to
roughly identify people’s social and regional backgrounds. In fact, in these societies
highly subtle pronunciation variation is not usually a topic of any grave concern. An
ongoing standardisation, therefore, does not necessarily lead to acceptance of
deviations from the standard language. Instead, it appears to lead to an over-
awareness of the deviations from the standard language and of language variation in
general.

Language discrimination

A drawback of the existence of a dominant standard language, alongside non-
standard languages, is the risk of language discrimination. Robert Hall (1950)
condemned the attitude towards non-standard speakers, which in his view led to
insecurity, worry, and fear, making enemies instead of friends. Van der Plank
(1985:114) perceived a growing tolerance towards substandard varieties but a
diminishing lenience towards non-standard varieties.

Vallen (2000:2-3) gave examples of situations in which the dominance of the
standard language can cause serious problems, such as when job applicants do not
meet this norm. He also mentioned the stigmatisation of foreign accents. An
increasing standardisation of one language variety may therefore lead to a linguistic
divide and to the isolation and folklorisation of varieties that deviate strongly from
the norm.

Other effects

Jansen (1988:209) put forward other disadvantages of a standard language, namely
not being able to hear where someone is from, uniformity, and the exclusion of all
personal idiosyncrasies. He felt that a need exists in listeners to classify other people
regionally, just like they want to know their mood.

So, standardisation meets the desires of many speakers but has serious
drawbacks too. The same goes for the preservation and endorsement of dialects.
Interestingly, there are contrasting forces in the Netherlands. The preservation of
dialects and stimulation of the standard language go hand in hand, and it is not
uncommon for individuals to support both causes simultaneously. What this shows
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most of all is that the awareness of the advantages of the standard language does not necessarily lead to a diminished appreciation of non-standard speech.

3.8 CONCLUSION

The present chapter has illustrated that the Dutch language allows for considerable variation. Today’s variation is much different from the variation as it existed in earlier times. The obvious need for variation has resulted in new varieties, and at the same time the old dialects are being revitalised and continued in an adjusted form. Besides varieties of Dutch, non-Dutch indigenous and non-indigenous languages have entered the country. Efforts are made to incorporate various non-Dutch varieties into Dutch society.

Dutch is deeply rooted in Dutch society. The Dutch appear to be protective of their own language and have in the past openly objected to influences from other languages. This openness and the resultant changing language situation is embraced but at the same time causes serious concern. The standard language seems to function as a point of reference in this discussion. The endorsement of this language variety, however, has led to a folklorisation of deviations from this norm. Protective attitudes are now alive, both to dialects and their opposite, Standard Dutch.

Despite the obvious rich variation, the overall language variation within the Netherlands is decreasing. On the other hand, individual speakers are confronted with a higher number of varieties than ever before. Speakers have become more mobile and likely to meet speakers of other varieties. Besides that, the media have been playing an increasingly dominant role in this, with speakers hearing a multitude of languages, oftentimes even on a daily basis. From an individual speaker’s perspective, variation has grown, one could argue. Yet, the general consensus is that Dutch is being threatened. This affects the way Standard Dutch is viewed.
METHODOLOGY
4. SPEECH MATERIAL

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Speech material was collected for a description of the pronunciation characteristics of Standard Dutch and for a number of other purposes. The present chapter presents the resultant two speech corpora, called the First Corpus and the Second Corpus.

To realise a speech corpus, speakers needed to be found who spoke Standard Dutch to a high degree. There are several ways to select such speakers. One could do it, first of all, on the basis of theoretical grounds; one could, for instance, assume that newscasters speak Standard Dutch. Claims that newscasters do so are regularly made by ordinary Dutchmen and can be found in the literature. Secondly, presenting listeners with speech from various speakers and letting them decide on the degree of standardness of the speech heard would be a way. A third approach is to ask people themselves to present the names of exemplary speakers of Standard Dutch.

For the First Corpus, the first two approaches were combined by selecting speakers who on the basis of theoretical grounds could be expected to speak Standard Dutch to a high degree and subsequently making a further selection by having listeners evaluate the degree of standardness of these speakers. For the Second Corpus, the first and third approaches were combined by asking respondents for names of prototypical speakers of Standard Dutch, creating a list on the basis of these names, and subsequently letting a new group of respondents make a selection from the list of names.

The First Corpus was considerably larger than the Second Corpus. The First Corpus consisted of old and new radio recordings. It was put together before the actual research project started, and it thus served as a starting point. The Second Corpus was created during the course of the research and consisted of recordings from television. Section 4.3 explains the reasons for adding the Second Corpus to the speech material.

Chapter overview

The details of the two corpora are in Section 4.2 and 4.3: the speech sources, the recording dates, the speakers, the sound quality and other relevant features of the recordings. These sections also discuss the theoretical and practical considerations in the material-collection process. Serious restrictions apply when depending on speech data that have not systematically been put into archives and are not kept for linguistic research, and these are discussed. Section 4.4 summarises the complete corpus.
4.2 THE FIRST CORPUS

The speech material for the First Corpus (see Table 4.1 for an overview) was obtained from the archives of the Film Research Foundation (Stichting Film en Wetenschap; SFW), Radio Netherlands (Wereld Omroep; WO), and from the Dutch Broadcasting Production Company (Nederlands Omroepproductie Bedrijf; NOB). It consisted of speech from 30 male radio presenters on current-affairs programmes and documentaries. Roughly ten minutes of speech was collected per speaker. The speakers were from five periods: the 1950s, 1960s, 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s.

Sources for speech material

The First Corpus needed to meet certain qualitative and quantitative criteria. Several potential speech sources existed, whose suitability needed to be investigated before a choice could be made among them. Radio and television archives were first investigated. The primary aim of the guardians of these archives is to systematically acquire and maintain a sound collection that can be used for making new programmes. The historical archive of the Audio-visual Archive Centre (Audiovisueel Archief Centrum) of the Dutch Broadcasting Production Company looks after Dutch radio footage and was therefore contacted. It possesses old and recent radio recordings that are qualitatively suitable for a phonetic description and a listening experiment (which were the intention), but access for an extensive corpus was problematic. Libraries for the blind were also contacted, but not enough data on the personal backgrounds of speakers were available there. The age of speakers and the recording dates were necessary, and these libraries did not have such information in all cases.

Then, the (much smaller) archives of two other organisations were considered, namely the Film Research Foundation in Amsterdam and Radio Netherlands in Hilversum. The audio-visual archive of the Film Research Foundation possessed an extensive collection of historical picture and sound material relating to political and social issues. Around the time they were contacted, their sound collection contained 20,000 gramophone records of radio broadcasts from the 1930s-1960s period. Alongside this collection, a well-documented selection of Dutch radio programmes with an informative or documentary nature was available. Radio Netherlands is a radio broadcasting company, consisting of a Dutch division and several foreign ones, which broadcasts current-affairs programmes, documentaries, and music. Radio Netherlands had a large archive of potentially suitable recordings.

After looking at the speech sources and at the criteria for the recordings (explained below), it was decided that the latter two sources (i.e. the archives of the Film Research Foundation and Radio Netherlands) were the best options. After

---

1 The First Corpus was constructed, written out, and described by Josephine van Rie for the project entitled De uitspraak van het Standaard Nederlands: een evaluatief en descriptief onderzoek, which ran from January 1994 to March 1996.

2 This foundation no longer exists and became part of the Dutch Audiovisual Archives (NAA: Nederlands Audiovisueel Archief).
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successful efforts to find material in these archives, and to make copies of original
recordings, it appeared that to complete the corpus satisfactorily the historical
archives of the Dutch Broadcasting Production Company needed to be entered after
all. As the amount of material needed was now much smaller, and defined more
specifically, the Dutch Broadcasting Company agreed to cooperate.

For the recordings, choices were made regarding type of medium, type of
programme, speech style, speech conditions, sound quality, amount of material,
number of speakers, sex of speakers, age of speakers, and the periods under
investigation. The choices made regarding these criteria are explained below. These
explanations, above all, bring home the fact that oftentimes suitability demands
needed to be adjusted on the basis of the availability of material.

Type of medium

According to Bell (1991:1, 3), the media (both written and broadcast) are important
providers of language in society and generate much of the language that is heard in
everyday life. Therefore, our choice for media was obvious. Speech was looked for
that would on theoretical grounds be close to Standard Dutch. Speakers in the
national (as opposed to regional/local) mass media are likely speakers of Standard
Dutch, because they are by the broadcasting companies considered suitable to be
broadcasters on programmes for all Dutchmen, and they are likely to be adjusting
their speech to a national norm while presenting. Bell (1984) indicated that a shift
towards national norms is most likely to be operative in programmes aimed at a
national audience. Also, these speakers may generally be considered speakers of the
Dutch standard language by the audience simply because they are presenters in the
mass media, i.e. because of the position they occupy. The idea that media speech
(from radio and/or television) is close to a (national) linguistic norm is supported by
remarks hereon in the literature (for instance Goudsblom 1964:121, Lotzmann 1974,

Only radio speech was used for the First Corpus. An important reason for this
was that sufficient sound material from the early 1950s from television was not
available. An advantage of radio speech was the likelihood of radio presenters to
have been selected on the basis of their verbal qualities alone, while television
presenters are likely to have been selected on the basis of appearance too, besides
their speech qualities. It could therefore be argued that the speech of radio presenters
is more likely to meet qualitative norms, as these speakers rely solely on their
speech habits while presenting. Also, radio speakers have no other means of
communicating their message but their voice, meaning that they are likely to
monitor their speech particularly closely.

Type of programme

For the First Corpus, the variation on the inter-speaker and intra-speaker dimensions
was kept limited by using one type of programme. Informative formal programmes,
such as news programmes, news-related broadcasts, and official announcements contain the language that is most likely to contain the smallest degree of regional colouring and phonological liberty (Labov 1972, Lipski 1985:221). Within the media, news is the primary language genre, Bell (1991:1) pointed out, as it fills hours of radio and television time. He indicated that although the news occupies a minority of airtime it is seen by both media organisations and audiences as the focus of media content. According to McQuail (1987), news broadcasts are arguably the most central genre (and the most researched). After taking all of this into consideration, news broadcasts were decided to be most convenient for our research.

A choice needed to be made between two types of news. In defining news genres, Bell (1991:14) distinguished between so-called 'hard news' and 'soft news'. Hard news contains events that have come to light since the previous issue of a programme, such as accidents, conflicts, crimes, announcements, and discoveries. Soft news, Bell indicated, is not time-bound to immediacy, containing longer items, often providing backgrounds, and carrying to some degree the presenter’s opinion. News programmes such as current-affairs programmes are examples of soft news. There is obviously no strict division between these two types of news, and there is in fact a continuum from soft to hard news.

Hard news would offer the most suitable speech material for our purposes. Firstly, hard-news programmes are strictly defined stylistically, making it easier to select mutually comparable recordings. Soft news often involves more stylistic variation in which accommodation strategies are active (interviews, comments, various locations, various accents, and accommodative speech by the interviewer).

The only types of available news recordings from all the desired periods were current affairs and documentaries (soft news), and these were opted for, so as to keep recordings from various periods mutually comparable³. Not all programmes of this type were acceptable, and a restriction was applied. In accordance with Bell’s (1991) theory of social-style conception, it was decided that only speech fragments from programmes aimed at the Dutch audience as a whole would be considered and not, for instance, speech aimed at an interlocutor, one or more specific guests, or a strictly defined demographic group of listeners. This way, some of the soft-news drawbacks as mentioned above were reduced.

Speech style

Preference was given in our research to speech that was somehow prepared by the presenters. Read speech and prepared commentaries are examples of prepared speech. Reports of unpredictable events and reactions to unexpected questions are cases of unprepared speech. Reading is a kind of stylistic variation that has many advantages for the research, as a maximum amount of attention is paid to form rather than content. If close attention is paid to speech, it is most likely that the desired speech style is achieved, and it is assumed that a great deal of attention leads to the newsreader speech that both the speaker and the listener expect. An additional

³ The Second Corpus did contain hard news.
advantage is that careful speech is most suitable for transcriptions and acoustic measurements, as articulatory reduction processes are minimised in this type of speech.

Some of the speech of the First Corpus may have been read. It was not always clear whether the presenter read from a piece of paper, used catch words only, or more or less improvised. It was speech that was prepared mentally, well pronounced, and relatively formal. In the 1950s and 1960s, radio recordings were often read to some degree, although it is likely that the presenters were to produce speech that sounded read without them actually reading. Media speech from the 1950s in particular was well enunciated and put in grammatically well-formed sentences, containing almost no hesitations. This denotes considerable mental planning. Speech from later decades did contain frequent hesitations and repetitions, and it was therefore less likely to be read.

Speech conditions

Preference was given to speech recorded in a studio. In some cases, speech was included of reports of stationary events recorded on location, providing the quality was good enough and the speech sounded prepared. Recordings on location were used of one 1950s speaker and one speaker from the 1990s. All the other speech was recorded in a sound studio.

Sound quality

A perceptual and acoustic description of speech involves subjecting the speech to transcriptions and formant-frequency measurements. Acoustic measurements in particular entail a superior sound quality. Possible interfering sounds are background noise, broadcasting disturbances such as high-frequency tones, the use of telephone lines in broadcasts, or noise from gramophone needles. Unlike the intelligent human ear, measuring instruments cannot distinguish between the human voice and background noise. Any such additional noise was deemed likely to interfere with the quality of the measurements.

 Archived radio recordings from as early as 1935 are available to us, but the sound quality of such early recordings leaves much to be desired because of the primitivism of the techniques applied and of the sound carriers used. This makes these older recordings less suitable for acoustic purposes. In 1949, the magnetic tape started to be used by Dutch broadcasting companies. This technique has helped to improve and preserve sound quality, and it has made recordings fitter for measuring formants. In 1952, gramophones started to be copied onto magnetic tape, which as a consequence sometimes contained an audible clicking noise of the needle, as well as a low-frequency humming sound. This needle noise was mainly due to the degeneration of the gramophones and needles used. The earliest recordings in the present research were from the early 1950s. The quality of our 1950s recordings was fortunately still high enough for acoustic analyses. In fact, the 1950s recordings only in a few cases contained a clearly audible gramophone click. Other disturbances
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were not encountered. In the recordings of the First Corpus, there was some variation in recording quality, new recordings generally being superior to older ones, but they were all of a remarkably good quality. A DAT recorder was used to copy original recordings.

Amount of material

For every speaker, ten minutes of speech was collected, with a minimum of 1,000 words; not including names and words spoken with a foreign pronunciation (for instance restaurant; pronounced with French influences). The expectation was that this amount of speech would contain enough tokens of phonemes that typically occur less frequently in Dutch speech. The expectation was also that ten minutes of speech would contain enough consonants, vowels, and diphthongs to come to satisfactory stimulus fragments in the intended listening experiment and to enable the intended measurements and transcriptions.

Number of speakers

For each of the five periods studied, five speakers were selected. Five additional speakers from the most recent period (1990s) were added, for two reasons. First of all, the emphasis in the research was on modern norms and modern speech. Secondly, they were added to make use of the good availability of 1990s speech. So, 30 speakers were selected in total.

Sex of speakers

It was decided that only speech from male broadcasters be collected. The reason for this was that in the 1950s and 1960s the number of female radio presenters was small, making it impossible to select enough female speakers from all periods.

Age of speakers

We looked for speakers within a limited age range, to make sure that they represented their period in a similar way. Older speakers are likely to have different norms and speech habits (originating from a different period) than younger speakers. With one exception, speakers were selected who at the time of the original broadcast were between 30 and 44 years of age. The one exception was a speaker from the

---

4 The ages of the speakers in the named archives were found through the Retirement Fund of the Dutch Broadcasting System (Pensionfonds Nederlandse Omroep; PNO). If the year of birth could not be traced, plausible information given by colleagues who knew the speaker in question was relied on. The age of some speakers could only be indicated by means of a range: for instance “42 to 44 years old” or “37 or 38 years old”. In these cases, the average of the oldest and youngest age was taken to be the age of the speaker. In the two examples named above, this would be 43 (42 to 44) and 37.5 (37 or 38), respectively. The ages of speakers of each decade were added up and rounded off.
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1950s, who was 50 years old at the time of the broadcast. The reason for including this speaker was that more suitable 1950s speech could not be found.

There were two problems with regard to establishing the age of the speakers. First of all, the recordings of certain speakers were made within a time span of two years, meaning that the age of the speakers varied within a two-year range. Secondly, the year of birth of a number of speakers from the 1950s and 1960s was all that was known and not the exact dates. These minor uncertainties as to the ages of the speakers were considered too small to have a negative effect on the research.

The average ages of the five (or ten) speakers in the five decades were relatively stable, as the speakers from each decade were on average in their late or mid thirties, but the age ranges across the decades show considerable variation. As was said above, one specific older speaker caused the high age range for the 1950s. The average age of the remaining four speakers of this decade was 33.

Periods studied

Recordings were used from various periods. The reason for this was that older speech and modern speech may be perceived to possess a different degree of standardness. Old speech is often idealised and considered more correct than modern speech, for instance.

There are several grounds for the choice to study speech from the 1950s-1990s period. One reason for not looking for pre-1950s speech was the inevitable technical limitations of early recordings. It is also not likely that the norm lies in a period before the 1950s, because speech from before this time is largely unknown to young Dutch speakers. It is not regularly heard in the media, and it is therefore not likely to represent a living norm. As for the 1990s, contemporary speech must obviously be used, because norms may well lie in the present, and in the present case this was the 1990s.

After establishing the starting and end date of the recordings, the intermediate period was looked at. Periods needed to be defined as well as intervals between them. Periods of eight to ten years were estimated to be long enough to detect changes over time, and thus three intermediate periods arose (the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s). Speech material was collected from the ensuing five time periods (1950s, 1960s, 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s), with intervals of eight to ten years between the periods and a range of two years within the periods. This two-year period was chosen on the basis of the availability of the speech. The poor availability of older speech in particular required that speech from a time span of over a year be tolerated. The exact five time periods were 1952-1954, 1962-1964, 1972-1974, 1982-1984, and 1992-1994.

4.3 THE SECOND CORPUS

After the First Corpus (see overview in Table 4.1) was put together, the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey (described in 5.3) was held. This survey showed a striking agreement amongst respondents on the names of exemplary (famous)
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speakers of Standard Dutch. Most of the speakers whom the respondents put forward were television newsreaders. A central aim of the research was to describe the speech of speakers of Standard Dutch, and the agreement on certain famous speakers of Standard Dutch that appeared from the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey was considered a reason to put together a second corpus, namely one with famous speakers of Standard Dutch, and television newsreaders in particular. To make a proper selection of these newsreaders, the First Newsreader Survey (described in 5.5) was held. Four speakers emerged from this survey.

For the Second Corpus, no theoretical prerequisites and restrictions were defined as to the type of medium, speech style, and the age and sex of the speakers. Potential obstacles were the availability and the quality of the speech, but this risk was considered small, as contemporary newsreaders - most of whom regularly presented the news at the time the survey was held - were certain to come out of the survey.

The Second Corpus contained speech of two female (Pia Dijkstra and Hennie Stoel) and two male television-news presenters (Harmen Siezen and Joop van Zijl) while presenting. These four speakers can safely be considered the most famous television newsreaders in the Netherlands around the time when their speech was recorded. The two men were clearly part of an older newsreader generation than the two women. Harmen Siezen’s speech was recorded four years before the end of his news-reading career as a newsreader, and Joop van Zijl ended his career some years prior to the recordings. Pia Dijkstra and Hennie Stoel, the two female speakers, were active newsreaders when their speech was recorded. Roughly ten minutes of speech were recorded per person. The recordings were made in 1998 and 1999.

Type of medium/programme

The medium and the type of programme for the Second Corpus were known beforehand. In the above-named two surveys, the respondents indicated which speakers were in their view role-model speakers of Standard Dutch. From the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey, it appeared that famous speakers of Standard Dutch are in many cases television-news presenters, i.e. presenters of hard news. As was outlined in 4.2, hard news theoretically provides the most suitable speech for research into the standard language. Through the First Newsreader Survey, the best speakers of Standard Dutch amongst the group of television-news presenters in the Netherlands were then selected.

For research purposes, television speech is suitable, because (news-reading) speech conditions are highly stable, and in most cases the researcher can actually see the speech being produced while recording and determine to what extent it is read. Moreover, all but one of the newsreaders put forward by the respondents were regularly active around the time when the recordings were made, and therefore it was relatively easy to make the recordings.

In the case of one speaker (Joop van Zijl), speech of a news broadcast was not available. He was a former newsreader who at the time of the survey had resigned as an active newsreader. That is why his speech was recorded while he was presenting
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a television programme on an annual major event. This type of programme was soft news, partly read from notes.

Speech style/conditions

The speech that the speakers produced was formal but not stilted. Produced in highly controlled studio circumstances, it was prepared with much attention paid to form. Some of the speech was read from autocue or through catchwords on paper, and part of it was improvised. Many highly edited sentences were obviously read out. Every now and then, newscasters need to improvise considerably, for instance when there are last-minute news reports or in the event of technical difficulties. The auto cue may fail, perhaps. Whether this was happening in the case of our speakers was not always visible or audible to the viewer, which was largely due to the professionalism of the newscasters. All in all, the speech was stylistically highly stable.

Sound quality/amount of material

The recording quality was more or less the same for all speakers. The speaker whose speech was not recorded during a news broadcast (Joop van Zijl) was presenting from a television studio, and therefore his speech was comparable to that of the other speakers. All of the speech was recorded directly from television with a DAT recorder. All in all, the quality was high.

Television-news broadcasts often contain background noise of the events of which film footage is shown during the broadcasts. The newscaster speaks while the film footage is running. Speech that was produced during these inserted film fragments was not included. The same goes for speech produced while the newscasters audibly flipped over papers in front of them.

The same quantitative criteria (ten minutes of speech, with a minimum of 1,000 words) that were applied for the First Corpus were applied for the Second Corpus. For the fourth speaker (Joop van Zijl), who did not act regularly as a newscaster anymore by the time the recordings were made, his 1998 Commemoration of the Dead report was recorded.

Number/sex/age of speakers

As the First Corpus contained only men, the desire was to somehow include both women and men in the Second Corpus. There are no reasons to believe that men approximate Standard Dutch more than women do. (In fact, many studies (see Section 9.2) suggest the opposite.) Fortunately, the results of the First Newscaster Survey yielded two women and two men. At the time of the recordings, the women were 45 and 54 years old, respectively, and the men were 59 and 63.
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Periods studied

The speech of the Second Corpus speakers was recorded after their names emerged from the First Newreader Survey. This was four years after the First Corpus was put together, and consequently the two corpora were not strictly from the same period within the same decade; the 1990s speech from the First Corpus was from the 1992-1994 period, while the 1990s speech from the Second Corpus was from 1998 and 1999. It is assumed that the difference between these two recording times is small enough for them to be considered from the same period.

4.4 CORPUS OVERVIEW

So, 34 speakers were selected; 30 (the First Corpus) on theoretical grounds, and four (the Second Corpus) through surveys. The most important information on the selected speakers can be seen in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Speech material for the phonetic description.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>corpus name</th>
<th>speakers</th>
<th>sex</th>
<th>recording date</th>
<th>age on recording date</th>
<th>medium</th>
<th>type of news programme</th>
<th>selection procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Corpus</td>
<td>30 speakers</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>1952-1994</td>
<td>29-50</td>
<td>radio</td>
<td>soft</td>
<td>theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Corpus</td>
<td>HAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>television</td>
<td>hard</td>
<td>surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>soft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>hard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HES</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.10 gives more details on the speakers whose speech was described. The first group of speakers (First Corpus) were relatively unknown radio presenters, although their voices were likely to sound familiar to many Dutchmen. This made these speakers suitable for the intended listening experiment, as evaluations of celebrities are largely preconceived rather than based on actual speech sounds. The speakers from the Second Corpus were well-known television newscasters. This appeals to a feeling that famous speakers play an important role in the shaping of pronunciation norms. Moreover, women were included as speakers in the Second Corpus. Hard news became part of the speech to be described after the Second Corpus was added.

The Second Corpus (four speakers) was ready for a phonetic description, but the First Corpus (30 speakers) still needed to undergo a further selection. The First Corpus recordings served as the basis of the Speech Evaluation Experiment (described in Section 5.2), in which three of the 30 speakers were selected. The three First Corpus speakers and the four Second Corpus speakers together formed the speech material for the transcriptions and the acoustic measurements.
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5. INVESTIGATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

For the present research, two basic types of research were performed, namely literature research and empirical research. Literature references appear across the chapters, but three of the chapters are based exclusively on this type of research, namely Chapter 2 (on the history of the standardisation of Dutch), Chapter 3 (on today’s language situation in the Netherlands), and Chapter 10 (on phoneme descriptions in the literature). Chapters 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, and 12 contain mainly the results of empirical studies through which new data were retrieved about the topic under study. The methodologies of these empirical studies will be discussed in the present chapter.

In subsequent chapters, where relevant, the investigations are named, and the number of listeners or respondents is included as well. The original questionnaires of the Sociolinguistic Investigations can be found in Appendix 1 to 7, and the results of the acoustic measurements are in Appendix 8.

Chapter overview

The present chapter presents the methodologies of nine empirical investigations, which were performed between mid 1996 and early 2005. Six of these focused on respondent and/or listener evaluations and are here referred to as the Sociolinguistic Investigations. The other two were the Phonetic Investigations, as they involved phonetic descriptions. All nine investigations are listed in Table 5.1. This table indicates also in which section or chapter the methodology and the results of the investigations are.

Table 5.1: The empirical investigations discussed in this chapter/dissertation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>investigation type</th>
<th>investigation name</th>
<th>methodology in section</th>
<th>results in chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sociolinguistic</td>
<td>Speech Evaluation Experiment</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6 &amp; 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociolinguistic Definition Survey</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6 &amp; 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Survey</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Newsreader Survey</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Newsreader Survey</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phoneme Evaluation Survey</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone Survey</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6 &amp; 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phonetic</td>
<td>Perceptual Description</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acoustic Description</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Certain groups of respondents participated in more than one investigation. This is made clear in the relevant sections. In the remainder of the chapter, the investigations are outlined. The larger investigations are summarised at the beginning of the relevant section.

5.2 SPEECH EVALUATION EXPERIMENT

The Speech Evaluation Experiment was a listening experiment in which 114 listeners evaluated several characteristics of the speech of 30 male radio presenters on current-affairs programmes and documentaries. The speech of these speakers constituted the First Corpus (see Section 4.2). The listeners belonged to three age categories; there were men and women, they were from all over the Netherlands, and they had various educational levels. The speakers were from five periods in the 1950s-1990s period. Table 5.3 shows the speaker group as it appeared on the stimulus tape and Table 5.5 shows the listener group.

The Speech Evaluation Experiment had two aims. First of all, it served to select speakers whose segmental pronunciation features approximate Standard Dutch. The second aim was to gain insight into general qualities of standard speech: how formality, modernness, and other such qualities correlate with standardness.

Stimulus tape

The recordings that were made for the Speech Evaluation Experiment were described in 4.2 and consisted of the speech of 30 speakers from five decades (1950, 1960s, 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s). These recordings needed to be transformed into stimuli to be used in the experiment. Below is an outline of the technical adaptations the recordings for the stimulus tape were subjected to in the process of selecting speech for the stimulus tape. The most important adaptation was pitch normalisation. So, the speech was monotonised. Below is also an explanation of how the selected and technically adapted utterances were transformed into a stimulus tape with 30 fragments of highly non-regional speech recordings (the news-report speech under investigation; called Original Fragments) plus, to function as distracters, five regional recordings (speech that was not under investigation; called Additional Fragments). The 35 fragments were preceded by five introductory stimuli (speech that was not under investigation; also part of the Additional Fragments). So, there were 40 stimuli in total on the tape, 30 of which were subject to investigation.

Time-neutrality of the stimuli

Knowledge of the age of speech may affect evaluations of the standardness of the speech in question, as people may have fixed ideas on the standardness of speech from certain periods. Fortunately, the First Corpus speakers were already relatively unknown voices. To be sure, the recordings were made ‘time-neutral’ as much as
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possible, that is, the number of time cues in the recordings was minimised. Three noteworthy time indicators were potentially present in radio speech such as it was used by us, and these had to be removed:

- Content: References to persons, events, or time periods are indicators of time.
- Style: Style presents hints as to the time of recording. Archaic or trendy forms, for instance, are typical of time periods.
- Sound quality: The sound quality may also present such clues. Humming, scratching, and a reduced bandwidth may signify an old recording, for instance.

Selection procedure, Step 1: Selection of time-neutral utterances

Now, the steps are explained that were taken to minimise the effects of the above three aspects. Simultaneously, the selection procedure of speech for the stimulus tape is revealed. The First Corpus newsreader speech was subjected to this procedure, and the outcome of the procedure was suitable speech for the stimulus tape. This is followed by an explanation of the transformation of the suitable speech into stimulus fragments.

On the basis of the transliterated speech, a first selection was made of suitable utterances. To achieve time neutrality as far as content was concerned, words, sentences, and parts of sentences that gave some indication of when the recording was made - or not made - were highlighted (marked as unsuitable) in the transliterations, so that they would not appear on the stimulus tape. Examples are names of presidents, wars, and sometimes also extreme (historical, as it were) weather conditions. To achieve stylistic neutrality, archaic forms were also highlighted this way, such as the Dutch adverbial mede (usually meaning ‘with’) in certain contexts and the rather formal adverbial gaarne (‘with pleasure’). Such forms could be interpreted as coming from older speech. It should be noted that such seemingly archaic forms are present in modern recordings too, but they are more numerous in older recordings. Therefore, they present hints as to the time of recording.

This first selection yielded 1,093 suitable utterances (sentences and parts of sentences) over all 30 speakers. These utterances were highly time-neutral as far as content and style were concerned according to one judge¹, but to make sure this time-neutrality indeed existed three additional judges were asked to evaluate these selected utterances. These judges were a male in his early sixties and two females in their late twenties. They were presented with written versions of the selected utterances. To function as distracters² in this pre-selection test, 152 utterances of the

¹ Josephine van Rie selected time-neutral speech fragments (Step 1) and acted as a judge.
² In this chapter, ‘distracter’ refers to a fragment added to broaden the pronunciation range within the speech or language utterances offered to listeners. The listeners were not distracted per se through these fragments, but, rather, exposed to a wider range of language variation.
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original recordings were added that were obviously typical of a certain period. The three judges indicated for each utterance whether there was a time period in which the utterance in question in their view could not have been pronounced. If a period was mentioned, then the utterance would be unsuitable. For prospective listeners, the speech was to originate from any period since the onset of broadcasting. The judges were informed of the fact that the utterances were pronounced in semi-formal informative programmes. Furthermore, it was pointed out that modern spelling was used in this written text, irrespective of the age of the fragments, so that the judges knew that spelling would not present any clues.

The outcome of this second selection were 831 utterances (not including the distracters). So, these were by all three judges in the second selection considered to be time-neutral, and they were therefore considered time-neutral as far as content was concerned by four judges altogether.

Selection procedure, Step 2: Selection of recordings and construction of the stimuli

After listening to the speech recordings (on DAT) belonging to the selection of written utterances, a selection was made among the time-neutral stretches of speech. The stretches of speech with the highest recording quality were considered most suitable. Stimulus fragments were created consisting of a random selection of these high-quality stretches of speech pasted together. These joined utterances in each fragment contained both uninterrupted and interrupted sentences. Stretches of speech of around 40 seconds were created per speaker (still on DAT).

Selection procedure, Step 3: Adaptation of the sound quality

There were several reasons why the sound quality of the recordings needed to be adapted. The aim was to test the effects of segmental speech qualities on evaluations, and therefore non-segmental cues needed to be minimised. Lay listeners cannot be expected to evaluate only segmental speech features when exposed to both segmental and non-segmental cues. Intonation and speech rate are such non-segmental speech qualities. Besides the non-segmental speech qualities, recording quality and voice quality were looked at to see whether they were suitable. The way these four qualities of the speech/recordings were dealt with is discussed below.

1. Intonation

Intonation may provide clues as to the time of recording of the speech. There were strong intonational differences between old and new recordings in the First Corpus. It was in particular striking how older presenters used a lively (to modern standards: exaggerated) intonation. Witteboon (1960:28) indicated that newsreaders should use intonation to bring across the contents of the news in a clear and understandable way. Being aware of this function of intonation, the speakers in the older recordings may have consciously produced this lively intonation. It may also have been part of
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their effort to be understood by listeners. Older technical equipment was inferior to today’s.

Monotonisation of the speech recordings was the most obvious technique to eliminate intonational patterns. The choice to leave the intonation intact or to eliminate it through monotonisation was difficult, as both scenarios have drawbacks. This technical process inevitably makes speech sound less natural, by adding a robot-like quality. So, there was a choice between less natural speech and highly marked intonational patterns (in some of the older speech). The effects on standardness evaluations of both monotonisation and of the deviant intonation are uncertain. After comparing pitch-normalised versions of the stimuli with the original stimuli (containing intonation), the choice was made to monotonise. It turned out that the pitch-normalised versions sounded natural enough to be used as stimuli, especially after taking some time to get used to the adapted speech. It was estimated that the negative effects of monotonisation would interfere less with the final results than the negative effects of maintaining the original intonation.

The original stimulus recordings were first read into a Silicon Graphics machine using the Datman tool. The ensuing files were converted to a format legible for Sesam3 signal-processing software and were automatically transported to a Vax machine. In this conversion, a down-sampling of 48kHz to 16kHz took place. The bit rate was 12 bits. Through Sesam, the selected utterances were extracted from the running speech, pasted together, and saved in files. These files were transported to a Silicon Graphics machine. In this process, the sampling frequency of 16kHz was maintained. The files were subsequently pitch-normalised using the Psola resynthesis in Praat. The F0 contour was reduced to a constant frequency of 110Hz, which is a typical fundamental frequency for Dutch adult males (Rietveld & Van Heuven:320).

2. Speech rate

Speech rate may also give some indication of the time of origin of a speech fragment. It is possible that because radio speech has become less formal over the years - possibly resulting in an increase in the number of words and/or syllables per time unit - variation in speech rate presents a clue as to the age of the recording. Indeed, Van de Velde (1996:187-188) observed an increased speaking rate over a number of decades in the speech of Dutch radio presenters. To see whether the speech rate of our stimulus fragments of certain decades deviated strongly from those of the other decades, the number of complete words in the first 39 seconds of all stimuli was counted, which was the minimum length of all fragments (the length of the fragments was approximately 40 seconds). The five fragments of each decade and five randomly selected 1990s (of the ten that were available) fragments were used for this calculation. The average number of words of the fragments of each

3 Sesam is a speech editor developed at the Institute of Phonetic Sciences of the University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands. See Buiting (1981) and Broeder (1990).
decade was calculated, along with the number of words in the fragments with the lowest and highest number of words of each decade.

The results are in Figure 5.1. The vertical dimension in each bar represents the range between the number of words of the fragment with the lowest and the one with the highest number of words. The horizontal line near the centre of each bar is the average number of words of the five fragments of the decade in question.

![Figure 5.1: The range between the fragments with the highest (top horizontal line in each bar) and lowest (bottom horizontal line in each bar) number of words and the average number of words for each decade (central line in each bar).](image)

Figure 5.1 shows that there is no decade the fragments of which all have a higher or lower number of words than the fragments from any of the other decades. In other words, looking at the range of each decade there is considerable overlap. When we look at the averages, we see that they do not consistently go up or down over time. In fact, the averages of the 1950s and 1990s are closer to each other than are the averages of the 1960s and 1980s. The average number of words is obviously unlikely to present any clues as to the time of recording. So, it did not require adjusting.

3. Recording quality

To reduce the ease with which listeners could estimate the age of the speech through the recording quality, it was decided that three distracter fragments be created, and added as stimuli, which were manipulated in such a way that they sounded older than they actually were. To ‘confuse’ listeners this way, three 1990s fragments (one non-regional and two regional ones; see the ‘artificial 1950s quality’ column in Table 5.3) were given 1950s recording qualities. These three were subjected to a low-pass filtering using a 4th-order low-pass filter with a cut-off frequency of 4.5kHz. This was to approximate the sound quality of typical medium-wave
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recordings. This bandwidth is not typical of older fragments only, but for a 1990s fragment to be comparable to a 1950s fragment this bandwidth needed to be applied. For old radio broadcasts, including those from the 1950s, are known to have been aired on medium wave mainly. As our recordings were not copies of actual radio signals but studio recordings of broadcasts, they were not necessarily of a medium-wave quality. To be certain, the bandwidth of these three distracter fragments was therefore reduced.

After that, a 1950s scratching sound was added to the three distracter fragments. The 1950s recordings were from gramophone discs, and these recordings all contained a light scratch, although it was in most cases hard to discern. A file was created of a stretch of clearly audible scratching sounds during a relatively long speech pause in a 1950s recording. This stretch of scratch was repeatedly copied into a new sound file, to create a sequence of scratching sounds resembling a gramophone record. This repeated scratching sound was added to the three 1990s low-pass-filtered fragments. The researcher, who by this time had been exposed to old and new recordings enough to recognise a convincing 1950s sound, determined the signal-to-noise ratio auditorily.

4. Voice quality

It is theoretically possible that the voice qualities of radio presenters have over the years remained the same and present no clues as to the time of recording of speech. Nevertheless, it does not seem too farfetched that presenters today use their voices in ways different to presenters in earlier times. Because today broadcasting equipment (both transmitters and radios) is better than in earlier times, speakers do not need to adjust their speech to be understood better.

As was said earlier, the sound quality that was the result of the monotonisation process was an obvious downside, as it made the speech unnatural-sounding. A fortunate side effect of this manipulation, however, was that it masked some of the distinctive qualities of the voices of the speakers. Differences between voices could still be heard, but due to this added quality the voices came to sound more alike.

Ordering of the stimulus-tape fragments

A total of 40 pitch-normalised and stylistically and lexically neutral fragments were put on a stimulus tape. The total group of fragments can be subdivided into the Original Fragments and the Additional Fragments. The speech of the Original Fragments was under investigation, that of the Additional Fragments was not. The Additional Fragments were used to broaden the pronunciation and recording-quality range on the stimulus tape.

The Original Fragments consisted of five fragments from each of the following decades: the 1950s, 1960s, 1970s, and the 1980s. In addition, ten from the 1990s were amongst the Original Fragments. The Additional Fragments consisted of Regional Additional Fragments and Non-regional Additional Fragments. The construction of the Additional Fragments is discussed below.
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To function as Regional Additional Fragments, recordings of eight speakers with accents that were typical of a certain region in the Netherlands were added to the collection of fragments available for the stimulus tape. They were from provinces in various areas of the Netherlands (north, east, south, west, and centre). In Table 5.2, these regions are given, as well as the provinces of origin of the speakers within these regions. The regional speakers all claimed to possess an accent that was typical of the province in question, and they were all born and raised there. Four of these speakers were presenters on local radio stations, namely those from Groningen, Friesland, South Holland, and Limburg. The others worked for the University of Nijmegen. The regional speakers were within the age range of 28 to 53. Small differences in the degree of deviation from Standard Dutch could be heard between the speakers.

Table 5.2: Region and province of origin of the eight speakers whose speech formed the Regional Additional Fragments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>regional origin speaker</th>
<th>province of origin speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>north</td>
<td>Friesland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groningen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>east</td>
<td>Gelderland (Twente area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>centre</td>
<td>Gelderland (Betuwe area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>south</td>
<td>Brabant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>west</td>
<td>North Holland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Holland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fragments that were considered time-neutral by the four judges in the selection procedure, and that were not used in the stimuli constructed so far, were written out. The eight regional speakers each read out a number of these transcripts, and they were recorded while reading. The resultant recordings were cut up in words and parts of sentences and pasted together in such a way that they resembled the Original Fragments. These eight recordings constituted the Regional Additional Fragments.

Two of these Regional Additional Fragments were given a 1950s quality the same way as with the 1990s fragment described above, namely the fragments from Limburg and the Betuwe area. Two non-regional fragments were added to the selection of Additional Fragments. These were a 1990s fragment with a 1950s recording quality and a 1950s fragment with an exceptionally good recording quality.

Table 5.3 contains an overview of the total collection of fragments available for the stimulus tape. It includes a short description of the fragments and the technical adaptations they were subjected to.
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**Table 5.3: Overview of the stimulus tape fragments (N=40).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>fragment</th>
<th>description</th>
<th>technical adaptation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>speech:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>phonic:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>normalised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; time-neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Fragments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950s</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-regional</td>
<td>high-quality 1950s</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Fragments</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friesland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groningen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twente</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betuwe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brabant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limburg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Holland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Holland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Order of fragments on the stimulus tape**

A stimulus tape was put together using the above 40 fragments. Five of the Additional Fragments were used as introductory fragments, and the other five were used as distracters. The introductory fragments had a double purpose. First and foremost, they were necessary for the listeners to become accustomed to the manipulated speech and the evaluation task. Secondly, the introductory fragments exposed the listeners to a wide range of recording qualities, times of recording, and accents. The five introductory fragments consisted of the two Non-regional Additional Fragments and three of the eight Regional Additional Fragments (one of which had a 1950s quality, namely the one from the Betuwe). The 30 Original Fragments and the six remaining Regional Additional Fragments (one of which had a 1950s recording quality, namely the one from Limburg) followed the introductory fragments and were put on the stimulus tape in a semi-random order (explained below).
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Two master tapes were made with an opposite fragment order, to reduce the risk of order effects. Both of these recordings started with the same set of introductory fragments. Table 5.4 presents an overview of the order of the fragments on the stimulus tape(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>number on tape</th>
<th>fragment name</th>
<th>fragment description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regional Additional Fragment</td>
<td>North Holland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Non-regional Additional Fragment</td>
<td>high-quality 1950s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Regional Additional Fragment</td>
<td>South Holland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Non-regional Additional Fragment</td>
<td>1990s (1950s quality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Regional Additional Fragment</td>
<td>Betuwe (1950s quality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-40 (semi-random)</td>
<td>Original Fragments</td>
<td>5 * 1950s 5 * 1960s 5 * 1970s 5 * 1980s 10 * 1990s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Additional Fragments</td>
<td>Friesland Groningen Twente Brabant Limburg (1950s quality)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As was indicated, the distribution of fragments 6 to 40 was not completely random. Sets of randomised fragments were used instead. Each set consisted of one fragment from each decade, an additional 1990s Original Fragment, and a Regional Additional Fragment. Five such sets of seven fragments were used. A complete randomisation could have led to fragments of a certain decade being more numerous at the beginning or end of the stimulus tape, which would have increased the risk of order effects in listener evaluations.

The fragments were preceded by a beep and a voice introducing the fragment number. Both versions of the stimulus tape lasted approximately 40 minutes. The digitised stimulus tapes (two versions) were copied onto Ferromagnetic cassette tapes, resulting in various copies of each of the two stimulus tapes.

Listeners

A diverse group of listeners participated. Three age groups with a ten-year gap between them were defined, and potential respondents were required to fit into one of these age groups. The age groups were ‘young’ (18-27 years old), ‘intermediate’ (38-47 years old), and ‘old’ (58 years or older). The Netherlands were divided into four areas (‘north’, ‘east’, ‘south’, and ‘west’), and on the basis of this division the
respondents that were found were allocated a regional origin. The listeners were also divided up on the basis of educational level: ‘high’ (higher tertiary education, either finished or enrolled as a student) versus ‘low’ (all levels below ‘high’).

The listeners were found in several ways. First, personal contacts were used. Furthermore, ads were placed in a newsletter, and several groups of people (for instance members of church congregations) were found on the Internet. Also, calls were placed on various Internet newsgroups. Finally, students were contacted personally through e-mail. In the end, 114 listeners were found willing to participate. In Figure 5.2, the percentage of listeners per listener characteristic is visualised.

![Figure 5.2: Percentage of listeners (N=114) per listener variable.](image)

The largest unevenness lies in the field of level of education; the listeners in the experiment were generally relatively highly educated. The high educational level is largely a consequence of the techniques used to find listeners and is mainly caused by the youngest age group (18-27), which consisted mainly of university students. Although this group of respondents had not graduated yet, they were considered to be like highly educated respondents. The other listener characteristics, namely age, sex, and regional origin, are distributed relatively evenly over the group of listeners, although the intermediate age group is somewhat underrepresented.

There was no striking unevenness in the respondent cells. In other words, the various listener characteristics visible in Figure 5.2 were relatively evenly distributed across speakers from the various regions, ages, and so on.

---

4 All listeners were given the option of receiving money for their participation. About half of them declined.
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Tasks

The listeners listened to their (version of the) stimulus tape and evaluated the 40 speech fragments using the following eight 10-point scales:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Type</th>
<th>Scale Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT STANDARD DUTCH</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT POSH</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT WESTERN</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT REGIONAL</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLD-FASHIONED</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMAL</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGLY</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOPPY</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scales 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 are standard Dutch. Scale 9, which is the highest, means that the speech is not standard Dutch. Scale 10, which is the lowest, means that the speech is not standard Dutch.

The choice for these seven scales was inspired by recurring remarks in the literature on qualities that a standard language typically meets (see Chapters 2 and 3). Besides these evaluative scales, the listeners guessed the age of each fragment and the name of each speaker. The listening task lasted between 40 minutes and three hours.

After prospective listeners agreed to participate in the Speech Evaluation Experiment, they were sent a parcel with a copy of the stimulus tape, or they performed the task while the researcher was present. In some cases, groups of people were visited, and the tape was played to the whole group at the same time. In about half the cases, headphones were used.

5.3 SOCIOlinguistic DEFINITION SURVEY

The Sociolinguistic Definition Survey investigated popular opinions of Standard Dutch. In this survey, respondents first of all presented their descriptions of the characteristics of Standard Dutch. These are qualities of the language itself, and these characteristics were mainly of a non-linguistic nature. Besides intrinsic characteristics, the respondents gave characteristics that can be described as user characteristics. These are characteristics of prototypical users of the language.

Besides this descriptive purpose, the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey served as a pre-selection tool for speech of the Second Corpus. The description of the speakers of Standard Dutch in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey led to the First Newsreader Survey, in which speakers of Standard Dutch were selected for the Second Corpus.

---

5 The Dutch scale terms were: NIET STANDAARDNEDERLANDS - STANDAARDNEDERLANDS; NIET BEKAKT - BEKAKT; NIET RANDSTEDEDELUK - RANDSTEDELUK; NIET REGIONAAL - REGIONAAL; OUDEWETS - MODERN; INFORMEEL - FORMEEL; LEUK - MOOI; SLORDIG - VERZORGD.

6 This survey is described in more detail by Smukman (1998).
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Respondents

In total, 217 respondents participated, with various ages, regional origins, levels of education, and of both sexes. The group of respondents consisted of the listeners who participated in the Speech Evaluation Experiment (N=114) plus 103 students from various institutes of higher education in the Netherlands. The addition of 103 students made this group even more highly educated than it already was. In Table 5.5 are the relevant data on the listeners.

Table 5.5: Group of listeners (N=217) in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey, defined on the basis of age, sex, and regional origin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>regional origin</th>
<th>male</th>
<th></th>
<th>female</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>average age</td>
<td>age range</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>north</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20-64</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>east</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18-72</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>south</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19-64</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>west</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18-82</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tasks

The respondents answered several questions on Standard Dutch in the Netherlands. After putting forward a definition of Standard Dutch in their own words, they answered questions on the matters listed below.

1. Where Standard Dutch is spoken.
2. The profession of speakers of Standard Dutch.
3. Whether men or women are most likely to speak Standard Dutch.
4. Whether speakers on radio or on television are most likely to speak Standard Dutch.
5. Whether newsreaders from commercial or from semi-commercial broadcasting stations are most likely to speak Standard Dutch.
6. The name of an exemplary famous speaker of Standard Dutch.
7. The origin of (own) opinions on the definition of Standard Dutch.

The questions had response categories, and the respondents selected one category only. Some respondents performed this survey by filling in a paper questionnaire, and others (most of the students) answered the questions through e-mail.

---

7 The reason for adding these 103 students was because for the International Survey (described in Section 5.4) extra students were required to make the groups of the five countries similarly large.
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5.4 INTERNATIONAL SURVEY

The International Survey placed the Dutch standard-language situation in an international perspective and thus gave insight into the generalisability of the results of the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey (see Section 5.3). The most important point of interest was the extent to which the Dutch standard-language situation was in accordance with general (i.e. international) sociolinguistic tendencies. And in those cases where the Dutch situation was not in line with that of other countries, the question was whether cultural factors could be found to explain the differences.

Respondents

In total, 701 respondents participated in the International Survey. The respondents were students from five countries, namely the Netherlands, Flanders (which is not strictly a country but part of Belgium), Poland, New-Zealand, and Japan. In Table 5.6, the number of respondents per country can be seen. For the Dutch section of the International Survey, the results were used of part of the respondent group who had already participated in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey (see Section 5.3), namely the students. Such a relatively homogenous group of respondents would make a comparison realistic between countries. Another reason was that students were relatively easy to contact through e-mail and easy to find at universities.

Looking at the regional backgrounds of the respondents, there was some unevenness among the countries. In Poland, for instance, respondents were mainly from the very east of the country. The reason for this was that the survey was done at the University of Lublin, which is in the east of Poland, near the Ukrainian border. The Flemish students, on the other hand, had various regional backgrounds, and representatives from four of the Flemish universities participated. These universities are all geographically close to each other, which is partly due to the small size of the Flanders area. The Japanese respondents were from all main districts of Japan, but there was a relatively high percentage of respondents from the area around the university where the survey was done, namely the University of Tokyo. The New-Zealand respondents were mainly from the region around the university where the survey was performed, namely the University of Canterbury, in Christchurch. The Dutch respondents, finally, were from all major regions in the Netherlands; students from all 11 Dutch major universities participated.

The problem with regional origin is of course that the countries that are compared have different sizes and different population numbers. It is therefore impossible to compare the degree of regional diversity of the respondent groups. It is nonetheless safe to say that within the respective countries the groups of Dutch and Flemish students were regionally more varied than the Polish, New-Zealand, and Japanese groups.
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Table 5.6: Respondents in the International Survey (N=701).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>country of origin</th>
<th>men</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>women</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>average age</td>
<td>age range</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>average age</td>
<td>age range</td>
<td>total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17-28</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flanders</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19-28</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17-27</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19-31</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19-30</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New-Zealand</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17-51</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18-50</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18-40</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18-37</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The age ranges are misleading. In the New-Zealand and Japanese group, there were some older students, but these were exceptions, as the average age in the table shows. All in all, respondents in the age range of 18 to 21 years old were considerably more numerous than older or younger students. In all countries except the Netherlands, men were underrepresented, especially in New-Zealand and Japan. Of the 701 respondents, 263 were men (37.5%).

International Survey procedure

The Dutch questionnaire was translated into Polish (for Poland), English (for New-Zealand), and Japanese (for Japan). The Flemish survey did not need to be translated, because Dutch is spoken in Flanders. The questionnaires from the four foreign countries were basically the same as the Dutch version, but, naturally, the questions and the response categories needed to be modified to fit the local situation. Two questions needed to be adapted in particular. First of all, the response categories of the question on the geographical origin of the standard language needed to be modified to suit the situation in each country. Furthermore, small modifications needed to be made to the list of professions of exemplary standard-language speakers offered to the respondents. Japan, New-Zealand, and Poland, for instance, have no king or queen, and in the Japanese survey the emperor was an essential additional response category. Moreover, choices needed to be made on the local names of the standard languages in Japan and Poland. These two countries have more than one name to denote the standardised language.

The Polish and Japanese translation tasks were passed on to local contacts. In both cases, several local volunteers checked the translation with an English translation of the Dutch original. The above-named textual adaptations were done in collaboration with people from the countries in question, and the final questionnaires were in agreement with the local situation around the time when the surveys were done.

The Dutch section of the International Survey was done partly through e-mail and partly through a paper questionnaire. The Flemish survey was done through e-mail, again after searching university sites for e-mail addresses of potential
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participants. The New-Zealand and Japanese surveys were done on location by local contacts using a paper questionnaire. The Polish survey was done on location by the researcher using a paper questionnaire.

Tasks

As the International Survey was a translated and adapted version of the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey, the respondents performed the same tasks that were explained in 5.3. So, various questions were answered on the definition of the local standard language and the nature of its speakers.

5.5 FIRST NEWSREADER SURVEY

The First Newsreader Survey was performed to select speech for the Second Corpus (see Section 4.3). While lesser-known speakers (the First Corpus) had already been selected through the Speech Evaluation Experiment, the First Newsreader Survey aimed at finding famous speakers of Standard Dutch. The Sociolinguistic Definition Survey (see Section 5.3) showed that television newsreaders are widely considered to speak Standard Dutch, and for that reason it was decided that respondents should evaluate the standardness of speech of television newsreaders. This was done through the First Newsreader Survey.

Respondents

In the First Newsreader Survey, 191 respondents participated, as can be seen in Table 5.7. The respondents were found through personal contacts and the Internet. The respondents in this survey were also the respondents in the Phoneme Evaluation Survey (see Section 5.7).

Table 5.7: Group of listeners (N=191) in the First Newsreader Survey and the Phoneme Evaluation Survey, defined on the basis of age, sex, and regional origin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>regional origin</th>
<th>male</th>
<th>female</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>average age</td>
<td>age range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>north</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>east</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>south</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>west</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents had various ages, were of both sexes, and came from various parts of the Netherlands.
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Tasks

The respondents were presented with the names of 19 newsreaders who at the time the survey was held (1998) were newsreaders for the two Dutch broadcasting companies that produced regular evening-news broadcasts, namely NOS and RTL4. The respondents indicated whether they knew who the speaker in question was and to what extent they considered this speaker to be a speaker of Standard Dutch. To answer this question, the respondents were presented with a 10-point scale that was identical to one of the scales used in the Speech Evaluation Experiment (see Section 5.2):

NOT STANDARD DUTCH  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  STANDARD DUTCH

The respondents generally filled in the questionnaire through e-mail. Only few filled in paper versions.

5.6 SECOND NEWSREADER SURVEY

The Second Newsreader Survey was a replication of the First Newsreader Survey. The First Newsreader Survey was held in early 1998, and the Second Newsreader Survey was held in early 2005. In 1998, change seemed to be in the air in Dutch television newsreading circles. A number of newsreaders were dominating the news, but a new generation seemed to be up and coming and ready to take over. The Second Newsreader Survey was held to see what the state of affairs was at the end of the research, i.e. who the new role models of Standard Dutch were.

Respondents

The respondents in the Second Newsreader Survey were students at the University of Nijmegen and the University of Leiden, and they can be seen in Table 5.8.

Table 5.8: Group of listeners (N=155) in the Second Newsreader Survey, defined on the basis of age, sex, and regional origin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>regional origin</th>
<th>male</th>
<th></th>
<th>female</th>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>north</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>east</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>south</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18-23</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>west</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents had various ages, were of both sexes, and came from various parts of the Netherlands. Most of the respondents were from the south, and the east and west were also represented well.
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Tasks

The respondents were presented with the names of 26 newsreaders who at the time the survey was held were newsreaders for the two Dutch broadcasting companies that produced regular evening-news broadcasts, namely NOS and RTL4. The list of 26 newsreaders in the questionnaire contained 14 of the newsreaders who were also part of the First Newsreader Survey, and 12 of them were new. The respondents indicated whether they knew who the speaker in question was and to what extent they considered this speaker to be a speaker of Standard Dutch. To answer this question, the respondents were presented with a 10-point scale that was identical to one of the scales used in the First Newsreader Survey:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT STANDARD DUTCH</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</th>
<th>STANDARD DUTCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

All respondents filled in a paper survey. They were presented with printed black & white pictures of the newsreaders, as in the First Newsreader Survey well-known speakers were sometimes not recognised on the basis of their names only.

5.7 PHONEME EVALUATION SURVEY

The Phoneme Evaluation Survey tried to reveal the perceived acceptability of certain well-known phoneme realisations in Standard Dutch. In the results of the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey and in the literature, a limited set of such stigmatised realisations occurred regularly. The Phoneme Evaluation Survey focussed on the extent to which these realisations are acceptable in the standard language.

Respondents

The respondents in the Phoneme Evaluation Survey were the same who participated in the First Newsreader Survey, i.e. 191 respondents of both sexes, with various ages, from various parts of the Netherlands, and with various educational levels. See Table 5.8.

Tasks

In the Phoneme Evaluation Survey, the respondents indicated to what extent certain phoneme realisations are acceptable in Standard Dutch. These were well-known tendencies that can be heard in the speech of many speakers of Dutch today and that are subject to popular debate. The realisations were the following:
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1. strongly diphthongised (ee), (oo), and (eu)
2. the lowering of the first element of (ei), (ui), and (ou)
3. the realisation of (r) as a so-called *goose* (r) (approximant (r); see Section 10.5)
4. the realisation of (g) as a so-called *zachte* (g) (voiced and/or velar (g); see Section 10.4)
5. the devoicing of (v) and (z)

The respondents were given the above list of realisations (explained in lay terms), and they were asked to evaluate them using the following scale:

1 = NOT AT ALL ACCEPTABLE IN STANDARD DUTCH
2 = NOT REALLY ACCEPTABLE IN STANDARD DUTCH
3 = MORE OR LESS ACCEPTABLE IN STANDARD DUTCH
4 = ACCEPTABLE IN STANDARD DUTCH
5 = REQUIRED IN STANDARD DUTCH

The respondents were also given the opportunity to opt for NO OPINION/UNKNOWN. Furthermore, they were requested to write down any phoneme realisations that in their view were often heard on television but that were not part of Standard Dutch. The respondents generally filled in the survey through e-mail. Only few filled in paper versions.

5.8 TELEPHONE SURVEY

The Telephone Survey was performed to answer questions that remained after the results of other studies had become known. The respondents answered various ‘left-over’ questions on the Dutch language and on Standard Dutch.

Respondents

The Telephone Survey had 1006 respondents. Regional origin was defined strictly. The respondents came from two towns in the west (Rijswijk and Velsen) and from two towns in the south (Roermond and Sittard) of the Netherlands. The western towns were in the area that is often regarded as the linguistic core area in the Netherlands, while the southern towns represented the linguistically peripheral area. The ages of the respondents varied strongly, and the two sexes were represented close to equally. An overview of the respondent group is visible in Table 5.9:

---

8 The Telephone Survey was performed in cooperation with Marie-José Palmen, who also organised and supervised the telephone calls. The results served as the basis of both Palmens’s and the present study, but different approaches were taken. Palmens’s research focussed on response behaviour, whereas the actual responses to the questions were used for the present research. More details on the methodology of the Telephone Survey can be found in Palmen (2002:121-125).
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Table 5.9: Group of respondents (N=1,006) in the Telephone Survey, defined on the basis of age, sex, and regional origin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>regional origin</th>
<th>male</th>
<th>female</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>average age</td>
<td>age range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>south</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17-94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>west</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>540</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tasks

The callers dialled random telephone numbers in the named four towns and asked people to participate in a survey on various matters regarding Standard Dutch. The people who were willing to participate were then asked a number of questions. An effort was made to present response categories to respondents, and they were asked to give one response only. Nevertheless, in reality answers were frequently given by the respondents before the polltaker could present the response categories. These answers often contained more than one of the response categories, and they were registered. The respondents expressed their views on the following matters:

1. whether the Dutch language is under threat
2. whether other languages are influencing Dutch and, if so, which languages
3. whether speakers of Standard Dutch can be identified regionally
4. the most notable difference between Standard Dutch and non-standard Dutch
5. the number of speakers of Standard Dutch
6. whether the respondents themselves speak Standard Dutch
7. whether it is important that there is a standard language
8. authority in the shaping of Standard Dutch
9. whether Standard Dutch is allowed to have a Randstad ring to it
10. whether Standard Dutch should be the only language allowed on television
11. whether Standard Dutch should be the only language allowed in schools
12. the beauty of Flemish Dutch
13. whether northern and southern Dutch should sound the same

Standardness score

The speech of the respondents was recorded, and a degree of standardness was attached to them. This was done individually by the main researcher. At times, these evaluations of the speech were based on a few seconds, but in most cases, several sentences of speech were available. Only the speech of the western respondents was scored this way.
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5.9 PERCEPTUAL DESCRIPTION

The Perceptual Description described selected vowels and consonants in the speech of seven speakers of Standard Dutch. Five transcribers participated in this description, and together they transcribed tokens of four consonants and six vowels in the speech of these speakers. Up to 20 tokens of each of these vowels of each speaker were transcribed. Various contexts were selected.

The results of the Perceptual Description served a descriptive purpose and compared, amongst others, male and female speakers. Besides that, the vowel transcriptions were used to compare perception with acoustic reality (see Section 5.10).

Speakers and speech material

The seven speakers of whom selected phonemes were described were at an earlier stage selected on the basis of the high degree of Standard Dutchness of their speech. They were selected in two ways. First of all, three speakers were selected by means of the Speech Evaluation Experiment (see Section 5.2). This experiment, amongst other things, aimed at selecting speakers who were by a large group of listeners considered good Standard Dutch speakers. The average Standard Dutchness of the speech of these three speakers was highest amongst a group of 30 speakers. They were two male radio presenters from the 1990s (called John Jaspers and Tom Herlaar) and one male speaker from the 1970s (Noud Smelt).

Secondly, four speakers were selected through two surveys, namely the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey and the First Newsreader Survey. The Sociolinguistic Definition Survey showed that newsreaders are associated most strongly (amongst other professions) with Standard Dutch speech. In addition, when asked to give a famous speaker of Standard Dutch, the respondents named television newsreaders most frequently. To select the best speaker of Standard Dutch amongst Dutch television newsreaders, a follow-up survey was held: the First Newsreader Survey. The respondents rated the standardness of the speech of 19 prominent Dutch television newsreaders. The four highest-scoring speakers were two males (Harmen Siezen and Joop van Zijl) and two females (Pia Dijkstra and Hennie Stoel).

So, there were seven speakers. These will from here on be referred to by codes. Relevant information on the speakers, including these codes, is in Table 5.10.
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Table 5.10: Speech material for the phonetic description.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>speaker</th>
<th>code</th>
<th>sex</th>
<th>age</th>
<th>recording date</th>
<th>medium</th>
<th>news type</th>
<th>selection tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom Herlaar</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>33-34</td>
<td>1972-1974</td>
<td>radio</td>
<td>soft</td>
<td>experiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noud Smelt</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td>34-35</td>
<td></td>
<td>radio</td>
<td>soft</td>
<td>experiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joop van Zijl</td>
<td>JZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>TV</td>
<td>hard</td>
<td>surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmen Siezen</td>
<td>HAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td>TV</td>
<td>hard</td>
<td>surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pia Dijkstra</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>TV</td>
<td>hard</td>
<td>surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennie Stoel</td>
<td>HES</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>TV</td>
<td>hard</td>
<td>surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first three speakers (JJ, TH, and NS) were relatively unknown radio presenters around the time when they were recorded, although their voices were likely to sound familiar to many Dutchmen. The other four were well-known television newsreaders, and they had a celebrity status. The TV newsreaders were clearly older than the radio reporters.

Regional origin of the speakers is not included in the table, and it has not been tested in any way. The reason is that this would cause too many difficulties in a corpus as small as ours. The regional origin of several of our speakers was unstable in the sense that they had moved around in their youth. The regional origin of some speakers was not fully known.

**Phonetic/phonological conditions**

For the phonemes under investigation, phonetic/phonological conditions were defined that would provide insight into patterns of variation in Standard Dutch. For each of the consonants, one or more of the following phenomena was/were looked at: degree of voice, degree of tension, place of articulation, manner of articulation, and the presence of rasp. Lowering of the first element and degree of diphthongisation were looked at in the vowels.

**Prerequisites**

Three prerequisites were adhered to. First of all, the tokens under investigation needed to be part of an unreduced syllable and preferably even part of a syllable carrying primary stress. This way, the phenomena under investigation ran the smallest risk of being less pronounced, and this was assumed to be true for both vowels and consonants. Secondly, the effects of variation within linguistic context were minimised by keeping the phonological conditions as restricted and consistent as possible. Within the confines of the numbers of actual phoneme occurrences

---

9 Harmen Siezen, for instance, was a vicar’s son and grew up living in several places across the Netherlands. (This may have caused him to sound non-regional.)
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available, the conditions were kept strictly defined. Thirdly, a prerequisite for a condition to be suitable was a high frequency of occurrence. For each phoneme, numerous conditions could be defined on theoretical grounds, but not all of these actually occurred frequently in everyday speech and in our corpus.

Below, the selection criteria that were applied for each phoneme are outlined. A summary of the phonetic/phonological conditions that were defined can be seen in Table 5.11. The aim was to find ten occurrences of each selected condition with a minimum of five. This aim was met, and in most cases ten tokens were found. Tokens were first selected on the basis of written occurrences in transcripts that were made of the recordings, and subsequently the actual tokens on the tape were listened to, to determine whether the expected suitability was in accordance with reality. The choices made for each phoneme (class) are discussed below.

(v) and (z)

Devoicing was the main point of interest with respect to (v) and (z), and contexts were selected that would reveal devoicing tendencies. This is the case in contexts in which this devoicing occurs ‘spontaneously’ and is not caused by adjacent voicelessness. Therefore, for both (v) and (z) a fully voiced context was defined, namely an intervocalic context; either a word-internal one (for instance bewolkings, gezondheidszorg) or a word-initial one (de versies, hij zoekt).

A requirement for word-initial occurrences was that the voice flow was not interrupted before the fricative under investigation and that the token in question was comparable to a word-internal realisation as far as its voice environment was concerned. All tokens found carried primary stress.

(g)

As devoicing of (g) was a point of interest, the same context that was defined for (v) and (z) was applied for (g), namely an intervocalic context, either word-internal (lugubere) or word-initial (te geven), with primary stress.

Besides degree of devoicing, the place of articulation and presence of rasp in (g) were topics of interest. For that reason, two contexts were selected that could reveal variation in these respects. Such variation may be affected not only by the voice of surrounding phonemes but also by the position of (g) in the syllable. Coda contexts for (g) were therefore included, besides the onset context that was already selected. It was also decided that contexts involving voiceless neighbouring consonants be included. Both of these are common realisations in Dutch.

With this in mind, two additional phonetic/phonological conditions were defined. First of all, syllable-initial occurrences (either word-internal or word-initial) were selected that were preceded by a voiceless obstruent (in the preceding syllable/word): lichtgevond, ook goed. Secondly, a coda condition was defined. A common context of (g) in coda position is when it is followed by a voiceless dental plosive (/t/) in the same syllable, and this context was therefore chosen: macht, vastgelegd. Due to frequency limitations in the corpus, the occurrences of (g) in
these two conditions included some tokens in syllables with secondary stress or no stress at all. A prerequisite was that the tokens in these reduced syllables were as auditorily prominent as in primarily stressed syllables.

(r)

For (r), the focus was on place and manner of articulation. Various common contexts were chosen to see what the effects on (r) realisations would be of position in the syllable and of voice of neighbouring consonants. Onset and coda occurrences were selected for (r) in voiced and (partly) voiceless conditions. Four contexts were selected; two onset and two coda contexts. Only (r)’s in syllables with primary stress were chosen.

The (r)’s in onset contexts were syllable-initial intervocalic occurrences that were either word-internal (liberaal) or word-initial (de rechtszaak) as well as occurrences following a voiceless plosive (/t/, /k/, or /p/) in the same syllable: centraal, priesterschap.

Two coda contexts were defined. First of all, word-final occurrences followed by an obstruent (in the next word). Obstruents were chosen to avoid resyllabification tendencies that (r) may be subject to if followed by other types of phonemes. Due to limitations in the corpus, both voiced and voiceless obstruents were accepted as following phonemes: vier deuren, jaar tweeduizend. Secondly, coda occurrences were chosen that were followed by a voiceless dental plosive (/v/) in the same syllable, which is in line with the context defined by Van de Velde (1996): gevoerd. This is a highly recurrent context in Dutch.

(ee), (eu), (oo), (ei), (ai), and (ou)

Listeners generally evaluate vowel variation critically. Therefore, particular attention was paid to this class of phonemes. To achieve a minimum degree of reduction, first of all, vowels were selected that were part of syllables with primary word stress. Only in those cases where syllables with primary stress were not available and more tokens were needed to achieve enough occurrences, tokens in syllables with secondary stress were selected, providing they were as fully realised as a primarily stressed syllable. To avoid reduced vowel realisations, preference was given to vowels not belonging to the following word types: prepositions (for instance boven; ‘above’), common names (Den Haag; ‘the Hague’), conjunctions (zodra; ‘as soon as’), and conjugations of the verbs ‘to be’ ((ik) was; ‘(I) was’) and ‘to have’ ((ik) had; ‘(I) had’). Also, various words were avoided that were known to be prone to reduction processes.

Ideally, both preceding and following consonants would be selected on the basis of their (preferably minimum) impact on the adjacent vowel. Deterding (1990) talked about a context in which the vowel is preceded by a glottal fricative (/h/) and followed by a voiced dental obstruent (/d/). An example would be the vowel in the nonsense word heed. In this context, the vowel is affected minimally by adjacent consonants, as - theoretically speaking and based on experience - the phoneme /h/ as
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a preceding consonant in the same syllable tends to take on the shape of the following vowel and is therefore not intrusive of the shape of that vowel, while the voiced dental obstruent is known to affect the shape of preceding vowels to a minimal degree. Unfortunately, such well-defined contexts are not realistic when natural speech is used.

As for the preceding consonants, one concession that was made was that vowels after (j), (w), (r), and (l) were tolerated, although it has been suggested that this has drawbacks (for instance by Deterding 1997:49). Following Van de Velde (1996), for the vowels occurrences were chosen in open syllables followed by a (voiced or voiceless) obstruct and schwa (*weten, keuze, kopen, reizen, kuiken, koude*). As was indicated, obstruents were chosen because they are known to minimally affect preceding vowels.

The above-named six examples are open syllables. According to Van de Velde (1996:159-160), diphthongisation is most likely to take place word-finally, and he believed that open syllables come next as far as the likelihood of diphthongisation is concerned. To see whether indeed vowels in open syllables are more likely to diphthongise than those in closed syllables, occurrences were included in closed syllables. The closed-syllable vowels were followed by a voiceless obstruct; *weet, reuk, verloot, beleid, kruis, koud*. This is due to Dutch only permitting voiceless obstruents syllable-finally and not voiced ones. In a small number of cases, consonants other than obstruents needed to be tolerated, due to a shortage of tokens, but only if the effect of these consonants on the preceding vowel was obviously minimal.

**Contexts overview**

Table 5.11 summarises the phonetic/phonological positioning of all the phonemes under investigation. Examples are included. In the ‘pattern’ column, the ‘/’ symbol denotes the phoneme studied, and ‘C’/‘V’ indicate whether it is a consonant or vowel; ‘C’ is thus the consonant under investigation, and ‘V’ is the vowel under investigation. The parentheses represent syllable boundaries.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>phoneme</th>
<th>condition</th>
<th>pattern</th>
<th>two examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(g)</td>
<td>· one-consonant onset · preceded by voiceless obstruent</td>
<td>(-C\textsubscript{obstr} -V)</td>
<td>lichtgewond ook goed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· two-cons. coda cluster · word-final /t/</td>
<td>(-VC\textsubscript{c})</td>
<td>macht vastgelegd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v), (z)</td>
<td>· one-consonant onset · intervocalic</td>
<td>(-V)(CV-)</td>
<td>gezond de versies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(r)</td>
<td>· two-consonant onset cluster · syllable-initial voiceless plosive</td>
<td>(C\textsubscript{obstr} -CVC\textsubscript{v})</td>
<td>liberaal de rechter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· one-consonant coda · followed by obstruent</td>
<td>(-VC\textsubscript{c})</td>
<td>centraal priester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· two-consonant coda cluster · final /t/</td>
<td>(-VC\textsubscript{c})</td>
<td>vier deuren jaar twee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vowels</td>
<td>· rhyme without coda · followed by obstruent+schwa</td>
<td>(-V)(C\textsubscript{obstr}V\textsubscript{sch})</td>
<td>gevoerd fuseert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· rhyme · followed by one-obstruent coda</td>
<td>(-VC\textsubscript{obstr})</td>
<td>weten reizen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description technique: consensus transcription

A perceptual description involves a careful auditory analysis of the segmental features of phonemes, resulting in a transcription. An advantage of a perceptual description over measurements is that it represents what is actually heard, irrespective of acoustic reality. The weakness of this technique is intra- and inter-transcriber variation. Individual transcribers are known to perceive differences between phonemes with identical formant values (Peterson & Barney 1950). Besides that, there is transcription variation between transcribers. Both types of variation are the result of variation in the attention span of transcribers and related personal factors.

A consensus transcription can partly circumvent the drawbacks of these types of variation. In a consensus transcription, two or more transcribers together listen to speech and try to come to a transcription that both, or all, transcribers agree on. Vieregge and Broeders (1993) used a consensus transcription in their research and pointed out that such a transcription can be used to reduce errors as a result of inattention and other shortcomings of transcribers. Shriberg, Kwiatkowski, and
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Hoffmann (1984) and Ting (1970) made similar suggestions. Nevertheless, this technique cannot with complete certainty rid such errors.

A drawback of a consensus transcription is the credibility of a consensus. For such a transcription cannot eliminate compromise. It comes to existence through mutual influence and dialogue, not only through objective independent perception. Dialogue in the most positive case leads to a better understanding of the phoneme by the transcribers, but it can also lead to an adaptation to a fellow transcriptionist’s perception and convictions. The common purpose - a transcription - may bring about concessions and imprecisions by the transcribers due to factors such as time pressure and tiredness. One of the transcribers may also be more convincing and self-assured than the other. Such dominance may be due to personality or, for instance, academic stature and transcription experience. Each transcriptionist to a different extent thus influences the consensus transcription. Besides these differences, there are also differences between transcriptionists in the fields of awareness, linguistic expectation, auditory illusions, and, for instance, competence (Vieregge 1992:58). Vieregge (1992:57) indicated that in fact a consensus transcription by one group is in the end as a rule different from a transcription by another. The final set of symbols does not reveal irregularities.

Transcribers

Four pairs of transcribers participated in the transcriptions. The main researcher was a member of each pair. All transcribers possessed considerable expertise with regard to the transcription of phonemes and/or the pronunciation of Dutch. The pairs of transcribers each transcribed a different set of phonemes, and they all used their own transcription techniques. Table 5.12 shows the phoneme sets each transcriptionist pair described, the tools used, and whether headphones were used. Transcriber 1 was the main researcher.

Table 5.12: Transcriber pairs, phonemes transcribed, and technical aids used in the Perceptual Description.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>transcription pair</th>
<th>phonemes</th>
<th>tool</th>
<th>headphones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transcribers 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>(r) and (g)</td>
<td>Revox</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcribers 1 &amp; 3</td>
<td>vowels (JI, HAS, JZ, PD, and HES)</td>
<td>cassette player</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcribers 1 &amp; 4</td>
<td>vowels (TH and NS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcribers 1 &amp; 5</td>
<td>(v) and (z)</td>
<td>Praat</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transcription procedure

Transcribers 1 & 2 (who transcribed (r) and (g)) opted to use a Revox machine and made use of the functionality of slowing down the speech on the tape and even to control the speed manually and so play the tape extremely slowly. This is particularly useful in establishing the presence of voice and the nature of stricture. Both transcribers used headphones. Transcribers 1 & 3 and transcribers 1 & 4 (all of whom transcribed vowels) transcribed with the aid of a cassette player with the
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option of slowing the tape down (not manually, only automatically). These two pairs used no headphones. Transcribers 1 & 5 transcribed (v) and (z) with the aid of the Praat speech-synthesis programme (see Section 5.10); the speech was stored digitally, and separate files of speech stretches were played. The ease with which the speech is played and repeated is an important advantage of this technique, making the listening process more comfortable. Spectrograms were also generated, as an aid for this transcription, so that the transcribers used both auditory and visual cues to determine the realisational characteristics of (v) and (z). Headphones were used during this transcription.

To facilitate the transcriptions, the phonemes to be transcribed were highlighted on the transcripts. Each transcriber pair was given the freedom to transcribe broadly or narrowly, and they were therefore free to adhere to basic phonemic symbols only (i.e. broad) or to include diacritics (i.e. narrow). The degree of transcription detail was determined by the transcribers. The first step was an introductory listening session in which transcriber pairs established the actual presence of articulatory variation and became accustomed to the recording. On the basis of these introductory sessions, decisions were taken as to which phoneme qualities would be transcribed, i.e. which detail.

5.10 ACOUSTIC DESCRIPTION

After the transcriptions, acoustic measurements were performed on the vowels. A number of formants of tokens of six vowels in the speech of seven speakers were measured. The speakers were coded as JJ, TH, NS, HAS, JZ, HES, and PD. The vowels that were measured were three semi-diphthong phonemes, namely (ee), (eu), and (oo), and three diphthong phonemes, namely (ei), (ui), and (ou). The speakers were introduced in 5.9.2 (overview in Table 5.10). Besides these ‘focal’ vowel phonemes, four ‘peripheral’ vowel phonemes were measured, to function as reference points: (a), (aa), (ie), and (oe). \( F_1 \), \( F_2 \), and \( F_3 \) were measured at one or three points in the vowel duration. The vowel tokens that were measured occurred mainly in stressed syllables that were followed by an obstructant, and about half of them were also followed by schwa. Up to ten tokens were selected in open syllables and up to ten in closed syllables.

Formant-based description

To characterise the vowels, a formant-based method was used. The link between vowel openness and \( F_1 \), or between vowel frontness and \( F_3 \), is rough and not absolute (Kent & Read 1992:93, Deterding 1997:51). A single vowel quality can, for instance, be associated with more than one formant pattern. Adank (2003:12), amongst others, nevertheless considered a formant-based procedure a suitable method to represent differences between vowels. Adank considered this method successful, as well as promising for sociolinguistic research. Sociolinguists such as Labov (1994) used formant values in their vowel characterisations and so did a
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number of Dutch linguists, most notably Pols, Tromp, and Plomp (1973) and Van Nierop, Pols, and Plomp (1973).

The advantage of formant frequencies is that they provide a compact (two- or three-dimensional) description of vowels. In phonetic practice, it is most common to measure $F_1$ and $F_2$ to characterise a vowel. Pols et al. (1973) concluded from their research that $F_1$ and $F_2$ are the two most appropriate parameters for describing the spectral differences between vowels. They argued that the most basic qualities of vowels can be determined by plotting these two formants in a space. Detering (1997:51) felt that the best way to represent vowels is not certain, but, in line with Pols et al.’s (1973) research, nevertheless reverted to a simple plot of $F_1$ against $F_2$ to visualise vowels.

$F_3$

Another method would be to plot the first three formants in a three-dimensional space (Lindblom 1986:18), for $F_3$ is also relevant, as certain vowels may be distinguished on the basis of this formant. Detering (1997) measured $F_1$ to $F_3$ to characterise vowels of British English, and Pols, Tromp, and Plomp (1973) and Van Nierop, Pols, and Plomp (1973) also measured these three formants in their Dutch vowels. But although $F_3$ matters, a visualisation of $F_1$ to $F_3$ in a chart is impractical (most importantly because of the legibility - on paper - of the resulting vowel space).

In addition, Adank (2003:186) found that $F_3$ did not improve the regression models of the perception of phonemic variation (and neither did $F_0$). In Adank’s view, these results can be accounted for when it is assumed that listeners do not directly use the vowel-intrinsic values of $F_0$ and $F_3$ for their evaluations but indirectly only, by estimating the anatomical/physiological characteristics of the speakers. Her findings thus support an $F_1/F_2$-based description.

With all of this in mind, it was decided that $F_1$ and $F_2$ be measured, subjected to manual corrections, and used as the basis of a description. In acknowledgement of its importance, $F_3$ was measured also and subjected to manual corrections. $F_0$ was measured but not subjected to any checks or manual corrections. Neither $F_0$ nor $F_3$ were part of any subsequent calculation or visual representation. They can be found in Appendix 8.

Measuring points and tokens

Formant values were looked for that would provide a general qualification of the vowels in question and that would enable mutual comparisons as well as comparisons with the transcriptions. Three points in time relative to the total duration of the vowel were chosen as measuring points, namely 25%, 50%, and 75%. The very edges of the vowels (<25% and >75%) were avoided because of the likely effects of adjacent phonemes. The formant values at these three points would give a good impression of the beginning, centre, and end of the vowels in question. Such fixed points in time are convenient for making comparisons of the main components of vowels, and they are also convenient for comparing degrees of
CHAPTER 5

diphthongisation. This is also in accordance with Adank, Van Hout, and Smits (2004:1732).

For the peripheral vowels, only the 50% point in time was measured. This central point is furthest removed from the surrounding phonemes and is taken to be the most characteristic point of these monophthongal vowels. The 50% point for peripheral vowels also enables a straightforward comparison between peripheral and focal vowels. Table 5.13 shows the measuring points in the vowels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vowel phonemes</th>
<th>points measured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>focal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semidiphthongs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diphthongs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peripheral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monophthongs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (ee), (oo), (eu)        | 25%, 50%, 75%    |
| (ei), (ui), (ou)        |                  |
| (a), (aa), (ie), (oe)   | 50%              |

Deterding (1997) considered about ten instances to be sufficient to gain a reliable idea of the nature of a certain vowel phoneme by a speaker. For the present research, up to ten tokens of each vowel phoneme were selected in open syllables and up to ten in closed syllables. Ten for each context was the aim, and in most cases ten tokens for closed and ten for open syllables were found. With up to twenty tokens per vowel phoneme and three formants at one or three measuring points in each token, in total 7,773 formants were measured (F₁-F₃).

The Praat programme

Software was used to measure the formants of the vowels, namely Praat; a speech analysis, synthesis, and manipulation package developed at the Institute of Phonetic Sciences of the University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands. Praat was run in Unix on a Silicon Graphics Indy computer with audio.

Step 1: isolating the phonemes

Five steps were taken to retrieve the formant values. Choices needed to be made regarding the techniques to isolate phonemes and the relative contribution of various additional measuring aids. The decisions depended on the amount of available time, degree of expertise of the researcher, and the nature of the recordings.

The original DAT recordings were stored in a Unix computer. The vowels were extracted from the running speech using Praat and saved as separate files. They were isolated from their phonetic context in such a way that the effects of surrounding consonants were minimal. Inevitably, there was variation in the extent to which this was achieved. In the extraction procedure, vowel tokens were rejected that were strongly affected by phonetic context, and tokens were also rejected if they were strongly articulatorily reduced. In the end, in all extracted tokens the surrounding consonants could not be guessed with any degree of certainty if the token was played in isolation.
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Step 2: determining the number of formants

To generate formant values, Praat must first be instructed to look for a number of formants in the speech signal. If this number of formant values is higher than the number of discernable formants, then Praat will look for values in the speech signal where there are none. If Praat is instructed to look for a number of formants that is lower than the actual number of discernable formants, it will fail to register one or more of the existing ones and instead measure a point exactly between two formant tracks.

So, before automatically generating formant values the number of formants that Praat should be instructed to look for in the signal needed to be determined. The correct number needed to be determined separately for each vowel token. Experience has shown that instructing Praat to look for four, five, or six formants is most likely to lead to successful results, and these numbers were therefore taken as points of departure. For each token, a spectrogram was generated and projected on the screen. The same spectrogram was drawn four times in this way, resulting in a screen with four identical spectrograms. In each of these spectrograms, the three points in time (25%, 50%, and 75% of the vowel duration) were marked with a vertical line. A linear prediction-based tracker was then instructed to draw tracks over the formant tracks registered in three of these four spectrograms: one with four formant tracks, one with five, and one with six. In all three cases, only the first three formants and F0 were highlighted in this way.

The empty fourth spectrogram (i.e. the one containing the three vertical lines but no tracks from the tracker) was used as a visual reference aid. The cutting points between tracker tracks and the three vertical time demarcations represented the nine values (three formants at three points in time) that an acoustic measurement by Praat would yield if it were instructed to measure the formants at the named points in the vowel by looking for four, five, or six vowels. A spectrogram for each vowel was then drawn, with each of the three numbers of required formants, and in addition an empty spectrogram. This is shown in Figure 5.3. The spectrogram in the bottom right-hand corner (representing five required formants) shows the successful measurement.

The next task was to decide which of the three spectrograms showed the strongest agreement between the drawn tracks from the tracker and the actual (blurry) formant tracks. In most cases, one of the three spectrograms instantly revealed convincing agreement with the tracks from the tracker. In the instances where the tracker was not successful in any of the three spectrograms, the one with the strongest agreement was chosen. A note was then made of which (one or more) of the nine points to be measured was not identified successfully by the tracker. The peripheral phonemes were only checked in this way at 50%, i.e. at three cutting points, irrespective of the success of the 25% and 75% track agreement.
Figure 5.3: Phoneme (ei) by speaker HAS, represented in spectrograms showing the three numbers of required formants. The three measuring points are also indicated. Clockwise, from the top left-hand corner, the number of required formants is 4, 6, and 5. These are followed by an empty spectrogram in the bottom left-hand corner.

Step 3: automatic measurements

After this, Praat was instructed through a script to measure the formant values for each vowel, using four, five, or six required formants: the pitch ($F_0$) and three formants ($F_1$ through $F_3$) at 25%, 50%, and 75% (or 50% only, for the peripheral vowels) of the duration of the vowel. $F_0$ was measured using the (preferred) autocorrelation method; the $F_0$ frequencies were found between 55Hz and 300Hz. Formant frequency measurements were then generated, using the Burg Method (default settings: time step = 10ms; maximum number of formants = 4, 5, or 6; maximum frequency = 5500Hz; window length = 25ms; pre-emphasis = 50Hz). Subsequently, the three points in time were calculated on the basis of the duration of the vowel, and then Praat generated the pitch and three formant values at these three points.
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The formants that the tracker had not identified were deleted (manually) from the resultant data matrix. These were measured manually at a later stage. This means that for a number of tokens one or more of the measuring points were measured automatically, while the remaining points to be measured were done manually (see Step 4). The F0 measurements were not checked, and they were taken as they were. They were retrieved and stored but left out of any calculation.

Step 4: manual measurements

The vowels of which not all (three or) nine points were successfully measured automatically were looked at separately. In a spectrogram, a window was drawn manually over the relevant points of the vowel (25%, 50%, or 75%). The size of this window needed to be large enough to obtain a legible spectrum. A spectrum shows the peaks (represented in formants) in a selected stretch of the vowel rather than the course of the formants through tracks.

In a large enough spectrum, the formants are usually visible and measurable. As the formants to be measured manually generally occurred in a signal that was qualitatively poor and/or short (the cause for the unsuccessful measurement), a window was in most cases required that was many times longer than the window length of the automatic measurements (25ms). A spectrum was then generated over the selected window, and the formants were determined manually in the spectrum. The manual measurement values were used to fill the empty cells in the existing matrix.

In judging the spectrogram with the tracks from the tracker, and in determining the formants in a spectrogram, inevitably knowledge of likely formant values plays a role. If a spectrogram of a realisation of a certain vowel is looked at, for instance a token of (ee), the formant values that are registered lead to expectations as to those of the next token of that vowel by the same speaker. Moreover, there is the knowledge of a typical (ee) in Dutch (described, for instance, in Rietveld & Van Heuven 1997). In the manual measurements with the aid of a spectrum, such knowledge of formant tracks inevitably created expectations of the values between which peaks were looked for. As an illustration, Pols, Tromp, and Plomp (1973:1094) used spectra and hand-drawn envelopes to measure formants and indicated that they felt that their a priori knowledge of where a formant should be located played a noticeable role in some of their decisions. Fant (1959:66-67) also encountered this phenomenon.

Step 5: final check and correction

Only when the number of vowels is high enough to average out errors can a fully automated measurement produce reliable results that require no final check. This was not the case in our research (our averages were based on up to 20 occurrences only), and ‘blind’ automatic measurement errors were deemed able to distort the results. Erroneous measurements may still result in plausible formant values. A final check was done, therefore, to detect any ‘suspicious’ formant values.
CHAPTER 5

The automatic and manual measurement values were transformed into box plots. Extreme values (outliers in SPSS) were considered suspicious, and these were looked at again in spectrograms. Some of the suspicious values turned out to be imprecise measurements, while others appeared correct despite being exceptional. (Deciding solely on the basis of formant value output which automatic measurements are successful and which are not would have been a normative action and was avoided.) The imprecise measurements were done again (manually), but in a number of cases they led to missing values.

Summary

In Table 5.14 are the number of automatic and manual measurements. In those cases where automatic measurements were successful, they were successful at four, five, or six required formants (see ‘Step 3’ above), and the table shows which maximum number of formants yielded a successful automatic measurement. The number of unsuccessful measurements (missing values) is also visible. In these cases, both automatic and manual measurements were unsuccessful.

Table 5.14: Measurement techniques for the vowels. The technique, number, and percentage mentioned represent measurements of F1, F2, and F3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>technique</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>automatic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max. no. of formants = 4</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max. no. of formants = 5</td>
<td>6,191</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max. no. of formants = 6</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manual</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsuccessful (missing values)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>7,773</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In total, 7,773 formants were measured (not including the pitch). Of these measurements, 80.0% were done successfully with an automatic measurement involving a default maximum number of formants of five. Less than ten percent of the measurements were done successfully with an automatic measurement with a default maximum number of formants of four (7.1%) or six formants (9.6%). Only 2.2% of the measurements were done manually. In 1.5% of all cases, no formant values were retrieved, resulting in missing values. In a majority of cases, this was F3, as F1 and F2 are more easily identifiable by Praat.

Finally, although the manual measurements have taken up much time and yielded relatively few formant values, they have proven to be an important contribution. Without them, a number of vital vowels of certain speakers would not have been measured, because not enough tokens were available before the manual measurements to calculate an average. In a considerable number of cases, these were peripheral vowels, which were necessary to calculate the edges of vowel diagrams.
6. INTRINSIC CHARACTERISTICS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

Daan (1983:480) felt that although many feel that everybody knows what Standard Dutch is, there are as many norms as Dutchmen. The present and the next three chapters try to create order in these norms, and together they provide an overview of the most prominent characteristics used to describe a standard language.

Descriptions of Standard Dutch by ordinary users are discussed, and these are compared with the literature. In their descriptions, these users tend not to distinguish strictly between various kinds of argumentations. Above all, they generally do not differentiate between linguistic features and non-linguistic characteristics, and this distinction is therefore not made here either. So, the definitions discussed are not exclusively phonetic or, for instance, grammatical, but instead involve descriptive adjectives and other qualifying tools, such as references to people and situations. On the basis of the descriptions posed by our respondents, two types of characteristics to describe the standard language emerged, and these two are discussed separately in this and the next chapter. User characteristics (who speak Standard Dutch?) are described in Chapter 7, and in the present chapter the intrinsic characteristics (which qualities does the language itself have?) of the language are looked at. These qualities are mainly non-linguistic.

Chapter overview

As a preliminary to defining Standard Dutch, the authority issue is looked at (6.2). In 6.3, the actual intrinsic characteristics of the standard language in the Netherlands according to respondents are discussed. A number of characteristics is also put forward that exist in the literature but were not put forward by the respondents. First of all, characteristics posed by respondents themselves towards this definition will be looked at in detail, along with their relative dominance. These characteristics are categorised in search of general tendencies. These results as well as the literature suggest that unnaturalness and standardness are closely related, and therefore this alleged characteristic of Standard Dutch is discussed separately. After that, the perceived relative importance will be looked at of various linguistic levels (amongst others grammatical and lexical) in the definition of standardness (or ‘Standard Dutchness’) and of one non-linguistic level (type of speakers). Finally, adjectives related to standardness are discussed, to see whether clusters of characteristics exist that together qualify ‘standard’. Section 6.4 concludes the chapter.

The data for the present chapter were obtained from three investigations, namely the Speech Evaluation Experiment, the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey, and the Telephone Survey. In the presentation of the results in tables and graphs, the number of respondents or listeners who participated in a task is mentioned, along with the investigation from which the data are borrowed. In the figures in this chapter, the top bar always represents the response category that was chosen most
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often, the second bar represents the second most popular category, and so on. Only response categories that were actually selected by the respondents are in the tables and graphs.

6.2 AUTHORITY: LINGUISTS OR LAYMEN?

A question underlying any language definition is: who have the authority in this definition? Van Haeringen (1951:317-318, 1962a:120) felt it is the linguist’s duty to describe and propagate the norm, as long as in, say, 25 years the norms are allowed to change again. Geerts (1987), in line with this, did not see what would be linguistically unscientific about fixing the boundaries of phonetic freedom. Daan (1983:486) was more specific as to authority, and she considered the Dutch Language Union (Nederlandse Taalunie) to be the most desirable institute to determine language norms in the Dutch-speaking area.

It is clear that linguists have on many occasions in the past acted in a prescriptive way. They have attempted to make clear what is in their view correct and what is not. This is also how (both prescriptive and descriptive) books on language are usually interpreted by ordinary users. Jansen (1985:160) in fact believed that people often expect linguistic descriptions to be prescriptive. Milroy and Milroy (1999:4) said something similar and, together with Kruisinga (1936:6, 16), hinted at the lack of actual effects of popular linguistic articles in newspapers and of lectures by linguists. Daan (1983:486), in contrast, talked about the possible long-term influence of linguists on the language situation.

The notion that only linguists and other experts can prescribe the norm has long been controversial. In the 18th Century, Ten Kate (1723) indicated that not only the language expert has a say but the language user too. Kloek (1951:42) pointed out that linguists do not possess the right to prescribe and that it is linguistically unscientific to interfere in the standard language by first fixing it and subsequently prescribing it. Hall (1950:13) suggested something similar by equating ‘correct’ with ‘socially acceptable’. Daan (1969:15-16, 1983:478) also claimed that the norm lies not in rules and prescription but primarily in the heads of people.

But in the heads of which people? In defining Standard Dutch, the question automatically arises how many people are involved in the decision process, and to what extent are some users excluded from authority? Ebertowski (1980) claimed that the system of values that exists within a society is predominantly determined by the middle classes. Van der Lubbe (1968:33) considered linguistic authority to be with those whose language is generally considered exemplary, and Jansen (1988:210) made a similar claim. According to Jansen, those adult speakers who claim to use the standard language should be asked which existing language structures they would prefer in their formal use of the language. Indeed, not every individual has an equal impact on the standard language, and the number of influential individuals is limited. Heestermans (1988) indicated that in some

1 The Nederlandse Taalunie is an institute that propagates the Dutch language; in Flanders, the Netherlands, and abroad.

104
language areas the roles of famous individuals in the construction of the standard language have been important. In Germany, for instance, the role of the reformer Luther was crucial, while in Friesland (a province in the very north of the Netherlands) the poet Japiex played a noticeable role.

Authority according to respondents

Authority was one of the issues the Telephone Survey covered. The respondents indicated where the authority lies regarding Standard Dutch by answering the question: ‘Who decide on the definition of Standard Dutch?’ The respondents were presented with five response categories, including NO OPINION.

One obvious response category was LINGUISTS, and in accordance with Daan’s (1969, 1983:478) comments on the norm being in people’s minds rather than in rules and prescription, the SPEAKERS category was added. The latter category refers to ordinary speakers. The GOVERNMENT was another category, because the standard language is often associated with the language of civil servants, politics, and official documents. Besides these response categories, the respondents were given the opportunity to write down another authoritative body (OTHER).

The responses to this question are in Figure 6.1. The respondents were allowed to select more than one response category. The total number of response categories was five, all of which were selected by one or more respondents. In the Telephone Survey, the group of respondents was split up into southerners and westerners (see Section 5.8), and this division is visible in the figure.

![Figure 6.1: Responses to the question: ‘Who decide on the definition of Standard Dutch?’ [1,123 responses (west=556; south=567) by 1,047 respondents (west=547; south=500) in the Telephone Survey].](image)

More than a third of the respondents considered LINGUISTS to be the ones to carry authority regarding the definition of Standard Dutch. The respondents were not
conference visitors or regular readers of prescriptive and descriptive linguistics
texts. It is also doubtful whether they were influenced by the rare occasions when a
linguist appears on the radio, on television, or in the written media. Kruisinga
(1936:15) in fact felt that the general public does not meddle in linguists’ affairs at
all (except in the case of spelling). Perhaps the respondents who chose LINGUISTs
were thinking stereotypically of linguistic researchers at universities whose
knowledge reaches ordinary Dutchmen through grammar books at school.

More than a quarter of the respondents considered SPEAKERS themselves to be
the ones to decide on the definition of Standard Dutch. It is not likely that these
respondents felt that ordinary speakers somehow actively partake in the shaping of
the language in question. They were most likely to be referring to the shaping of the
standard language through actual usage. Of the respondents who opted for this
category (n=247), 24 referred to both LINGUISTs and SPEAKERS as authorities, thus
considering the coming to existence of the standard language to be a combined
action of conscious and natural language construction. This (small) subset of
respondents may have been expressing the conviction that in the end users must
endorse descriptions by linguists for these descriptions to become valid.

More than a fifth of the respondents considered the GOVERNMENT to be the
body to determine what shape the standard language should take. This implies that
the government must decide on which forms are standard and which are not, but it
does not mean that the government holds the linguistic expertise needed to decide
which forms are standard. Of the 216 respondents who chose this response category,
36 considered both LINGUISTs (i.e. the experts) and the GOVERNMENT (i.e. the
regulative body) fit to decide which forms are standard and which are not. Of the
respondents, 10.4% named an authority of their own (OTHER). A wide variety of
responses was given by these respondents, and these were difficult to categorise;
6.4% of the respondents did not have an opinion (NO OPINION).

Cross-tabulations were made, but no significant differences were found in the
response patterns between the western and the southern respondents. The
significance level was set at 1%\(^2\). Apparently, westerners and non-westerners had
similar views on authority regarding the standard language.

*Origin of lay beliefs*

While modern linguists largely obtain their authority and views on the standard
language from empirical data, laymen generally have no access to such data. To gain
more insight into why laymen believe what they believe, and where their expertise
originates from in their view, the respondents of the Sociolinguistic Definition
Survey were asked where they had obtained their views on the definition of
Standard Dutch. Plausible response categories were defined for the respondents to
choose from: SCHOOL, HOME, and READ IT SOMEWHERE. Besides these, the

\(^2\) Despite the multiple responses, chi-square was calculated. The chi-square is inflated
because of the dependence in the data, but there is no clear way to correct chi-square to
get the correct lower value. In any case, this does not have any consequence when the
outcome is not significant.
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respondents were given the option of writing down another place (SOMEWHERE ELSE) or indicate that they had NO OPINION. The respondents gave one response only. Figure 6.2 has the results.

![Bar chart showing response percentages](chart.png)

Figure 6.2: Responses to the question: What is the origin of your views on the definition of Standard Dutch? (214 respondents in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey).

Of the respondents, 33.6% chose to write down their own source of opinions (SOMEWHERE ELSE). This would suggest that perhaps an important and obvious response category was not put on the questionnaire. This was not the case; the responses these respondents wrote down were impossible to categorise. They were a collection of intuitive remarks on the origins of beliefs. Some examples: ‘intuition’, ‘I simply know’, ‘from personal experience’, and ‘through travel’. The second category was the NO OPINION category.

The HOME and the SCHOOL categories were also popular. A quarter of the respondents chose these. Kloeke (1951:2-3) attached importance to school as an influential and authoritative body. At the same time, he felt that the authority of the parental home of speakers interferes with the school’s authority. He believed that the influence of the social setting to which speakers belong may even overrule the school’s influence. This would mean that the school rules may in the end be rejected in the home and remain restricted to the school and the professional sphere. Hellinga (1938:336) emphasised that schools have not been the place where the standard pronunciation has developed, just the birth place. In Section 7.4, the school setting is looked at more closely.

Only a small percentage of respondents believed that they had read about Standard Dutch and formed their opinions on the definition of this language variety that way (the READ IT SOMEWHERE category). From the popularity of the NO OPINION category, and from the obscurity of the responses in the SOMEWHERE ELSE category, it can be concluded that most of the respondents were generally not aware of where they obtained their beliefs and responded on the basis of logic.
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6.3 INTRINSIC CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristics used

The respondents in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey were asked, first of all, how they would define Standard Dutch in their own words. This was perhaps the most relevant question of all in the survey, for the respondents themselves invented the characteristics, thus providing insight into their relative importance. Besides being the most informative question, it was also the question the responses to which were most difficult to interpret. Categories of characteristics needed to be defined on the basis of the responses, while the responses respondents gave were sometimes ambiguous and difficult to categorise. Many respondents did not restrict their responses to a single characteristic but named more than one. In some cases, characteristics logically fitted into more than one category. A cause for this ambiguity in the responses is the wide variety of uses and interpretations by laymen of terminology relating to language; for instance the terms ‘dialect’, ‘accent’, and ‘pronunciation’. A categorisation such as the one listed below is therefore inevitably affected by interpretations by the researcher.

Table 6.1a: Characteristics used to define Standard Dutch in the answer to the question: ‘How would you define Standard Dutch?’ (Table 6.1a and 6.1b together: 207 respondents in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>characteristic</th>
<th>respondents using char.</th>
<th>example responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRECT</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;The correct language&quot; ; &quot;The language described in dictionaries, grammars, and spelling reference books&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-REGIONAL</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;The language that is not typical of a certain area&quot; ; &quot;It does not reveal the speaker's regional origin&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINGUA FRANCA</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;The language we all understand, have in common&quot; ; &quot;For normal communication&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPPOSITE OF DIALECT</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;The language that is the opposite of dialects&quot; ; &quot;The language that contains no dialectal features&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLISHED</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;It is a polished language&quot; ; &quot;It is the neatest and most precise language&quot; ; &quot;It is a crisp and clear language&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIA LANGUAGE</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;The language of the media&quot; ; &quot;The language that is spoken on radio and television&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;The language that is generally accepted&quot; ; &quot;The language most people accept as their standard&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRADITIONAL STANDARD</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;The language that is called ABN or Algemeen (Beschaafde) Nederlands&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The characteristics posed by the respondents in their responses to the question ‘How would you define Standard Dutch?’ are summarised in Table 6.1a (those chosen by more than 5% of the respondents) and Table 6.1b (those chosen by less). The ‘characteristic’ column contains a description of the characteristic, the ‘respondents using char.’ column contains the percentage and number of respondents who mentioned the characteristic in question. The ‘example responses’ column illustrates the categories by means of actual (extracts of) responses of one or more respondent(s). Ten of the 217 respondents did not answer this question, and the remaining 207 respondents posed 315 characteristics; on average almost 1.7 characteristics per person.

The total number of characteristics posed was 20, including the OTHER category (Table 6.1b), which contained idiosyncratic responses that could not be categorised. The highest number of characteristics given by one speaker was five. The characteristics mentioned by more than five percent of the respondents are discussed below. The others are assumed not to carry much weight and are therefore presented later, in Table 6.1b.

CORRECT (31.3%)

Hartveldt (1978:23) claimed that the sociolect that is the standard variety is generally acknowledged as correct. Indeed, almost a third of the respondents referred to correctness as a characteristic of the standard language. It is likely that these respondents considered Standard Dutch to be fixed and orderly, rather than flexible and changeable, or that they preferred it to be.

Most of these respondents mentioned or hinted at the standard language being present in linguistic reference books. Such books have been around for centuries; in the 16th Century, books on language started to be published frequently in the Low Countries. Oftentimes, personal language rules were presented by the writers, and these highly prescriptive books will have influenced language norms. Van der Wal and Van Bree (1994:222) nevertheless indicated that it is difficult to determine what the effects of such prescriptivism have been. Hall (1950:12) emphasised that prescriptive books have no legal authority. Nevertheless, they are often viewed as such. According to Preston (2000:18), appeals to the dictionary and grammar books are not really appeals to trusted authorities on usage; they are, he claimed, appeals to wise men and experts who have insight into the abstraction that is the language. Our respondents thus indirectly referred to these wise men and experts in their responses.

Over the centuries, reference books have become increasingly descriptive. Language books (books on the Dutch language, as opposed to schoolbooks) are as a rule no longer an explicit effort to shape the norm but above all a description of existing norms.

NON-REGIONAL (30.9%)

Possibly the oldest and most frequently mentioned condition that a standard language has to satisfy is to possess (a high degree of) regional neutrality, and this
characteristic is posed by almost a third of the respondents. As far back as the Middle Dutch period, language items were avoided that were regionally marked. Jespersen (1925) is the most well-known modern-day advocate of the view that ‘standard’ is related to ‘regionally neutral’. He felt that standard-language speech does not reveal which region the speaker is from. Van Haeringen (1924a:65-66) considered this to be true for the Netherlands as well, and so did Van Bree (1981:11), Van der Wal and Van Bree (1994:21), and, for instance, Palmen (2002:123). Van Haeringen went as far as to envision a future without regionally marked varieties; not as a possibility but as an inevitability. According to Kloke (1954:817), however, Jespersen’s non-regionalness argument is not in accordance with reality.

Since the rise of modern sound carriers, the opportunities to hear the language of others has grown, and along with this development the characteristic of regional neutrality as a characteristic of the standard language has become more realistic and practicable. This tendency of sound carriers homogenising the standard language started somewhere early in the radio years (1920s and 1930s), and Van Haeringen (1924b) already predicted a type of homogenising tendency at an early stage of radio broadcasting. With the aid of new types of media, anyone now had access to spoken standard-like speech, and this tendency was irreversible.

Although some feel that there is no place for variation within the norm language (for instance De Vries 1987:128-129), non-regionalness does not necessarily exclude the possibility of variation. Most writers would in fact acknowledge that variation is inevitable, even in the standard language (Kruisinga 1936:15,17, Stroop 1998:109). Jansen (1988:210) said that the variation in (spoken) Standard Dutch is enormous (and he put forward the speech of discussion programmes on television to illustrate this). Van Haeringen (1924b:65) argued that not being able to hear where a speaker comes from does not in fact mean that everybody speaks the same way. In this view, variation is allowed as long as it is not regional. According to Kloke (1954:817), a commonplace is that language unity must always be the goal, but he emphasised that such unity can only be derived from ‘harmonious diversity’ and should not be confused with rigid uncompromising uniformity.

So, Van Haeringen (1924a:65) distinguished between regional and other types of variation in the standard language. To explore the role of regionality in the standard language in the view of respondents, the respondents in the Telephone Survey were asked whether regional traces are AUDIBLE or NOT AUDIBLE in the speech of speakers of Standard Dutch. Some respondents presented various remarks that could not be categorised (the OTHER category) or had NO OPINION. So, there were four response categories, and all of these were selected by one or more respondents. The categories and their popularity can be seen in Figure 6.3.
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Figure 6.3: Responses to the question: ‘Are regional traces audible in the speech of speakers of Standard Dutch?’ [1,000 respondents (west=499; south=501) in the Telephone Survey].

Over 60% of the respondents indicated that in the speech of speakers of Standard Dutch regional features can regularly be heard (AUDIBLE). More than a quarter of the respondents considered audible regionality to be absent in the speech of these speakers (NOT AUDIBLE). This group of respondents apparently considered traces of regionality3 in the speech of speakers to be an indication that the speech in question is not standard. The OTHER category is considerable, but this category is unstructured, as it contains various responses. A negligible percentage of respondents had NO OPINION on this matter. The difference between southerners and westerners is significant ($\chi^2=34.461$, $df=1$, $p<.01$); the westerners were less accepting towards audible regional traces in Standard Dutch4.

The regional traces mentioned in the above question logically include traces from all parts of the country, including the west, but it should be borne in mind that the interpretation of ‘regional’ may have been varied. For westerners, for instance, ‘regional’ traces may be the same as ‘provincial’ traces, i.e. regional features from outside the Randstad. Non-westerners may have a more general view on this than westerners, namely that western speech is as ‘regional’ as speech from other regions. This explains why non-westerners find regional traces less unacceptable; some of these traces are closer to the standard language.

Van Bree (1981:421) claimed that westerners (the stereotypical authoritative group in the Netherlands) oftentimes do not hear their own accents. This may not be typical of the Netherlands only. The respondents in Inoue’s (1991:65) research on Japanese showed that his Tokyo (the stereotypical basis of Standard Japanese) respondents in particular oftentimes believed that their everyday informal speech is not different from the standard language that would appear in formal writing. So, it is possible that people from linguistic core areas are more inclined to feel that

---

3 The differences in the perception of regionality by people from within and from outside an area is extensively illustrated by research on this issue by Preston (2000).

4 The NO OPINION category is not taken into consideration in this calculation, due to its small size.
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whatever they speak (or hear around them in their area) is close to the standard language, including regional speech from their core area.

Acceptability of Western sounds

From the responses in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey, two seemingly conflicting views appear. On the one hand, the respondents felt that Standard speech is regionally neutral, while on the other hand, they associated the west with Standard Dutch. Based on these two beliefs, one wonders whether Western speech and regionally neutral speech are not in fact the same; whether speech from the Western cities is regionally neutral to large groups of people. To address this matter, the respondents in the Telephone Survey were asked whether it is acceptable if Standard Dutch has a Randstad ring to it, i.e. the ‘sound’ of the large Western cities.

If regionality of the standard language is the topic of discussion, the regional origin of respondents becomes relevant. Respondents from the west of the Netherlands live in the area that has close connections with the rise of the standard language, and for that reason they are likely to have different beliefs to those respondents that do not live in an area with such connections. Therefore, regional origin is taken into consideration.

There were three response categories (ACCEPTABLE, NOT ACCEPTABLE, and NO OPINION), all of which were selected by a number of respondents. The results are in Figure 6.4.

Figure 6.4: Responses to the question: ‘Is it acceptable if Standard Dutch has a Randstad ring to it?’ [990 respondents (west=494; south=496) in the Telephone Survey].

More than half of the respondents considered it ACCEPTABLE if Standard Dutch has a Randstad ring to it, and well over a third considered this NOT ACCEPTABLE. About one in ten had NO OPINION. The difference between ACCEPTABLE and NOT ACCEPTABLE is significant; there is a preference for the former ($\chi^2=22.107$, $df=1$, $p<.01$).

The difference between westerners and southerners is also significant ($\chi^2=11.737$, $df=1$, $p<.01$); the westerners found a Randstad ring to Standard Dutch more acceptable than southerners did. It is possible that westerners in particular
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consider Standard Dutch to be the language of the western cities, while southerners are more inclined to feel that a language whose pronunciation is reminiscent of a particular area (including the west) is not standard. Still, both in the south and west the acceptability of a Randstad ring is controversial. The western-based Dutch standard language may start to dissociate itself from the Randstad and become a symbol of the country as a whole.

The results seem to support the notion that to westerners ‘standard’ and ‘western’ are closer to each other than in the view of non-westerners. Figures 6.3 and 6.4 indicate, first of all, that the strict homogenous standard language is by a majority of respondents not considered the norm and that regional or western traces are a natural part of Standard Dutch.

LINGUA FRANCA (24.0%)

The term lingua franca originated in the Mediterranean region in the Middle Ages among crusaders and traders of different language backgrounds and today describes a language serving as a regular means of communication between different linguistic groups in a multilingual speech community (Richards, Platt & Platt 1996:214, Holmes 1997:86). The lingua franca function of Standard Dutch here does not refer to communication at a basic level but to understanding each other better and avoiding communicative obstacles that are due to regional and other variation.

Almost a quarter of the respondents mentioned the communicative function of Standard Dutch. Goudsblom (1964:107), in line with this notion, felt that communication between Dutchmen from all parts of the country is amongst the central purposes of Standard Dutch. Some centuries ago, when dialects constituted the most common means of communication, the standard language (mainly written) was a way to convey information to speakers with various dialectal backgrounds. This communicative function is by many still deemed to exist today, albeit to a lesser degree (Kloke 1951:5, Van der Lubbe 1958:15, Stroop 1992:182). The easy accessibility of the standard language was put forward, amongst others, by Van de Velde (1996:30) and Milroy and Milroy (1999:20).

This communicative function has increasingly become symbolical rather than practical. Now that standardised and mutually comprehensible versions of Dutch are the norm in the Netherlands rather than exceptions, the lingua francaen of Standard Dutch does not anymore imply that it is an indispensable means of communication for people with different linguistic backgrounds.

OPPOSITE OF DIALECT (16.6%)

The contrastive approach to standardness is one of the most popular points of departure in discussions on standardness in language. About one sixth of the respondents contrasted the standard language with dialects. It is, however, difficult to distinguish strictly and objectively between ‘dialect’ and ‘language’ and between ‘dialect’ and ‘standard language’ (Goudsblom 1964:106). Nevertheless, the contrastive approach is frequently used, even by linguists (amongst others, Goossens
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1974:12 and Kloke 1951:48-49). Goossens described dialects as the total number of
 expressions of a local group in a language community, which, in comparison with
 other locutions occurring in the same area, can only be described by means of a
 maximum number of rules from the standard-language system. In other words, to
 him the standard language deviates to a maximum extent from local varieties.

POLISHED (8.8%)

Almost nine percent of the respondents considered Standard Dutch to be polished.
These respondents specifically referred to the care with which it is often spoken. The
fact that oftentimes Standard Dutch is learned at a later age rather than acquired
early in life may have led to crisp articulations of the language. Conversely, it is
possible that respondents considered polishedness to be a prerequisite of Standard
Dutch.

In the literature, polishedness and related characteristics have regularly been
assigned to Standard Dutch (for instance by Kloke 1951, 1954:811 and Hagen
1990:34), Daan (1983:483), on the other hand, said that non-standard speech is often
wrongly associated with poorly articulated speech.

MEDIA LANGUAGE (7.8%)

Almost eight percent of the respondents considered the speech of the media to be
exemplary with respect to Standard Dutch. This is a well-known notion that can be
found in much of the literature (see Section 4.2). Radio and television announcers
strive for a maximally clear and precise diction, as free as possible from
regionalisms in pronunciation, particularly those carrying a social stigma, said
Lipski (1985:221). It can be assumed that, while today media speech is considered
exemplary, in the early days of broadcasting, when the standardised language was
not as widespread and known as it is today, the makers of media programmes
themselves in the selection process estimated the standardness of the speech of the
speakers. It can therefore be hypothesised that media speech today prolongs norms
of standardness, while in earlier days it was one of the determining factors in the
coming to existence of the standard language.

The speech used in the media is not always appreciated positively. Kruisinga
(1936:15,17) qualified radio speakers as semi-civilised, and in Onze Taal magazine
(see Section 3.5) complaints about the poor use of Dutch by media presenters can
regularly be read. What this shows above all, is that the speech of the media is
viewed critically.

ACCEPTED (6.0%)

Kloke (1951:12) felt that the inevitable response to the question where authority
can be found is that it is there where people generally feel it is. In other words, he
believed that acceptance is an important precondition for a language to be standard.
According to Knops (1989:179), Standard Dutch pronunciation is (from an
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empirical point of view) the set of pronunciation features (including considerable variation) that is recognised and accepted as standard by the Dutch-speaking population. Six percent of the respondents considered this acceptance a prerequisite of the standard language.

TRADITIONAL STANDARD (5.1%)

About one in twenty respondents equated Standard Dutch with *Algemeen Beschaaft Nederland* (*General Civilised Dutch*, see Section 3.3). It seems that these respondents were presenting a synonym of Standard Dutch and were not as such defining the phenomenon. It is possible that this group of respondents was reacting to the use of the term ‘Standard Dutch’ in the survey, which is a term used by linguists and not so much by ordinary users. The term *Algemeen Beschaaft Nederland* is today mainly used in lay circles. According to Van der Wal and Van Bree (1994:21), *Algemeen Beschaaft Nederland* is the variety of Dutch that functions as the general norm, but some writers would disagree that *Algemeen Beschaaft Nederland* is the same as ‘Standard Dutch’, amongst others Stroop (1998:109).

Remaining categories

The characteristics that less than 5% of the respondents put forward are in Table 6.1b. Each remaining characteristic was chosen by less than five percent of the respondents. There was also a number of characteristics (represented by the OTHER response category: 7.4%) that could not be categorised into any of the above categories.
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Table 6.1b: Characteristics used to define Standard Dutch in the answer to the question: ‘How would you define Standard Dutch?’ (Table 6.1a and 6.1b together: 207 respondents in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>characteristic</th>
<th>respondents using char.</th>
<th>example responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FORMAL</td>
<td>4.6 (10)</td>
<td>“Formal official-sounding language”; “A stilted and bookish language”; “The language of writing”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO OPINION / NO ANSWER</td>
<td>4.6 (10)</td>
<td>(not applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINGUISTIC CHARACTERISTICS</td>
<td>4.6 (10)</td>
<td>“The language with no Gooise (r)”; “Zachte (g) should be accepted”; “A melodious language”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIALECTAL AVERAGE</td>
<td>3.7 (8)</td>
<td>“The basis of dialects”; “The language from which dialects are derived”; “A mixture of all dialects”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RARE/NON-EXISTENT</td>
<td>2.8 (6)</td>
<td>“The language spoken by only few people or no one. One hardly ever hears it”; “It does not exist”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICULAR AREA (WEST)</td>
<td>2.3 (5)</td>
<td>“The language from the west”; “Randstad Dutch”; “The language spoken in the two Holands”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSTABLE</td>
<td>2.3 (5)</td>
<td>“An unstable, fickle language”; “The language that changes all the time and will continue to change”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICULAR CITY (HAARLEM)</td>
<td>0.9 (2)</td>
<td>“People from the city of Haarlem speak it”; “The Haarlem accent”; “Haarlem-like speech”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFICULT</td>
<td>0.9 (2)</td>
<td>“A difficult language”; “The language that is almost impossible to produce”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDESPREAD</td>
<td>0.9 (2)</td>
<td>“The most widespread language”; “It is everywhere, you cannot escape it”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATED</td>
<td>0.9 (2)</td>
<td>“Educated people speak it”; “The language spoken at universities and colleges”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>7.4 (16)</td>
<td>“The language of the queen”; “My language”; “I do not like this language”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Categories of characteristics

To reveal more general tendencies, the characteristics mentioned in Table 6.1a and b can be redistributed into larger categories, as Table 6.2 shows. For each category in this table, the original characteristics that it consists of are indicated, as well as the number and percentage of respondents who chose each category and individual characteristic.
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Table 6.2: Characteristics to define Standard Dutch (results based on tables 6.1a and 6.1b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>category of characteristics</th>
<th>characteristics of Table 6.1a and 6.1b</th>
<th>respondents (n) naming characteristics</th>
<th>respondents (%) naming characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL</td>
<td>NON-REGIONAL</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LINGUA FRANCA</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPPOSITE OF DIALECT ACCEPTED</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIALECTAL AVERAGE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WIDESPREAD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURED</td>
<td>CORRECT</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POLISHED</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRADITIONAL STANDARD (ABN)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FORMAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RARE/NON-EXISTENT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIFFICULT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDUCATED</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIA</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUALITATIVE CHARACTERISTICS</td>
<td>UNSTABLE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTHER CHARACTERISTICS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOGRAPHICAL ORIGIN</td>
<td>PARTICULAR AREA (WEST)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PARTICULAR CITY (HAARLEM)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENERAL (86%)**

A large majority of the respondents somehow referred to the generalness of the standard language. Looking at the original characteristics that belong to this category (the ‘characteristics of Table 6.2’ column), there appear to be several types of generalness in the respondents’ minds. Firstly, there is generalness referring to the language being typical of the country as a whole. Secondly, there is generalness in the sense that the language in question connects people linguistically. Another type
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of generality that is implicit in many of the responses is emotional generality, which idea may be in accordance with De Vries (1980:227), who talked about a language that is colourless and dead.

CULTURED (57%)

Well more than half of the respondents somehow considered the standard language to be a cultured language; a product of culture, highly sensitive to correctness norms, and accessible to the elite mainly. In the responses, this elite quality of the standard language was often referred to, implicitly or explicitly; it is not a language that everyone has access to. In that respect, the CULTURED characteristic is the opposite of the GENERAL characteristic. As these two are the most dominant categories, it seems that they represent the two main views of the standard language. In the one view, the standard language is the way to distinguish oneself, while in the other this language is what connects people.

The idea that a standard language is the language of a confined class of people is old and was already acknowledged around the 17th Century (for instance by Van den Vondel 1650 and Nyloë 1703). More recently, Kloek (1954:3) indicated that the norm lies with a small group of Dutchmen. Willeyns (1979), Mees and Collins (1982), Daan (1985:46), and Jansen (1988:208-210) also considered Standard Dutch to be the sociolect of a specific elite-type group.

The results suggest that culturedness is not only associated with eliteness, but also with unnaturalness. As unnaturalness is a recurring theme in comments on the standard language in and outside research, this characteristic is discussed in detail in below.

MEDIA LANGUAGE (8%)

This category contained no subcategories and has been discussed already. Some may argue that this category supports the generality idea discussed above, as the media is accessible to people from all layers of society.

QUALITATIVE CHARACTERISTICS (7%)

According to Preston (2000:18), ‘the folk’ believe that a language is ‘good’ because it is, amongst other things, logical and clear. Preston thus referred to qualitative characteristics posed by ordinary language users. Almost seven percent of our respondents used such qualitative characteristics to define Standard Dutch. These respondents either put forward required characteristics of Standard Dutch or characteristics that are not tolerated in Standard Dutch. Most of these qualitative characteristics were related to pronunciation.

One third of this category consists of the UNSTABLE subcategory, which refers to the changeable nature of Standard Dutch. Much of the other two thirds consists of various remarks on linguistic items such as the acceptability (or not) of Dutch zachte (g) (‘soft (g)’, see Section 3.6) and the Goise (r) (the (r) from the ’t Gooi area, see
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Section 10.2. It is indeed common for people judging language to use specific language items to support their general judgement (Van der Kolk 1992). Four percent of the respondents considered Standard Dutch to be a dialectal average (this is not visible in the table), i.e. the basis of dialects or a mixture of dialects. This is another reference to qualitative characteristics and is in line with Kloke (1951:5), who said that Standard Dutch transcends local dialects.

GEOGRAPHICAL ORIGIN (3%)

Three percent of the respondents applied a geographical characteristic and referred to the western nature of the standard language or one particular city in the west, namely Haarlem. Regional origin is hardly ever mentioned spontaneously when a definition is asked for (by only 3.2% of the respondents). This could mean that regional origin is not considered the most noteworthy characteristic of Standard Dutch, although the literature by referring to it so frequently suggests that it is.

OTHER (8%)

About eight percent of the respondents presented a characteristic that could not be categorised in the above categories. One respondent, for instance, claimed that the Dutch queen speaks Standard Dutch, and another considered herself to be the best speaker of Standard Dutch.

The definition of Standard Dutch

The above-named categories are not mutually exclusive. The GENERAL category refers to both inherent (linguistic and non-linguistic) and functional characteristics, whereas, for instance, the MEDIA category mainly denotes social/professional circles where it is spoken. Therefore, the above list cannot simply be interpreted as a hierarchy of characteristics. It does enable us to define the standard language in the Netherlands in general terms, on the basis of lay perceptions. Based on the three most dominant characteristics in Table 6.3 only, this definition would be the following: ‘Standard Dutch in the Netherlands is the common linguistic reference point of Dutch people. It is associated with correctness and culturedness’. In this definition, the main characteristic points at the function of the standard language within a speech community, while, furthermore, two noteworthy qualitative characteristics are present in this definition.

The unnaturalness of the standard language

The idea of an extra effort being necessary to produce standard speech and of this speech somehow being fundamentally different to non-standard speech is old. The term ‘speaking broadly’ translates in Dutch as plat praten; ‘to speak plat’. One of the translations of the word plat is ‘uncivilised’, and in dictionaries (amongst others
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Van Dale (1996) ‘civilised’ is related to notions such as ‘carefully constructed’ and ‘not natural anymore’.

This idea is directly or indirectly referred to in a great deal of literature. Nyloë (1703:1-10) observed that people who speak Dutch the best and most agreeable are those who make an effort to do so. He in fact provided a ten-page description of how to speak proper Dutch (and on top of that demanded that speakers speak naturally). Van Haeringen (1924a:74) considered non-standard speech to be whimsical, loose, general Dutch, and put it opposite civilisation, as civilisation involves self-constraint, self-disguise, and control of natural tendencies by speakers. According to Van Haeringen, uncivilised persons let themselves go, while cultured persons contain themselves. Similar comments were made by Goedblom (1964:115), Kloek (1951:43-44), and Hellinga (1938:362). Kloek (1951:48) indeed believed culture to be based on a reformation of the mind, the result of which is ‘more’ and ‘different’ compared to nature. He (Kloek 1954:812) even called ABN a chemical formula.

So, unnaturalness of the standard language is a recurring topic in the literature, although mostly implicitly. Six possible reasons for this image of the standard language are discussed next.

1. Conservatism

The standard language is thought to be subject to a conservative force. Kroch (1978:29) and, for instance, Bloomfield (1964:393-394) indicated that prestige dialects tend to preserve archaic forms that are changed or lost in the vernacular. Bright (1964), White (1972), and Labov (1966, 1972) all found evidence of this. Kroch (1978:18-19) hypothesised that the prestige dialect characteristically resists ‘regular’ processes of phonetic conditioning that the speech of the non-elite strata would undergo. He felt that popular dialects are more susceptible to phonetic conditioning in such features as simplified articulation, replacement, or loss of perceptually weak segments, and have a greater tendency to undergo ‘natural’ vowel change. He found some support for this suggestion in his finding that non-standard varieties more regularly adapt the pronunciation of loan words. In several other investigations, too, less prestigious social groups turned out to use articulatorily reduced variants more often than the most prestigious group did (Labov 1966, Cedergen 1970, Guy & Braga 1976, Kemp & Pupier 1976).

The opposite conviction has also been expressed (Hellinga 1939), namely that an important characteristic of standard languages is the reduction of phonetic realisations, while dialects often maintain subtle pronunciation variants that have no distinguishing function. In this view, dialects are more conservative than the standard language. However, this stance is not supported empirically and is no commonplace in sociolinguistics. Also, the reduction of the number of realisations does not necessarily cause a simplified pronunciation altogether.
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2. Enhanced consciousness

Speakers and their conscious approach to language usage are also factors in the endorsement of certain characteristics and not others. Kroch (1978:18-19) hypothesised that the cause of stratified phonological differentiation within a speech community is found in ideology especially. Hagen and Vallen (1975) specifically hinted at the middle classes being particularly conscious of their speech, and Labov (1972) also believed that the prestige dialect oftentimes requires special attention. Kloek (1951:47) made a similar comment.

This ideology, then, causes the standard-variety user to expend more energy in speaking than the user of the non-standard variety. This suggestion was supported by Labov’s (1966) research, in which he met with suppression of change; by the upper middle classes in New York City. Kroch (1978) encountered a similar phenomenon and discovered that in Philadelphia the highest social class used a more or less unnatural energy when speaking (which, he suggested, was to maintain their status quo).

3. Prescriptivism

The perceived unnaturalness of Standard Dutch may also be founded in prescriptivism. The strong interest in the standard language in the Netherlands has over the centuries led to prescriptivism of several kinds. In the early 17th Century, language constructors played an important part in the realisation of a linguistic ideal. De Heuter, Spiegel, Van Heule, Dafforne, Ampzing, and Montanus were influential figures in half a century of language construction, towards a general civilised pronunciation. In early stages, the laws of culture determined the direction in which the standard moved; the avoidance of extremes and the desire for eloquence. Teachers were important passers-on of the ideal of these reformists.

Prescriptivism still exists in the Netherlands. In some countries, it is clearly a more dominant part of everyday life than in the Netherlands. In France, for instance, a strongly centralised language policy has existed since the 16th Century. The Académie française has written down the rules that the language should meet. In the Netherlands, the obedience to such authorities is less. Standard Dutch is widely viewed as an entity that is subject to change and variation, and there is no influential body to dictate the language structure. It is only individuals and a number of small organisations that persistently try and halt linguistic liberalism.

4. Not the mother tongue

Another explanation for any perceived unnaturalness was expressed by Jansen (1985:159), who indicated that the standard language is not always the mother tongue of speakers. He suggested that the standard language is a compromise that is often learned rather than acquired naturally. This is unlike dialects, which are not
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usually learned. In line with this, Overdiep (1949:13) and De Grave (1932:148) distinguished between speakers who have learned the standard language and those who are more secure in their use of the language.

5. Written tradition

The written tradition constitutes another explanation. While dialects supposedly change freely, the standard language is subject to conscious restraining factors such as a writing system. While dialect features can develop relatively unhindered, whereas variation in the standard language is often debated. Conscious choices are made between forms, and these choices are documented. The choice for one or the other form is not always in line with actual widespread usage, and Bloomfield (1964) argued that in fact the written norm is an important factor in the preservation of old forms.

An example of a change in the standard articulation in Dutch that was more or less enforced through spelling is the change in spelling from ae to aa in Holland. This spelling distinction brought with it a difference in pronunciation, the ae having a more raised realisation. Both were common realisations. The aa realisation somehow came to be perceived as the most civilised form, and it eventually started to dominate as most correct. Hellinga (1938:304-335) pointed out that dialect geographers have found no plausible linguistic origin for this change.

6. The media

The last cause posed here is the media. Radio and television speech is obviously intended to be easily comprehensiblible and is most usually quite well articulated. This could enhance the feeling that standard-language speakers, as opposed to non-standard-language speakers, are articulate language users. And it is true that mass-media speech is often thought to bear specific features that are not typical of spontaneous speech. Blanch (1972:84), as for instance, felt that announcers on news and sports programmes in particular use exaggerated intonational contours and a staccato style to underline their commentaries, and Van Haeringen (1949b:5) made a similar observation. Kruijssinga (1936:15,17) was critical about the spelling pronunciation of radio presenters, and according to Zandvoort (1959) newsreaders use stress more than is common in ordinary conversations. Media speech, however, does not as a rule come across as unnatural, despite being meddled with. Witteboon (1960:30) in fact believed that most Dutch-speaking presenters possess a natural-sounding final (n)6 (which in Dutch pronunciation is most usually deleted (n)7).

According to Lipski (1985:220), it is obvious to anyone who has listened to public broadcasting that a special style of broadcast speech exists that is distinctly different from daily speech. Lipski’s (1985:224, 226-228) data on Spanish radio

---

5 In fact, learning a dialect and using it amongst native speakers of that dialect would by most be considered socially unacceptable behaviour.
6 More on final (n) can be found in Van Hout & Van de Velde (2001)
7 In an unstressed (en) ending.
programmes in South America show a clear grading of the language used in the news. Lipski (1985:228-229) indicated that, for instance, in Latin America a specific non-regional radio norm has arisen that bears few resemblances with ordinary speech but which is understood and accepted by all. It is the result of subtle and unwritten societal pressures, he said. Lipski (1985:223-224) also gave an example of a feature on Carribean radio used regularly in broadcasting but that does not actually exist in the daily speech of the vast majority of Carribeans. This feature was in fact from a type of Spanish from another country.

A source of the possible unnaturalness of media speech are the explicit demands that radio speakers must meet. Witteboon (1960:28) gave a list of qualities that newsreaders in his view must meet8. The head of the Dutch Radio News Service, Rien Huizinga (see Van Gaalen 1989:41) favoured a somewhat formal style of speech on the radio, because all layers of society are addressed by the speakers. Philip Bloemendal (1918-1999) - probably the most legendary radio- and cinema-news presenter in the Netherlands - in a 1982 interview for KRO radio indicated that when he was hired as a radio presenter in the mid 1940s he was considered fit because of his strong voice, which carried far. He indicated that he spoke with a different voice when he presented his programmes, one that had a limited intonation and a BBC-like, monotonous and emotionless, quality. In those days, the quality of the media was such that this was also necessary, and it may be that this association of newsreader speech with hypercorrect pronunciation styles still lingers today. All in all, it should be no surprise that with so many demands some media speech sounds less than natural.

Newsreader speech is produced under special circumstances (Daan 1993:8, Witteboon 1960:29). Witteboon indicated that the unnaturalness of the newsreading setting makes an adjusted speech style inevitable. There is, for instance, no opportunity for listeners to interpret the facial expression of the newsreader, nor is there the opportunity for the audience to ask questions.

There is much agreement on mass media speech not being like everyday speech, but things may be changing. Stok (1989:40) indicated that broadcasters used to have to speak Standard Dutch and were severely tested by a committee of critical listeners when they applied for the job, but that the selection characteristics were slackening. Until the early 1970s, the language in news broadcasts was noticeably different from everyday speech. It is often claimed that at the beginning of that decade, the deformalisation of news broadcasts began to show. Polished and careful speech since seems to have been replaced by a more informative and business-like approach. In recent years, efforts have been made to introduce more emotions into

8 He indicated that newsreaders should adjust their intonation and furthermore that the language must be: simple, not broad, civilised, authoritative, well-educated, as well as clear and understandable to listeners with various educational levels and people from various parts of the country. Moreover, he said, it should not contain sentiment, emotion, or personal convictions. Radio-news presenters must control their emotions when they speak, yet speak naturally and, if possible, lively, said Witteboon. He spoke about an objective representation that is sober and business-like and in which content rather than the person speaking attracts the attention.
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news broadcasts, giving newsreaders more freedom than before to present the news in a personal style. This means that, again, newsreaders are subjected to quality demands that they may not even endorse.

*Linguistic and non-linguistic characteristics*

In their descriptions of the standard language, the respondents of the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey often referred to linguistic features. Not all linguistic levels can be assumed to have the same impact on beliefs, and, moreover, certain linguistic levels show more variation than others. Van Coetsem (1999:26) called the lexicon the least stable of all linguistic domains; phonology and grammar (morphology and syntax) being the more stable ones. However, the question is whether the most variable aspects of language are automatically also the main determiners of beliefs regarding standardness.

To find out more about which aspect of language determines beliefs most, the respondents in the Telephone Survey communicated in which dimension the most important differences lie between Standard Dutch and non-standard Dutch. The response categories consisted of the linguistic levels that respondents could be expected to know about: PRONUNCIATION, VOCABULARY, and GRAMMAR. Another category was the (nature and culture of) SPEAKERS, so as to give the respondents the opportunity to indicate that the difference between standard and non-standard lies not in the language but in the speakers. Besides these, the respondents could name differences themselves (through the OTHER category); both linguistic and non-linguistic. Finally, NO OPINION was a category. The total number of response categories was six, all of which were chosen by a number of respondents. The results are in Figure 6.5.

![Figure 6.5: Responses to the question: What is the most important difference between Standard Dutch and non-standard Dutch? [1,140 responses (west=548; south=592) by 847 respondents (west=417; south=430) in the Telephone Survey.](image-url)
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Obviously, PRONUNCIATION was considered the linguistic dimension that most dominantly distinguishes standard from non-standard varieties. It can be assumed that intonational features are part of pronunciation according to the respondents, for the distinction between segmental and non-segmental features is generally not made as strictly by laymen as by linguists. VOCABULARY was not perceived to be as important as PRONUNCIATION, and this was also true for the other features. Hellinga (1938:16) said that pronunciation is the most important factor in the perception of speaker’s speech, and similar comments were made by Van Haeringen (1949b:5), De Vries (1980:225), and Van der Toorn (1992:5-6). Even from the literary front came the suggestion that sounds are most telling and salient in language (Vestdijk 1957:46).

It is true that variation in pronunciation is present in each sentence, or even word, while variation in vocabulary is much less frequent. One can pronounce the same word twice, but it is impossible to pronounce the two versions in exactly the same way. Another reason for pronunciation to be a popular response here is that it is perhaps the least fixed of all linguistic levels. Today, there is uncertainty about certain pronunciation phenomena in Standard Dutch, making it an obvious object of discussion and controversy.

A little more than one in ten respondents mentioned GRAMMAR. The grammar of Dutch is highly fixed, and regional differences in this linguistic area are minor, so this relatively low percentage is not surprising. A similar percentage of respondents considered characteristics of SPEAKERS to be most decisive; who speak, rather than what is said or how it is said. (Chapter 7 discusses the speakers of Standard Dutch.) The OTHER and NO OPINION categories together represent about 11% of the respondents, so they seem less relevant.

No significant differences9 arise between the responses by southerners and westerners. The significance level was set at 1%.

Adjectives related to standardness

From the above, it appears that pronunciation is particularly decisive in evaluations of degree of standardness. But what are the pronunciation qualifications of Standard Dutch? In other words: which qualifications (i.e. adjectives) do people use to characterise Standard Dutch pronunciation? The Speech Evaluation Experiment listeners evaluated speech fragments on the basis of qualities other than degree of standardness. By correlating these qualifications with standardness, it becomes possible to describe Standard Dutch pronunciation by means of adjectives. In addition to STANDARD, the pronunciation qualities that the respondents rated were POSH, WESTERN, REGIONAL, MODERN, FORMAL, BEAUTIFUL, and POLISHED. All of these regularly occur in the literature in connection with standardness.

To assess the relationship between standardness ratings and the other evaluations, product-moment correlations were computed, based on the mean ratings

9 Despite the multiple responses, chi-square was calculated (see footnote 2).
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of each of the 30 speakers. Table 6.3 represents the resultant coefficients. The significance level was set at 5%.

Table 6.3: Correlations between ratings of STANDARD and seven other qualifications of the speech fragments (Speech Evaluation Experiment).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSH</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIONAL</td>
<td>-.72*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERN</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORMAL</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEAUTIFUL</td>
<td>.93*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLISHED</td>
<td>.62*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three correlations are significant: those between STANDARD and BEAUTIFUL (positive), STANDARD and REGIONAL (negative), and STANDARD and POLISHED (positive). These correlations all go in the expected direction, judging by contemporary literature. The relationship between STANDARD and BEAUTIFUL is particularly strong. De Vries (1987:127) felt that there is indeed reason to assume that there is a positive attitude towards the fixed norm in the Netherlands. Our results corroborate findings hereon in previous research on English (Giles 1970 and Trudgill & Giles 1978) and Dutch (Van Bezooijen 1994, 1995). In accordance with the Imposed Norm Hypothesis, which suggests that prestige varieties gain ‘consensual validity’ as the most beautiful form of language because of cultural norms (Giles, Bourhis, Trudgill & Lewis 1974:405), the ratings for BEAUTIFUL are derived from the ratings for STANDARD.

Besides beautiful, the standard language can on the basis of these results be characterised as highly non-regional and polished. The non-regionality characteristic in particular is frequently mentioned in the literature (see this section). The high correlation between STANDARD and POLISHED is in line with the association (according to respondents in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey) of Standard Dutch with culturedness/polishedness (see this section).

On the basis of the results, one could conclude that POSH, WESTERN, MODERN, and FORMAL are not required qualities of Standard Dutch pronunciation. Nor do these features make a language variety less standard. In part, this is not in

---

A factor analysis (principal axis factoring, with varimax rotation) was performed on the data, to see with which aspects of speech standardness would cluster. With three factors, 94% of the common variance in the original scale ratings was accounted for (the selection criterion eigen value >1). Three dimensions surfaced. Most dominantly, there was the ‘conservative’ dimension (posh, not modern, and formal), then there was the ‘beauty’ dimension (BEAUTIFUL), and finally there was the ‘western’ dimension (WESTERN). Also, poshness, modernness, and formality in pronunciation behaved independently of standardness. In other words, pronunciation can be posh, modern, formal, or none of these, but this does not provide strong clues as to the degree of standardness.
agreement with Cassier and Van de Craen (1986:71), who detected a positive correlation between degree of formality and degree of standardness in standardised southern Dutch (i.e. in Flanders).

So, the most dominant characteristic of the standard language pronunciation is its beauty. Labov (1966) showed that in (stable) societies the standard-language system is more or less accepted by all social groups. Lambert, Hodgson, Gardner, and Fillenbaum (1960) looked at reactions towards French and English in Montreal. They concluded that their findings demonstrated not only favourable reactions from members of the high-status group towards their own speech, but also that these reactions had been adopted by members of the lower-status group. Edwards (1979) found something similar. This does not mean that speakers of all varieties find the standard language more beautiful than any other variety. It is most usually suggested that only in special cases the standard language is not preferred, for instance when preferences for the standard language would by the peer group be considered a demonstration of a lack of loyalty towards the own ethnic group (Politzer & Ramirez 1974, Flores & Hopper 1975).

There is evidence of a correlation between the own variety and the evaluation of the variety judging. Ryan (1975) found that while the two ethnic groups in his investigation rated accented English differently, both groups rated Standard English speakers highest. Ryan and Giles (1982), on the other hand, found that, although the standard language evoked both negative and positive ideas in their research, in general speakers of regional varieties rated it more positively than they did their own variety. They investigated a large number of reactions and suggested a general pattern: speakers of regional varieties find speakers of their own variety warm, friendly, honest, sympathetic and trustworthy but often slow and unintelligent. They typically regard speakers of standard languages as cold, dishonest, and unsympathetic but quick, intelligent, and ambitious. In general, the standard language is nevertheless rated most positively by these listeners.

6.4 CONCLUSION

This chapter described the characteristics that laymen and linguists pose for the standard language to meet. Both referred to the other in the description of the standard language; in linguistic circles, the habits and opinions of ordinary speakers were considered important characteristics, whereas laymen tended to refer to experts. Both groups generally agreed that authority does not lie with one or the other but that it is an interaction between the two. Unlike linguists, laymen referred to government as an authority. In this view, the government must authorise and lay down rules ‘designed’ by speakers and linguists. Linguists themselves did not assign any function to the government in this respect. Laymen were generally aware of having no expertise, and this is also illustrated by them not being aware of the origin of their beliefs on the standard language.

There was a positive attitude towards the standard language, and both linguists and laymen agreed that Standard Dutch is the linguistic focal point that speakers in the Netherlands have in common. Standard Dutch is nourished and protected. The
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unnaturalness that this language variety has developed is not only taken for granted, it even seems to be cherished. As Standard Dutch was associated with both beautifulness and culturedness, we can assume that culturedness (which is closely related to unnaturalness) is even a required characteristic of the standard language. It gives this language variety a certain eminence; one of constraint, control, and perfection. There seems to be a desire in people for the standard language to be different from other language varieties, as opposed to it merely being different due to circumstances. In other words, the quality of the standard language being deviant and exceptional seems a prerequisite rather than a result of its special position in society.

Standard Dutch was by the respondents considered to be correct and non-regional mainly. Westerners associated regionalness with non-western varieties and rejected regionality in Standard Dutch more strongly than did the non-westerners. Westerners felt, more so than the non-westerners did, that standard and western were close to each other and that their own speech approximated Standard Dutch.

Although newsreaders are known to enjoy a high status and are considered representative Standard Dutch speakers, when asked for characteristics to define Standard Dutch few of the respondents referred to the media. Moreover, when asked where their knowledge on Standard Dutch originates from, the media were not mentioned at all by the respondents. It may be that the media are considered to pass on the standard language without them having a say in its construction and shape. Another striking result is that, when asked for a definition of Standard Dutch, very few respondents referred to a geographical origin, while in evaluating speech fragments the negative relationship between standardness and regionality is significant. Of all linguistic levels, pronunciation is considered the most important feature distinguishing standard from non-standard speech. This shows that it makes sense to zoom in on pronunciation in research into variation in the standard language.
7. USER CHARACTERISTICS

7.1 INTRODUCTION

During the Batavian-French Period (1795-1813), the attention for actual language use was revived in the Netherlands, and looking at speakers and their environment has since been a popular approach in the definition of Standard Dutch. The standard language has become firmly associated with certain types of speakers, with where they live and what they do. Den Hertog (1897:10) specifically defined professional environments that would stereotypically provoke the standard language. He said that a homogenous language is typical of the government, trade, science, and schools, and, for instance, magazines. Van Haeringen (1951:329-330), some time later, noticed that the uniform language is approximated with considerable ease in shops, at railway stations, by policemen, and by any schoolchild. He (1951:327) said that civilised speakers can be found amongst those possessing a car, those who travel second class on trains (as opposed to third), and those who visit good restaurants. User characteristics of the standard language will be looked at next.

Chapter overview

The present chapter contains results of five of the eight Sociolinguistic Investigations as described in Chapter 5, namely the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey, the Speech Evaluation Experiment, the Telephone Survey, the First Newsreader Survey, and the Second Newsreader Survey. Several types of user characteristics are discussed. First of all, the ‘where’ dimension is dealt with in Section 7.2. Both general areas and specific cities in the Netherlands were possible outcomes as places where Standard Dutch is spoken best. Secondly, ideas are looked at on the period when Standard Dutch was spoken at its best. The question is whether Standard Dutch is spoken best today or whether one should look to the past to find the best version of this language. This is the ‘when’ dimension, and this dimension is discussed in Section 7.3. Besides ideas on geographical and time origin, there are ideas on the nature of speakers of Standard Dutch, i.e. the ‘who’ dimension (dealt with in Section 7.4). Professions of speakers are discussed, and considerable attention is given to the perceived standardness of the speech of media presenters. Section 7.5 deals with the number and percentage of speakers of Standard Dutch; the ‘how many’ dimension. Section 7.6 concludes the chapter.

7.2 WHERE?

Kloek (1951:7) asked himself where to look for the linguistically authoritative centre in the Netherlands. Over a decade earlier, he had already expressed the difficulty of answering this question and argued that no place of origin of civilised Dutch can be defined (Kloek 1937:6). The respondents in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey answered Kloek’s question and indicated where in their view
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Standard Dutch in the Netherlands is spoken in particular. The responses are in Figure 7.1. The respondents were presented with eleven geographical entities, namely various regions and cities in the Netherlands. For four of the response categories, the Netherlands were divided up into four areas: NORTH, EAST, SOUTH, and WEST. Next, the RANDSTAD was available as a response category, referring to the large cities in the west of the Netherlands. There are historical grounds why this area is associated with Standard Dutch (see Section 3.4). The capital of the Netherlands and the city where the Dutch government resides were also put on the list (AMSTERDAM and THE HAGUE). Van den Vondel (1650:6) already referred to Amsterdam and the Hague as places where the standard language is spoken. Today, the Hague is still the political centre of the Netherlands, while Amsterdam is an important trade and business town. Moreover, Amsterdam is the capital city of the Netherlands and a cultural hub. The city of HAARLEM was also a response category, because in the Netherlands a popular assumption is that Haarlem is the place where Standard Dutch is spoken.

Van Haeringen (1924a:73) said that in cities in particular the standard language is spoken. It could be that cities other than the ones mentioned above were considered the regional origin of Standard Dutch. Three large cities outside the west were therefore added to give respondents the option of choosing non-western cities: GRONINGEN (north), DEN BOSCH (south), and ARNHEM (east). These three take up a key position within their respective regions. Besides these categories, the respondents could opt for EVERYWHERE THE SAME (in the Netherlands).

The respondents were also given the opportunity to name a geographical origin of their own choice (ANOTHER PLACE). Based on the places named by the respondents themselves, a new category was created, namely UTRECHT PROVINCE. This category includes references to the province of Utrecht or an area within the province of Utrecht, called the *Utrechtse Heuvelrug*. It does not include Utrecht city (the capital of Utrecht province). LARGE CITIES was another category created on the basis of places respondents wrote down themselves. They were cities that could not be categorised. It turned out that the NORTH, SOUTH, THE HAGUE, AMSTERDAM, and DEN BOSCH categories were not selected by any respondents, and these are therefore not included in the figure. The respondents were, finally, allowed to choose NO OPINION.

---

1 Literally, this means ‘Utrecht range of hills’. This is an attractive green region in eastern Utrecht, which includes areas with attractive old villas.
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Figure 7.1: Responses to the question: 'Where in the Netherlands is Standard Dutch spoken in particular?' (214 respondents in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey).

HAARLEM

The city of HAARLEM is chosen most often (25.7%) as the place where Standard Dutch is spoken in particular. This reflects a well-known popular belief today. It has been suggested that Johan Winkler was the first writer to make this claim and thus trigger this widespread notion: "Today's tongue in the city of Haarlem is undoubtedly the closest to the accepted Dutch language of all Holland varieties and all Dutch tongues. In Haarlem, the spoken language approximates the contemporary written language most" (Winkler 1874:77). He went on to explain: "During the time of the church reformations, and later too, many strangers settled in Haarlem [...], from Flanders, Brabant, and from the area around the Lower Rhine. These new citizens [...] exerted a great influence on the Haarlem tongue. This way, the typical Haarlem tongue came to existence." Winkler hinted at the effects of various

2 Original Dutch citation: ‘De hedendaagse tongval van de stad Haarlem staat ongetwijfeld van alle hollandse en dus ook van alle nederlandsche tongvallen het naaste aan de geijkte nederlandsche taal. De spreekaal nadert te Haarlem het meest tot de hedendaagse schrijffuul’.

3 Original Dutch citation: ‘Ten tijde der kerkhervorming en ook later, vestigden zich veel vreemden te Haarlem [...] uit Vlaanderen, Brabant en uit het land aan den Beneden-Rijn. Deze nieuwe burgers van Haarlem [...] oefenden nuttijcker wijze grooten invloed
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varieties coming together in Haarlem and, like in a melting pot, creating a new and standardised variety. A similar phenomenon was observed in more recent times by Scholtmeijer and Kapteijn (1998) in the Dutch town of Dronten. This is a Dutch polder city, created in the 1960s after land reclamation in the central Netherlands. Speakers of various dialects and accents came together there and, according to Scholtmeijer and Kapteijn, used standardised Dutch as a tool for convenient communication. The second-generation speakers, then, started out using Standard Dutch as their default language. Scholtmeijer and Kapteijn found that today in the town of Dronten Standard Dutch is spoken at its best.

Evidence in favour of a close distance between Haarlem and Standard Dutch speech was found by Heeringa (2004), who classified Dutch dialects and their mutual distance using the Levenshtein algorithm⁴ and found that the local Haarlem dialect is indeed linguistically closest to Standard Dutch. It seems unlikely, however, that the close linguistic distance of Haarlem speech to Standard Dutch is the ground for Haarlem's special position. Intuitively, Haarlem is not closer to Standard Dutch than any other Randstad variety is. Moreover, Heeringa indicated that Standard Dutch and the local Haarlem variety are not one and the same. Winkler also referred to the local Haarlem tongue being close to (written) Standard Dutch without it being the same. This accords with Daan (1969:10,11), who felt that the ‘Haarlem legend’ is a good example of a popular idea that has come to existence due to a wrong interpretation of tradition and to insufficient knowledge. She felt that it might well be due to Winkler’s statement but that Winkler did not actually make the claim in question and in fact merely communicated that Haarlem speech deviates less from Dutch than other regional varieties.

Despite the popularity of the claim and some linguistic evidence of specific qualities of Haarlem speech, there are no compelling reasons today why Haarlem should have a leading linguistic role. Haarlem has been a city of considerable importance, but it is not the political, cultural, or economic centre of the Netherlands or of Holland, nor is it older or more historical than other cities in the Netherlands or Holland. While Amsterdam and Leiden each have an old and established university, Haarlem has never been an outstanding centre of learning. Haarlem was never the most important trade town or the city associated with the monarchy or the government. Rotterdam and Amsterdam have a major port, and Amsterdam is the capital city; the Hague is the ‘royal capital’ and holds the Dutch Houses of Parliament. Haarlem has none of these qualities.

Arguments can be invented to support the Haarlem notion, one of which is printing. Laurens Coster of Haarlem played an important part in the exploitation of

⁴ The Levenshtein algorithm puts into numbers the distance between language varieties by calculating the cost (or least costly set) of operations mapping one string of phonetic transcriptions to another by inserting, deleting, or replacing phones. An extensive description of the algorithm is given by Kruskal (1999). This method was applied to Dutch dialects by Neronne, Heeringa, and Kleiweg (1999) and Heeringa and Neronne (2000).
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the potential of printing in the Netherlands. But although Coster was from Haarlem, and Haarlem was an early centre of printing in the Netherlands, the cities of Delft, Utrecht, and Leiden soon became equally important in the development of this trade. Another reason that is sometimes heard is that Haarlem does not have a stigmatised inner-city dialect, such as is the case with Amsterdam, the Hague, and Rotterdam, which cities all have well-known dialects that people from all over the country can recognise and even imitate. This seems a plausible explanation why Haarlem speech may have the image of being standard-like, or neutral; people simply do not know what broad Haarlem speech sounds like. This may have led to the idea that Haarlemmers typically do not speak with a broad city dialect. However, having been raised in Haarlem himself, Kloke was convinced that the true ‘Haarlemmer’ does not at all speak the standard language. Moreover, if the actual nature of Haarlem speech is largely unknown, then it could hardly function as a living linguistic norm. It can be assumed that a large part of the respondents who chose this category had never actually been in Haarlem and were not familiar with specific linguistic features of Haarlem speech. Haarlem speech is not the most frequently heard variety on television, and Amsterdam and Rotterdam (and their speech) are in the news more often. Kloke (1951:810-811), finally, posed another argument in support of the Haarlem notion, namely the geographical position of Haarlem in the heart of Holland. This explanation is not too convincing either, as Haarlem is not the only place in the centre of Holland; the city of Leiden, as for instance, can be considered equally geographically central.

Haarlem is generally not singled out in the professional literature as the western Dutch city with a strong influence on the establishment of Standard Dutch. It is merely seen as one of the birthplaces of Standard Dutch. Hellinga spoke of educated inhabitants of Amsterdam, Haarlem, and Leiden speaking the standard language, but those in Amsterdam in particular (Hellinga 1939:413-414). In addition, he argued that Haarlem has not been linguistically dominant in history, and he (1939:551-569) referred to the dominance of Amsterdam over Haarlem in the evolution of aa and ae. Amsterdam’s aa triumphed in the end, not the Haarlem version (ae) (see Section 6.3).

All in all, the idea of Haarlem as the place where Standard Dutch is spoken does not bear any convincing logical support and merely seems an example of a persistent language myth.

WEST/RANDSTAD

In total, 39.3% of the respondents chose the WEST or the RANDSTAD. These two geographical origins are not strictly synonymous, but they can be assumed to refer more or less to the same entity in most cases, namely the western area in the Netherlands. The respondents who opted for the RANDSTAD referred specifically to the urban areas where the three largest cities are. Daan (1969:33) agreed with these respondents and indicated that inhabitants of the Randstad generally approximate Standard Dutch most. If we add the western city of HAARLEM (which is part of the
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Randstad), then almost two thirds of the respondents turn out to have opted for a place in the west of the Netherlands.

The special position of the western cities has a clear historical basis. In the 16th Century, a mass migration took place from the south-western parts of the Dutch-speaking area (today’s Belgium) to the western (Holland) cities in the northern part of the area (today’s Netherlands) (see Section 2.5). These cities from then on started to play a dominant role in the establishment of the linguistic standard. By the mid 17th Century, this linguistic dominance was widely acknowledged; the influential literary author Van den Vondel (1650) considered Holland the place where Dutch is spoken at its best and most agreeable. Nioë (1703:4) also claimed that the best and most pleasing type of Dutch is found in Holland. This notion remained alive over the centuries, and Van Haeringen (1924a:73) and Daan (1983:480-481), two centuries later, believed that correct Dutch is found in the west and in the Holland dialect. Hagen (1990:34) relatively recently felt that Standard Dutch still has a Holland ring to it. So, as Kloeke (1951:5) suggested, it is clear in which region the linguistic norm in the Netherlands lies emotionally; namely the place it originates from.

Other responses

Of the respondents, 13.6% indicated that Standard Dutch is spoken to the same extent in all parts of the country (EVERYWHERE THE SAME). This may be a reference to the regional neutrality criterion (see Section 6.3). Furthermore, 8.4% had NO OPINION on the topic, and 3.7% named a geographical origin in the Netherlands that could not be categorised into any of the other categories: VARIOUS PLACES. The only city besides Haarlem that was by more than one respondent named as the place where Standard Dutch is spoken is the eastern city of ARNHEM (namely by six respondents, which is 2.8%). This may be due to the (former) stately image of Arnhem. As an illustration, Van Haeringen (1949:6-7) indicated that uvular (r) - which feature carries some status - originates from the Hague and spread to places such as Arnhem, rather than Amsterdam.

The EAST was mentioned by 1.9% of the respondents. Kloeke (1937:3) talked about the eloquence of the speech of speakers from the Gelderland area, which is in the east. According to Van Haeringen (1951:326), however, eastern speakers speak in a polished but not in a civilised way. A small group of respondents (1.9%) named the province of Utrecht or a region within this province (UTRECHT PROVINCE). According to Daan (1969:33), Utrecht is merely a linguistically transitional area between the west and the east. A possible motivation for mentioning the province of Utrecht and the city of Arnhem is that these places were where many wealthy citizens from the west are known to have settled.

As was mentioned above, the following categories were not selected by any of the respondents: the NORTH, the SOUTH, THE HAGUE, AMSTERDAM, and DEN BOSCH. The south (in recent centuries) and the north have played no exceptional role in the construction of Standard Dutch, and that explains these results. Both Amsterdam and the Hague, despite their special status within the Netherlands, are apparently not
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associated with the standard language. It is striking, most of all, that in the Netherlands the cultural and national capital, Amsterdam, is not considered to also be the linguistic capital. In line with this finding, Kloeké (1937:6) distinguished between the Hague and Amsterdam in this respect and specifically considered the Hague important in the development of civilised speech. He considered it impossible that the language from the Dutch capital was the basis of civilised speech.

7.3 WHEN?

A popular claim is that old speech is somehow more correct than modern speech. In the view of some, today’s Dutch is a deteriorated relic of a past norm. The obvious reason for this is that old speech has been around longer and is more established, familiar, and accepted. The fact that it is spoken by older people may give it some additional standing too. The opposite idea would be that the norm lies in the present or at least evolves with time.

To find out whether people look to the past or the present for their linguistic norms, they could be asked where (in time) their norm lies. However, the responses would merely reflect existing suppositions regarding old and new norms. To find out whether old and new speech is evaluated differently from a standardness point of view, results were used from the Speech Evaluation Experiment, in which listeners evaluated fragments from the 1950s until the 1990s using a standardness scale from 1 (=NOT STANDARD DUTCH) to 10 (=STANDARD DUTCH). They were not told the age of the recordings, and techniques to mask the age of the fragment were used (see Section 5.2). Segmental qualities were the main characteristic on which these standardness evaluations were based. The average standardness score each decade received can be seen in Figure 7.2.

A significant difference exists between the decades (ANOVA, repeated measures, Huynh-Feldt correction; \( F=8.599, df=3.582, 452, p<.01 \)). Significant differences exist specifically only between the 1950s and each of the other decades (paired T-tests, adopting the Bonferroni procedure, which takes into account the number of post-hoc comparisons).

Figure 7.2 suggests that modern (1960s-1990s) speech is more standard than older speech and that speech from before a certain point in time may be ‘too old to be standard’, namely speech dating from before the 1960s. To see how strong this tendency is, each individual fragment is ordered in Table 7.1 on the basis of average standardness score. Number 1 in the ‘standardness ranking’ column is the fragment with the highest standardness score, and number 30 is the fragment that received the lowest standardness score. For each fragment, the decade it stems from is indicated with a dark box. If the named suggestion is realistic, then a high number of

---

5 The speaker at the bottom of the list is Guus Weitzel, who used to be the distinctive voice of a major broadcasting company (VARA). According to Koenen (in: Daniëls 1993:29), Weitzel’s voice was like his newsreader contemporaries and can be characterised as civilised, overly clear, and somewhat more chic than the average listener’s. Koenen referred to Weitzel’s typical Hilversum (city from where, traditionally, broadcasts were aired) style of speaking.
modern fragments (1960s-1990s) should be mainly amongst the highest-scoring fragments, whereas the old fragments (1950s) should be amongst the lowest in the ranking.

![Bar chart showing average standardness scores of fragments from five decades (114 respondents in the Speech Evaluation Experiment). The 'K' values represent the number of evaluations on which the average is based, the 'n' values represent the speakers in each decade whose speech was evaluated.](image)

Figure 7.2: Average standardness scores of fragments from five decades (114 respondents in the Speech Evaluation Experiment). The 'K' values represent the number of evaluations on which the average is based, the 'n' values represent the speakers in each decade whose speech was evaluated.

In Table 7.1, no significant rank-order correlations were found between the decades and the ranking order of the standardness scores. The suggestion that the norm lies in the present would be supported if the first ten fragments were considered
separately, for there are no 1950s fragments amongst the first ten highest-scoring fragments. It is nevertheless striking that as far down as the 24th ranking a 1990s fragment can be found (although it should be noted that the 1990s fragments were more numerous: ten instead of five). The fragments from the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s received high, intermediate, and low rankings and can thus be found across the whole hierarchy of fragments. So, 1950s speech seems less standard in an absolute way, while 1960s-1990s speech can by respondents be considered both highly standard or less so.

Table 7.1: Fragments ordered on the basis of decade of origin and standardness ranking (114 listeners in the Speech Evaluation Experiment).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>standardness ranking</th>
<th>decade 50s</th>
<th>60s</th>
<th>70s</th>
<th>80s</th>
<th>90s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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Standardness of perceived decades

The results above reveal evaluations of speech from various periods, while the listeners were assumed to be unaware of the age of the speech. The listeners were (within the same task) asked to indicate whether they knew the age of the speech they heard. The standardness scores of fragments the listeners thought they knew the approximate age of could then be looked at separately. This reveals the perceived standardness of fragments thought to be from certain years. This method reveals predefined ideas on the standardness of speech from various time periods, irrespective of the accurateness of estimates.

Of the 114 listeners, 79 made estimates of the age of one or more of the fragments they heard. It was not possible to calculate averages for all of these 79 respondents, because in many cases too few estimates were given by a respondent (in the worst case, one estimate over the 30 fragments on the tape). It was decided that only respondents for whom an average standardness score could be calculated for each of the five decades would be taken into consideration. A minimum of five estimates was necessary for the standardness scores of a respondent to be taken into consideration; one for the 1950s, one for the 1960s, and so on.

Only 28 respondents met the named criterion. For each of these, an average standardness score was calculated for the fragment(s) they estimated to be from the 1950s, from the 1960s, and so on. To get an average standardness score for each of the decades, the estimated year of recording was recoded into decades: for instance, the response ‘1959’ was recoded into ‘1950s’ and ‘1983’ was converted into ‘1980s’.

The average estimates of each decade by each of the respondents were averaged, and the results are in Figure 7.3. An ANOVA was performed (Huynh-Feldt, repeated measures), but no significant differences in the standardness scores between these decades were found. On the basis of these results, no division can be maintained between speech that is estimated to be from before the 1960s and speech that is estimated to be from after the 1950s.

So, the subconscious (Figure 7.2) and conscious (Figure 7.3) evaluations of Dutch from various decades show a different pattern. Subconsciously (based mainly on speech qualities), modern speech (1960s-1990s) is more standard than older speech (1950s). Conscious evaluations (influences by presupposition), however, yield no significant differences between decades, and this may be due to predefined ideas on the degree of standardness of speech from certain decades. It seems that older speech is stereotypically considered to be more standard than it actually is.
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Figure 7.3: Standardness scores of speech from estimated recording decades (28 listeners in the Speech Evaluation Experiment).

Success of estimates of the age of fragments

To see whether the respondents were successful in recognising the age of speech fragments on the basis of the limited cues they were given, the estimated times of recording were compared with the real times of recording.

In Figure 7.4, the estimated average time of recording and the real time of recording of fragments from the five decades can be seen. The real time of recording is not always known exactly, as it varies from the second to the fourth year of each decade (for instance, from 1962 to 1964), and therefore the real time of recording has been set at the third year of the decade (for instance, 1963).

Although the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s in reality lie within a range of 30 years (beginning of 1970 until the end of 1999), the range of the estimates of these three decades is only seven years (between 1982 and 1989), and the total range over the five decades is 22 years. The average estimated time of recording of the fragments from these three decades are all in the 1980s. It seems that the respondents distinguished between modern speech (1970s until the 1990s) and older speech (speech from before the 1970s), and 1950s speech in particular is recognised as ‘old’ (albeit it less than it actually is).

The correlation between real and estimated decade of recording is significant ($r=.862$, $p<.01$). So, listeners were aware of difference in the ages of the fragments, and they recognised much of the age of fragments, but they generally estimated age differences to be smaller than they were. Again, it seems that there are restrictions as to how far back respondents are prepared to think back. A tentative conclusion may
be that contemporary speech is considered to be speech from after the 1950s and that speech from before the 1950s enjoys some standing but does not meet living contemporary norms.

Figure 7.4: Real versus estimated average time of recordings from five decades (114 listeners in the Speech Evaluation Experiment).

7.4 WHO?

Sex

The next point of interest are the speakers of Standard Dutch. It is, first of all, frequently claimed that within speech communities women approximate the standard language more than men do. A large number of studies have reached this conclusion (for instance, Fischer 1958, Levine & Crockett 1966, Anshen 1969, and Romaine 1978). The interest of women in exterior matters has been posed as a cause for differences. Van Haeringen (1951:327), for instance, suggested that women are more interested in exterior perfection and adjust their language more readily than men do. Such a subjective statement cannot easily be measured. Later research (for instance, Milroy 1980 and Thomas 1987) suggested that this classic sociolinguistic pattern is an overgeneralisation.

The respondents were asked whether MEN or WOMEN are most likely to speak Standard Dutch, and NO OPINION was another option. Furthermore, they were given the opportunity to indicate that men and women are equally likely to speak Standard Dutch: the MEN/WOMEN category. The responses to this question are in Figure 7.5.
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![Bar chart showing responses to the question: 'Do women or men in particular speak Standard Dutch?' among 217 respondents in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey.]

Figure 7.5: Responses to the question: 'Do women or men in particular speak Standard Dutch?' (217 respondents in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey).

Generally, women and men are considered equally likely to speak Standard Dutch, but in those cases where one of the sexes is chosen, women are most often opted for. The difference between the MEN and WOMEN categories is significant ($\chi^2=9.000$, $df=1$, $p<.01$). This provides some weak support for the sociolinguistic stereotype in which women are considered most likely to approximate the standard language. This stereotype is, therefore, alive in lay circles to a degree.

*Standard Dutch in the school environment*

In the home, people can be assumed to speak what they are most comfortable speaking, and most usually there are no strict language policies in the home. Parents do - on occasion or regularly - correct their children's language. The most basic language beliefs can be considered to originate from the 'home' environment (parental house, street, neighbourhood, etc.). At school, on the other hand, an explicit and structured language policy is common.

To gain insight into the role of the school environment, or rather its desired role, the respondents in the Telephone Survey communicated whether Standard Dutch should be spoken in schools. The respondents were presented with two main categories, namely STANDARD DUTCH ONLY and REGIONAL VARIETIES ALLOWED, and additionally with the NO OPINION category. The OTHER bar in the figure below represents a variety of comments made by the respondents. The results are in Figure 7.6.
None of the respondents gave more than one response. More than three quarters of the respondents indicated that in their view the only language that should be used in school is Standard Dutch (STANDARD DUTCH ONLY). A minority of the respondents felt that regional varieties should be allowed in schools (REGIONAL VARIETIES ALLOWED). A small number of respondents gave another response (OTHER), and hardly any of them had NO OPINION. There were no significant differences between the westerners and southerners, and so the majority of both the southerners and the westerners were equally clear on Standard Dutch being the only language allowed in schools.

**Profession**

Profession plays a role in image building and creates expectations as to language use. Hall (1950) even argued that one and the same utterance can be perceived as uneducated coming from a dock worker and original when uttered by a navy officer. Professions implicitly or explicitly require a certain speech style. A particular style may be practical (for instance, if clients need to be addressed, in which case comprehensibility is important) or serve a symbolical and social purpose (informal, non-standard speech in a factory or posh speech amongst wealthy people).

Speech style is a factor in the selection procedure of jobs, both as an explicit requirement or as a factor that subconsciously plays a role in the minds of recruiters. As a result, professions have their own language code (Van Gaalen & Van den Mosselaar 1985:44). Kroch (1978:17) said that ‘the elite dialect’ seems most characteristic of the professional representatives of the dominant classes, i.e. the elite professions in academia, law, business management, medicine, and the mass media. Van Lint (1985:119), with reference to Standard Dutch, talked about the language of executives in several social sectors: politicians, civil servants, business executives, and certain scientific researchers.
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The respondents in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey were asked which professions they associated with Standard Dutch. In the questionnaire, a number of professions that could logically be associated with Standard Dutch were presented as response categories. As was said above, a profession that is often claimed to be held by standard-language speakers is that of presenter in the media (Lotzmann 1974, Bell 1991:7, Van der Wal & Van Bree 1994:347, Van de Velde 1994:13), and newsreaders in particular (Akmajian 1979:181, Bell 1983). According to Goudsblom (1964:121), the national radio news is explicitly modelled on Standard Dutch, and according to Wijffes (1994:150) the Dutch television news has been authoritative from the beginning while being the programme with the highest number of viewers. Early newsreaders, according to Wijffes (1994:154) even possessed a status that was comparable to that of vicars and priests. With all of this in mind, NEWSREADERS were included as a response category.

Because of her special status in Dutch society as Guardian of the State, the QUEEN was included as a response category. She may also be considered a speaker (or: the speaker) of Standard Dutch because of this special position. Hoogendam (1998:55) believed that more or less everyone in the Netherlands speaks regionally coloured Dutch except perhaps the queen.

Furthermore, professions that somehow require linguistic expertise were included as response categories. TEACHERS were a response category because they teach children language at a critical age as far as the acquisition of language and norms is concerned. Both Daan (1983:476,480) and Paardekooper (1983) associated teachers with a good command of the standard language. Another group of experts were linguists and teachers of Dutch. This group is professionally involved in the Dutch language and can therefore be considered to carry some prestige as far as their own language production is concerned. Respondents may feel that those who study the language must also know how to speak it well. In the figure below, this group of professionals (Dutch-language experts (linguists) and teachers of Dutch) is called LANGUAGE EXPERTS. SPEECH THERAPISTS were included because they are also professionally involved in language, in a more practical way than language experts. EDUCATED SPEAKERS were another category. It is likely that highly educated speakers have some linguistic standing and speak the standard language (Labov 1974:224, Trudgill 1983:17, Hagen 1990:32). ACTORS and POLITICIANS were included because these two groups of professionals need to be understood by others while performing their profession (Van Lint 1985:119). The respondents were also given the opportunity to select ANOTHER PROFESSION, besides the ones listed. Another possibility was ALL PROFESSIONS, which represents the possibility of Standard Dutch being equally likely to be produced by speakers of any profession or the possibility of profession being an irrelevant factor. NO OPINION was the final

---

6 When Frits Thors, one of the most renowned newsreaders in the 1960s and 1970s, gave up newsreading, there was some speculation about the reasons for his considerable fame. His articulated speech (because of which he even won a prize) was one of the factors that were put forward (along with his old age and his grey hair). This illustrates the prestige newsreaders may have.

7 Dutch word: Neerlandici.
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category. The total number of categories was eleven, all of which were selected by one or more respondents. The respondent(s) gave one response only. The results can be seen in Figure 7.7.

![Bar chart](image_url)

Figure 7.7: Responses to the question: ‘People with which professions speak Standard Dutch in particular?’ (217 respondents in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey).

**NEWSREADERS** were by nearly half the respondents considered to speak Standard Dutch. None of the other categories even come close to this category. **EDUCATED SPEAKERS** were to some degree also associated with the standard language. The categories of people who are professionally involved in the Dutch language, i.e. **LANGUAGE EXPERTS** and **SPEECH THERAPISTS** together, were selected by 17.1% of the respondents.

The **QUEEN** was selected by only 6.5% of the respondents. The speech of the queen has not been investigated a great deal, which is probably due to the fact it seems idiosyncratic rather than representative of the type of speech of a certain category of people. Gussenhooven (1981) investigated the speech of the queen, and he suggested that the voicing of some of her fricatives may not be standard. According to Daniëls (1993:85), the voice of the queen is anything but relaxed. He felt that all would agree that she speaks extremely carefully and that she pronounces every sound separately. This articulatory meticulousness may have been a motivation of the respondents who selected her.

Of the respondents, 6.0% considered people from **ALL PROFESSIONS** equally likely to speak Standard Dutch. None of the other categories were popular.
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Famous speakers

Some famous individuals are likely to have the status of speakers of Standard Dutch. Perhaps their status is even stronger than the status of groups, because it is obviously easier to relate to - and imitate - the speech of an individual than that of a group of individuals. To get some idea of a possible consensus on famous speakers as linguistic role models in the Netherlands, the respondents in the Social Definition Survey were asked to give the name of a famous speaker of Standard Dutch and to indicate in their own words what this speaker is famous for (for instance, ‘from television’ or ‘actor’).

A wide variety of speakers was named by the respondents: 41 speakers by 123 respondents (123 was 56.7% of the total group of respondents). Of these 41 famous speakers, 24 were mentioned only once. Six speakers were mentioned by five or more respondents. These six and their professions can be seen in Table 7.2.

Table 7.2: Six famous speakers of Standard Dutch (123 respondents in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>speaker</th>
<th>respondents</th>
<th>profession</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HARMEN SIEZEN</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>television newsreader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOOP VAN ZUL</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>television newsreader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIA DIJKSTRA</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>television newsreader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL WITTEMAN</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>current-affairs TV presenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILIP FREIKS</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>television newsreader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUEEN BEATRIX</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>monarch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other speakers are categorised in the same table under the VARIOUS category. The percentage of respondents who chose a speaker (in the ‘respondents’ column) is calculated over the 123 respondents who actually named a speaker.

HARMEN SIEZEN (number 1) is amongst the most well-known television-news broadcasters of the last few decades. Stroop (1998:109) named Harmen Siezen as one of the speakers who speak Standard Dutch in a more or less ‘accent-free’ manner. Like the other newsreaders on the list, Siezen was a presenter of the NOS8 news, which is the oldest and most established news broadcast on Dutch television. In August 2002, he resigned as a newsreader. The fact that he was a newsreader for several decades has apparently given his speech a special emanation. By the time the survey was done, JOOP VAN ZUL (number 2) was no longer an active newsreader and had not been for several years already. In the years after his resignation, he

---

8 Dutch name: *Nederlandse Omroepprogramma Stichting* (‘Dutch Broadcasting Programme Foundation’).
presented programmes of a serious and official nature, such as the Commemoration of the Dead, but his face only rarely appeared on the screen. Together with Siezen, Van Zijl had clearly reached eminence amongst (ex-)newsreaders in the Netherlands around the time of the survey. In a 1998 poll9, PIA DIJKSTRA was elected secondmost popular newsreader in the Netherlands (after Harmen Siezen). Daniëls (1993:31) commented on Dijkstra’s clear voice and non-regional speech. She continued to present news broadcasts when the survey was performed. These three and PHILIP FRERIKS (number 5) were the most prominent NOS newsreaders when the survey was held. According to Wijfjes (1994:154), Dutch newsreaders are generally not charismatic but obtain their status due to the frequency with which they appear on television. Of these four newsreaders, Philip Freriks is perhaps the one possessing the most charisma. Some might argue that Harmen Siezen never acted particularly charismatically, which agrees with Wijfjes’ comment. So, it is likely that Harmen Siezen and Joop van Zijl obtained their high stature due to their frequent appearances on television and perhaps also as a result of them not breaking any unwritten behavioural rules10.

Speaker PAUL WITTEMAN (number 4) is a well-known television celebrity who is also famous for anchoring current-affairs broadcasts on public television. This type of programme started in the 1960s and is typically less formal and more critical than the news. Around the end of the 1980s, Paul Witteman was a renowned presenter of one of these news broadcasts. In 1993, he won the first edition of the Groenman Language Prize, which is given to presenters on radio or television for their eloquent use of the Dutch language. The jury qualified Witteman’s speech as natural and sober and containing a Randstad-like casualness. They considered his speech representative of media speech from the 't Gooi area (see Onze Taal magazine 1993:280-281). Paul Witteman is still one of the most wanted presenters of news-related talk shows.

The QUEEN was mentioned by only five respondents, and all other celebrities (VARIOUS) were mentioned by less than five respondents. The above results suggest that NOS newsreaders in particular have a special linguistic status, for the first three NOS newsreaders in the above-mentioned top six of famous speakers together

9 By bureau CIA Medianetwork (http://www.sat-net.com/listserv/dutchmedia/msg00-171.html; retrieved on 23 September 2004). Such informal polls are held regularly, and in a 2002 poll Hennie Stoel, another former NOS newsreader, was elected most popular, for instance.

10 According to Wijfjes (1994:154), the fame of newsreaders disappears once they perform their last broadcast, but it seems more complicated than that. The nature of the fame of television role models becomes clear from the fact that Harmen Siezen’s and Joop van Zijl’s contemporary Fred Emmer (born in 1934) was mentioned by only one respondent. At one point, Fred Emmer was - like Harmen Siezen and Joop van Zijl - a respected NOS news broadcaster. He became subject to critical publicity after leaving NOS news broadcasting. After his resignation, Emmer published a collection of erotic stories and was a regular writer for Playboy magazine. Joop van Zijl also left NOS news, but (judging from the above list) remained an influential personality, despite merely acting as a behind-the-scenes voice-over. The difference between the two is that Joop van Zijl did not attempt anything controversial in the public eye, while Fred Emmer did.
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constitute 36.6% of all the responses. In Figure 7.8, the professions can be seen of all famous speakers mentioned. The VARIOUS category contains the professions that were named only once.

![Bar graph showing professions of famous speakers](image)

Figure 7.8: Professions of famous speakers (41 speakers put forward by 123 respondents in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey).

It is clear that NOS NEWSREADERS were considered the most renowned speakers of Standard Dutch. Almost half of the respondents naming a famous speaker opted for these speakers. Furthermore, television presenters in general were named (GENERAL TV) frequently, namely by about a third of those who named a famous speaker. This means that 82.1% of the famous speakers mentioned were television presenters. Radio presenters were not mentioned, although some of the television presenters mentioned were active on radio too. None of the respondents mentioned this (being a radio presenter) as the reason for fame in these cases, though. It is safe to say that generally the Dutch audience’s exposure to television is much larger than their exposure to radio. It is possible that the image of radio, as far as the standardness of the speech of its presenters is concerned, is theoretical rather than practical; perhaps radio presenters are, more so than television presenters, obliged to speak Standard Dutch, while television presenters are actual role models.

Although there is no single POLITICIAN who was mentioned more than once, the group of politicians\footnote{The Dutch Prime Minister was one of them.} that was mentioned constitutes 7.2% of the famous speakers. Cassier and Van de Craen (1986:59-60) considered politicians to be representatives of Standard Dutch (in Flanders) and argued that they are in a position in which they need to be accepted by large groups in society. Our results do not support this convincingly. The QUEEN is treated as a separate category in Table 7.8, because she was mentioned a noticeable number of times (5) too. Two actors and two writers were mentioned, finally.
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Radio versus television presenters

The results so far show that media speech in particular affects the norm. Kloeké (1951:8) even considered the radio medium to have a greater linguistic influence than schools12. As national radio and television broadcasts aim at listeners with various ages, regional origins, and social backgrounds, speakers in the media are likely to be using a language that is by a wide audience considered standard. Presumably, these speakers are considered fit to address such a diverse audience.

There are various reasons to believe that radio speech is different from television speech. Television presenters are selected not only on the basis of their speech qualities but also their physical appearance. Radio presenters are presumably selected mainly, or solely, on the basis of their verbal presentation qualities. Moreover, with radio speech come no visual cues, and this may also be a source of differences in the perception of radio and television speech. Today’s popularity of television may also be a factor; people are generally more accustomed to television presenters (because they can be seen and heard). More people watch television on a daily basis than listen to the radio13. Another important difference between television and radio is that radio broadcasting has existed longer (since the 1920s) than television broadcasting (since the 1950s), but it seems unlikely that any awareness hereof will play any role today.

In the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey, the respondents were asked whether Standard Dutch is most likely to be spoken on RADIO, TELEVISION, or on both types of media to the same degree (RADIO/TV EQUAL). The NO OPINION category was also included. The results are in Figure 7.9.

![Figure 7.9: Responses to the question: ‘Is Standard Dutch spoken on radio or on television in particular?’ (217 respondents in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey).](image)

---

12 It should be noted that television was still in its earliest stages then and that there were no news broadcasts yet.

13 It has become less common to sit down and listen to the radio in the home environment. On the other hand, the number of daily car commuters has grown, and this increases the influence of radio broadcasting. Many broadcasts nowadays aim at the working man and woman commuting to and from work, through repetitive news flashes and traffic messages.
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More than a third of the respondents reported that Standard Dutch is equally likely to be spoken on radio and television (RADIO/TV EQUAL). Almost half of the respondents made a choice between RADIO and TELEVISION (48.8%, n=106), and 65.1% (n=69) of these 106 opted for RADIO, while 34.9% (n=37) chose TELEVISION. This difference between RADIO and TELEVISION is significant ($\chi^2=9.660$, $df=1$, $p<.01$).

So, although a considerable number of respondents considered both media to be equal in this respect, there is still a preference for RADIO. Radio is by this subgroup of respondents perhaps viewed as being more traditional than television. These respondents may also be particularly aware of the variation on television today, because of the existence of a large variety of channels. This may have triggered the idea that television speech must be variable too. Bearing in mind that the standard language is commonly viewed by laymen as a homogeneous language, such variation may evoke associations with non-standardness. According to Bell (1983), the language of presenters on national radio stations is generally viewed as being highly standard. Hagen (1990:34), on the other hand, personally considered Dutch radio speech to be "broad Randstad speech"\(^{14}\), thus hinting at a western-city speech style.

Opinions were varied. It is, above all, striking that almost half of the respondents (48.8%) chose either radio or television, and this leads one to suspect that personal viewing and listening behaviour by respondents played a role. Individual exposure to either medium may be decisive in the evaluation of the speech of these two media.

So, the respondents’ motives for choosing RADIO or TELEVISION in the above question were probably diverse. Although a relatively small percentage of respondents chose TELEVISION, this medium is by far the most popular of the two and can safely be assumed to be the most influential. To find out more about the perceived role of this medium and the demands it is subjected to, the respondents in the Telephone Survey were asked to what extent regional varieties are allowed on television. The results are in Figure 7.10.

More than two thirds of the respondents believed that there is some room for the use of non-standard varieties (IT DEPENDS, MAINLY STANDARD DUTCH, and ALL EXISTING VARIETIES), but they did not agree on the extent to which non-standard Dutch may be used. Almost one in three believed that on Dutch television Standard Dutch should be the only means of communication (ONLY STANDARD DUTCH). No significant differences exist between respondents from the west and south. The results in Figure 7.9 show a mixed picture of the tolerance towards non-standard speech. The tolerance towards variation on television is greater than that towards variation in schools (Figure 7.6), it appears. The difference between the two is that at school rules are explicitly dealt with, while on television they are generally obided by but there is more room for variation.

---

\(^{14}\) Original Dutch citation: Randstadplaat.
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Figure 7.10: Responses to the question: ‘Should Standard Dutch always be used on television?’ [998 respondents (west=498; south=500) in the Telephone Survey].

Which (television-news) presenters?

Ideas on the differences between commercial and public (semi-commercial) channels (see Section 3.6) may affect the evaluation of the speech of presenters. The speech of the established public channels may be associated with tradition and conservatism, whereas the new commercial channels are likely to be associated most strongly with modernness. Commercial channels are likely to be lacking the linguistic authority that the older channels have acquired over the years, and they may therefore be associated relatively strongly with modern varieties of standardized Dutch as opposed to with the old standard language.

The pronunciation characteristics of radio and television speech in the Netherlands seem to have become more diverse in recent decades. Because of changes in Dutch television programming (especially in commercial broadcasting), it is uncertain exactly where the linguistic authority in broadcasting lies nowadays. To see whether indeed public and commercial channels are evaluated differently, respondents in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey were asked to indicate which type of broadcasting channels in particular they associated with Standard Dutch. It was decided to look for possible evaluative differences by considering one type of programme; one that is traditionally associated with standard speech, namely news broadcasting (Van de Velde 1994:16). News broadcasts play an important role in the construction of the Dutch language, according to Sterkenburg and Van den Toorn (1997).

A distinction was made between two types of news broadcasts. First of all, ‘traditional’ news broadcasts (someone presenting the news while sitting at a desk and looking into a camera) were looked at. Besides this, news programmes were looked at that give additional background information to current affairs and that were not strictly restricted to daily news occurrences (extensive news reports, oftentimes on location).

The first category in the survey was NOS NEWSREADERS, who present the news of the day the traditional way. This is the oldest and most established type of news
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broadcast. Then, there were presenters of current-affairs programmes on public broadcasting channels (CURRENT AFFAIRS PUBLIC), who give background information additionally to the news. On commercial channels, this distinction between types of news broadcasts is not quite as strict. In the commercial news broadcasts, the news bulletins and current-affairs programmes seem to be merged into one broadcast, more so than is the case on public television channels. Therefore, the next category of speakers consisted of presenters of current-affairs programmes and newsreaders on commercial channels (called NEWS PRESENTERS COMMERCIAL in the table). Finally, the respondents were given the opportunity to indicate that speakers from all of the three named categories are equally likely to speak Standard Dutch: ALL THE SAME. Another category was NO OPINION.

So, there were five response categories, all of which were selected by a number of respondents. The results are in Figure 7.11.

![Response categories](image)

Figure 7.11: Responses to the question: ‘Which news presenters approximate Standard Dutch most?’ (216 respondents in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey).

It is clear that NOS newsreaders have a special authoritative status. The historical awareness regarding the NOS news broadcasts seems strong. The popularity of the NOS news relative to other programmes on public channels is illustrated by the fact that when the survey was performed the NOS news was the programme on Dutch television that by far most frequently received the highest percentage of viewers of all Dutch television programmes. None of the news broadcasts of the commercial channels even came close to this popularity. It may be that commercial channels were subconsciously associated with light amusement and not so much with linguistically authoritative news broadcasts.

A quarter of the respondents considered news presenters from all channels equally likely to speak Standard Dutch (ALL THE SAME). It is possible that commercial news broadcasts are increasingly embraced as linguistic authorities. But, due to the fact that these broadcasts (NEWS PRESENTERS COMMERCIAL) were chosen explicitly by hardly any respondent, it does not seem likely that the

---

15 This information can be found on any internet page with data on Dutch television viewing behaviour.
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commercial news broadcasts will ever gain the prestige that the NOS news broadcasts have.\(^{16}\)

The preference for public television shows a conservative attitude, but it may also stem from the fact that commercial channels are believed to focus on a subtype of viewers only. Public television generally has a more balanced and broad range of programmes and caters to a broader range of viewer types than commercial television, including the more educated. The public broadcasting stations have an air of quality and reliability that to many respondents will fit in better with the reliable nature of Standard Dutch.

Commercial or public news presenters?

Both commercial and public channels are popular. At the same time, the above results suggest that public channels have the upper hand as far as linguistic prestige is concerned. Due to the growing number of commercial channels, and a stable number of public channels, it is nevertheless possible that a shift in norms is taking place at the moment.

To gain further insight in today’s evaluation of the speech of newsreaders on commercial and public channels, the difference between the evaluations of speech from these two channel types was looked at more closely. The Sociolinguistic Definition Survey established that news presenters in particular have linguistic prestige. Therefore, the linguistic prestige of individual news presenters from commercial and public channels was compared.

Respondents in the First Newsreader Survey gave standardness scores to 19 television-news presenters. This group of news presenters consisted of all news presenters with the specific task (around the end of 1998) to read the news regularly. The list was obtained from NOS and RTL4 broadcasting companies.\(^{17}\) On the list were 11 NOS news presenters and eight RTL4 news presenters. The respondents were presented with the names of the presenters and asked to give a standardness rating (1 to 10) to the speakers they knew.

The first point of interest was how well known the individual news presenters were from these two broadcasting types. The familiarity of the respondents with the 19 news presenters is shown in Figure 7.12. This figure contains the average percentage of respondents who recognised each of the 11 NOS news presenters and the eight RTL4 news presenters who were presented to them. The news presenters from both types of channels are in descending order from left to right, based on the

---

16 The employees of the commercial and public news channels are traditionally strictly separated. The most notable switch from commercial to public news broadcasts was made by Sacha de Boer. With a background in commercial television, she joined the NOS newsreader team in 1996 and became a presenter of prime-time NOS evening news broadcasts. Early 2003, she was even appointed the main anchor lady of the main news broadcast (the eight o’clock news). She has obvious characteristics that are associable with commercial news broadcasts (such as an prominent approximant (/r)).

17 RTL4 was the only commercial channel with news broadcasts that were reasonably similar to NOS news broadcasts around the time when the investigation was done.
percentage of respondents who knew them. The news presenters have labels consisting of a letter referring to the broadcasting company of the speaker in question (‘n’=NOS; ‘r’=RTL4) and a number based on their position in the familiarity hierarchy (low=familiar, high=unfamiliar). The dark bars represent NOS news presenters, the light bars represent RTL4 news presenters. So, the most left-hand dark bar (called ‘n1’ in the figure) represents the NOS news presenter that was recognised most often of all NOS news presenters, and the most left-hand white bar (‘r1’ ) represents the RTL4 news presenter that was recognised most often of all RTL4 news presenters.

Figure 7.12: Familiarity of respondents with 11 NOS news presenters (dark bars; called n*) and eight RTL4 news presenters (white bars; called r*) (191 respondents in the First Newsreader Survey).

Figure 7.12 is somewhat deceiving because the commercial news presenters were less numerous, but it is self-evident that NOS news presenters were by far the most well known. NOS news presenters (n=11) were on average recognised by 69.2% of the respondents, while the average RTL4 news presenter (n=8) was recognised by 31.9% of the respondents. A closer look at the above figure reveals that the eight most well-known news presenters were NOS news presenters (‘n1’ through ‘n8’). Figure 7.11 shows that, while both types of broadcasting stations had well known anchormen, NOS newsreaders were considerably better known.

It cannot be assumed that the speech qualities of these NOS news presenters were better known too. It is possible that while RTL4 news presenters were not as well known as NOS news presenters, the general qualities of their speech were equally well known anyway. Furthermore, the NOS news presenters had generally been around longer, and this is a likely reason for their (name) fame. Finally, as the
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NOS news is part of the television establishment, NOS news presenters (even new ones) are perhaps more readily ‘iconised’ and remembered.

Figure 7.13 contrasts the standardness scores of NOS and RTL4 news presenters. The news presenters are in descending order from left to right, based on the height of the average standardness score the respondents gave to each of them. The bar codes are those used in Figure 7.12, so the lower the number (after ‘n’, or ‘r’) the higher the number of respondents knowing the news presenter in question.

![Figure 7.13: Standardness scores of 11 NOS news presenters (opaque bars) and eight RTL4 news presenters (white bars) in descending order from left to right (191 respondents in the First Newsreader Survey).](image)

Most importantly, none of the news presenters received strikingly low scores; the lowest is 6.5. It is clear, however, that none of the RTL4 news presenters obtained scores that can intuitively be qualified as ‘high’ (say, over 7.5). The respondents were clearly less hesitant to give such high scores to the NOS news presenters. The mean standardness scores of RTL4 news presenters range from 6.7 to 7.1, while the NOS news presenters obtained scores ranging from 6.5 to 8.1. It is indeed striking how respondents hardly differentiated between the eight RTL4 news presenters (range=0.4), while the difference between the first and eighth NOS news presenter is three times as large, namely 1.2. Apparently, respondents were more aware of, and critical towards, individual standardness differences amongst NOS news presenters. The speech of the various RTL4 speakers was viewed as being mutually alike. The two lowest-scoring NOS news presenters were, by the way, two black news presenters with light Surinamese accents\(^{18}\). None of the other news presenters had obvious exotic accents or looks.

---

\(^{18}\) The one with the lowest standardness score was Noraly Beyer. Van Gaalen (1988:42)
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A closer look at the above figure reveals that the six highest-scoring news presenters are NOS news presenters. NOS news presenters on average received a 7.2, while RTL4 news presenters obtained an average of 6.9. The codes over the vertical bars show that the bars do not represent the same order of speakers as in Table 7.1; the most well-known speakers did not always obtain the highest standardness score. In fact, the highest-scoring RTL4 news presenter (‘r1’) was only recognised by 10.5% of the respondents, whereas the lowest-scoring NOS news presenter (‘n11’) was recognised by 69.1% of the respondents. The only regularity is in the top three of NOS news presenters; the three most well-known NOS news presenters obtained the three highest standardness scores (‘n1’-‘n3’).

Highest-scoring newsreaders (in 1998 and 2005)

The four highest-scoring newsreaders in the First Newsreader Survey were two males and two females. These four are in Table 7.3.

Table 7.3: Four highest-scoring speakers according to 191 respondents in the First Newsreader Survey (held in 1998).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rank</th>
<th>newsreader</th>
<th>sex</th>
<th>age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Harman Siezen</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pia Dijkstra</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Joop van Zijl</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hennie Stoel</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two male speakers were of an older newsreader generation, as they were big in the 1970s already. The two female newsreaders became famous in the 1990s. Joop van Zijl quit in the mid 1990s, and the other three newsreaders quit as newsreaders in the 2000-2003 period. It can be assumed that they achieved their status because of the frequency with which they appeared on television (Wijfjes 1994:154).

It was suspected that, although the four newsreaders who came out of the First Newsreader Survey represented a contemporary norm, they were by the time the survey was held about to make way for a new generation of newsreaders. For instance, Sacha de Boer, a newsreader from a commercial television station, was making her way into the public newsreader world. With this in mind, the Second Newsreader Survey was held six and a half years later, to see whether indeed the influence of this older generation had died down and a new generation had arisen.

To compare the First Newsreader Survey and the Second Newsreader Survey, the group of respondents was restricted to students. This young group may be representative of a larger group of Dutchmen. To find support for this suggestion and see whether older and younger respondents in the First Newsreader Survey had deviant preferences for certain newsreaders, we compared the responses by

believed that any negative attitude towards the speech of Noraly Beyer is a result of her skin colour rather than her actual speech. Noraly Beyer has a light Surinamese accent.
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respondents until the age of 30 (n=120) with those of over thirty (n=71) in the First Newsreader Survey. It turned out that both groups had an identical newsreader top 4 (see Table 7.3). Therefore, it can be assumed that in the Second Newsreader Survey students’ evaluations are typical of a larger group.

Table 7.4 compares the results of the First Newsreader Survey and the Second Newsreader Survey. It contrasts the results of newsreaders who appeared either in the top 4 of the First Newsreader Survey or that of the Second Newsreader Survey.

Table 7.4: The highest-scoring speakers of the First Newsreader Survey (held in 1998; 120 respondents) and the Second Newsreader Survey (held in 2005; 168 respondents) compared. Only responses by student respondents were taken into consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>newsreader</th>
<th>First Newsreader Survey</th>
<th></th>
<th>Second Newsreader Survey</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rank (of 19)</td>
<td>standardness</td>
<td>rank (of 26)</td>
<td>standardness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>score</td>
<td>score</td>
<td></td>
<td>score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmen Siezen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pia Dijkstra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joop van Zijl</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennie Stoel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gijs Wanders</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacha de Boer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, only NOS newsreaders are in the top ranks. Most strikingly, the 1998 top-4 members obtain similar standardness scores seven years later: for all four, the standardness ratings in 2005 are only .1 to .3 different from the 1998 score. Three of the four 1998 top-4 members are still top-4 members in 2005. Amongst them are two newsreaders (Van Zijl and Siezen). Joop van Zijl in particular had become less well-known by the time of the 2005 survey, as he resigned a few years before the First Newsreader Survey. Only 50% of the 2005 respondents knew him (this was 85% in 1998). Those who did know him gave him high standardness ratings. Siezen remained famous, and 81% of the 2005 group of respondents knew him (87% in 1998). As Gijs Wanders appeared in the 2005 top 4, he is listed on both sides in the table. Wanders’ linguistic prestige seems to be growing gradually. The highest standard deviation in the 2005 survey was obtained by Philip Freriks (not in the table), who is famous for his slips of the tongue. He scored a 7.5 (7.2 in 1998), and his average standardness score suffered from a subgroup of listeners: 12% of the 2005 respondents gave him a 5 or less (cf .7% for Siezen).

Sacha de Boer’s score has remained stable over the years. The suggestion made earlier that she might become more settled as a role model is not borne out, as she remains amongst the large group of intermediate (not high (top 5) or low (bottom 5) in the ranking) newsreaders on the list. The difference between De Boer’s two standardness scores is that in 1998 she had one of the highest standard deviations (1.439) whereas in 2005, the agreement on her standardness score was one of the highest (st.dev.=.997). So, it seems that her actual speech and her position as a former commercial-channel broadcaster prevent her from scoring high in these
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rankings. As she left commercial broadcasting many years ago, it seems that her highly vocalised postvocalic (r), or other features in her speech, are the main cause for her relatively low score, not her image as a former commercial presenter.

Comparing the two newreader surveys, we see that linguistic role models may maintain their prestige after leaving the public eye. A reason for this may be that no new role models have surfaced, i.e. role models whom respondents generally agree on. Both De Boer and Freriks - the two main anchor people of the NOS news in 2005 - could not reach this prestige, which is possibly due to controversial pronunciation habits (De Boer) or slips of the tongue (Freriks). Most of all, this comparison shows that potential role models still need to perform well linguistically before they are embraced as such.

7.5 HOW MANY?

Estimated number of speakers

After establishing where, when, and by whom Standard Dutch is believed to be spoken, the number of people who speak Standard Dutch is now looked at. Kloeke (1951:27-28,35) was convinced that only about three percent of the population would actually qualify as speakers of Standard Dutch. Van Haeringen (1951:327) also believed that the civilised language was spoken by only few people, and some decades earlier he (1924:82) suspected that the number of civilised speakers was growing. Since, the situation in the Netherlands has changed, as access to the standard language has grown considerably.

We asked the respondents in the Telephone Survey how many people in their view speak Standard Dutch. The respondents were presented with the following response categories: A COUPLE, MANY, and EVERYBODY, and they were also given the opportunity to give a precise number of speakers (ANOTHER NUMBER) or select NO OPINION.

The majority of the respondents gave a number of speakers or a percentage of the Dutch population by using the ANOTHER NUMBER category. The numbers and percentages of speakers mentioned were varied and were standardised, so that they could be compared. First of all, the percentages given by respondents were taken as they were. A portion of the respondents gave a number of speakers, and these numbers were turned into percentages relative to the total Dutch population when the survey was done (15 million). The answers were put into categories of percentages with a range of 5, for instance, 55-<60%. The percentage of respondents who gave an answer fitting each category can be seen in Figure 7.14 below.

Two response categories could not be categorised straightforwardly, namely the MANY category and the A COUPLE category. The latter category was nevertheless interpreted as referring to ‘two or three’, i.e. between 0 and 5%. The MANY response could not be categorised on any ground and was therefore given a separate bar.

In case the respondents indicated that speakers of Standard Dutch do not exist (‘0 SPEAKERS’, ‘0%’, or simply ‘NOBODY’) or that everybody speaks it (‘100%’ or
‘EVERYBODY’), they were put in two separate categories, namely ‘0%’ and ‘100%’
19. The percentages that were calculated from estimated numbers of speakers
that the respondents posed were truncated to full numbers: 26.7% was turned into
26%, and, for instance, 73.3% was turned into 73%. The >0%<5% category is the
second-most ‘popular;’ more than one in six respondents gave a number/percentage
of speakers that equates to between zero and five percent of the Dutch population.
Kloeck’s three percent also falls into this category. It must be noted that the >0-
<5% category does not refer to a highly limited group of people, as 5% of the
estimated population of the Netherlands is as many as 750,000. So, estimates in this
category include not only references to a highly limited group of speakers, such as
‘10’, but also references to 10,000 or even half a million speakers. In the latter case,
it is hard to feel that an elite group of speakers is referred to, while with ten speakers
a language variety is almost non-existent.

The second-most popular category is the 50%<55% category. Most of the
answers in this category are of respondents who answered 50% or HALF OF THE
DUTCH POPULATION. All the other categories of percentages are unpopular. Only
few believed that all Dutchmen speak Standard Dutch (100%). About one fifth of
the respondents indicated that they consider MANY people to speak Standard Dutch.
As was said earlier, it is unrealistic to estimate what percentage of the Dutch
population these respondents were thinking of, for MANY could be 1,000 or 10,000
(which both fall into the 0-5% category), or something like 10,000,000 (65-70%). It
is possible that in many cases this response is the same as NO OPINION, as one could
argue that if this group of respondents had had a percentage or number in mind, they
would have given it. More likely, MANY could be in line with the idea that the
standard language is spoken on many occasions, i.e. with the 50% category.

Next, we looked at the differences between estimates by southern and western
respondents. As the range of the categories of percentages in the above table were
small, larger categories were made for this calculation. The most popular categories
were: >0<5% and 50<55%, and the MANY and NO OPINION categories. None of
the other categories were opted for by any considerable percentage of respondents.
If these smaller categories are redistributed into larger ones, and (for convenience
grounds) the 0% category is added to the >0<5% category, we get the following
six categories: NO OPINION, MANY, 0<5%, 5<50%, 50<55%, and 55-100%.
These new categories were used to calculate whether the difference between south
and west was significant. The significance level was set at 1%. The differences were
not significant, and therefore westerners and southerners apparently agreed in the
tendency to believe that either half the population or only a relatively small group of
people have mastered Standard Dutch. Although people generally gave idiosyncratic
responses, the results suggest two main approaches to the standard language, a strict
one and a lenient one.

19 For these two categories, a small inconsistency needed to be allowed for, namely the
creation of the >0<5% category (as opposed to the 0<5% category, which would be in
line with the other categories).
Figure 7.14: Estimates of the number of speakers of Standard Dutch [909 respondents (west=446; south= 463) in the Telephone Survey].
Own speech

Another way of estimating how many people speak Standard Dutch is by asking respondents to indicate whether their own speech is standard or not. Some claim to speak the standard language and others do not. It has been argued that the members of a group would themselves have to feel that they speak the standard language before their language can be considered standard (Jansen 1988:210). This highlights the dilemma faced by researchers studying the standard language. On the one hand, it is only logical not to take into consideration the norms of those who do not (feel they) influence the norm, on the other hand this raises doubts as to whether in fact the standard language is described in this case, rather than the language of an elite.

The respondents in the Telephone Survey were asked how often they speak Standard Dutch. They were given various response categories. The most important distinction was between respondents speaking the standard language (represented through the ALWAYS, SOMETIMES/OFTEN, and NOT OFTEN categories), those that did not (NEVER), and those that did not know (NO OPINION). The results are in Figure 7.15.

![Graph showing response categories](image)

Figure 7.15: Responses to the question: ‘Do you speak Standard Dutch yourself?’ [1,006 respondents (west=503; south=503) in the Telephone Survey].

All respondents answered this question and gave one response only. More than 40% of them claimed that they ALWAYS speak Standard Dutch. This is high, because the respondents were from all layers of society. This does not agree with Kloeck’s 3%. Almost a quarter said that they SOMETIMES speak it, or even OFTEN. Over seven percent claimed to speak it NOT OFTEN, while almost a quarter said that they NEVER speak it. One in twenty respondents had NO OPINION.

There is a significant difference between westerners and southerners ($\chi^2=50.463$, $df=3$, $p<.01$). Most importantly, more than half (50.1%) of the westerners claimed ALWAYS to speak Standard Dutch, while 30.6% of the southerners made this claim. More than one in five westerners (20.3%) claimed NEVER to speak Standard Dutch, while more than a quarter (28.2%) of the
southerners made this claim. The NOT OFTEN category consisted mainly of
southerners. The NO OPINION category was not included in this calculation, because
it was so small. Generally, southerners were less convinced of their own ability to
speak Standard Dutch.

Splitting up the western and southern groups of listeners into those claiming to
be able to speak Standard Dutch (those that opted for ALWAYS, SOMETIMES/OFTEN,
or NOT OFTEN) and those who can be assumed to have felt unable to speak it
(NEVER), we see that westerners and southerns were convinced to a similar extent
that they are at least able to speak it (westerners=73.6%; southerners=67.9%).

Unfortunately, the above results do not make it easier to answer the question as
to how many speakers of Standard Dutch exist. Hagen and Vallen (1975) and De
Vries (1981) indicated that there is a difference between the way people speak and
the way they feel they should speak, and Kloekke (1937:6) in his research found that
the majority of the subjects who in his research rejected certain realisations of
phonemes in fact produced ‘wrong’ realisations themselves. This should be taken
into consideration here, and it cannot be assumed that all of the respondents who
claimed always to speak Standard Dutch (40.4%) would by a large panel of lay or
expert listeners be considered to speak this variety to a high degree. The most
striking result in Figure 7.15 is that close to three quarters of the respondents
considered themselves able to speak Standard Dutch. This means that most usually
the broad interpretation of Standard Dutch is used when people are asked whether
they speak this language.

The western respondents in the Telephone Survey indicated whether they
thought they spoke Standard Dutch themselves. The level of standardness of the
speech of these respondents was determined on the basis of the recording of the
telephone calls. The results are in Table 7.5.

Table 7.5: Response to the question ‘Do you speak Standard Dutch?’ (455 western
respondents in the Telephone Survey).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you speak Standard Dutch?</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Standard Dutch score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>always</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>often/ sometimes</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not often</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those respondents who indicated that they spoke Standard Dutch ALWAYS, OFTEN,
or SOMETIMES did not speak Standard Dutch to a significantly (p<.05) higher degree
than those who indicate that spoke it NOT OFTEN or NEVER. There seems no
relationship between the perceived own command of Standard Dutch and the actual
degree to which one speaks this language variety. It should be noted that the
researcher applied an approach to standardness in which variation was allowed to a
high degree and in which understandability was the main criterion. A stricter
approach may have yielded different results.
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7.6 CONCLUSION

Besides intrinsic characteristics (see Chapter 6), user characteristics are a popular means to describe the standard language. The language of certain speakers is considered likely to meet standardness norms; for instance speakers with a certain profession, speakers from certain places, or speakers from a certain period.

The research has shown that in the Netherlands speakers from the urban area in the west of the country (the Randstad) are associated strongly with Standard Dutch. Speakers from the west indeed considered themselves somewhat more likely to speak the standard language frequently, significantly more so than non-westerners. The western city of Haarlem in particular is mentioned, but it has been argued that this is mainly a popular image about this city, which to some degree came to existence through chance.

Contemporary speech (1960-1990) is considered most standard, which does not accord with popular ideas on language, which state that somehow older speech is less deteriorated and pure. Evaluations of older speech are varied and seem to be dependent to some degree on awareness of the age of the speech evaluated. There seems to be some respect for speech from the 1950s, but it is unlikely that it is a living norm.

Men and women are deemed equally likely to speak the standard language, and newsreaders from public (radio and television) channels have a high standing when it comes to the standardness of their speech. Respondents were nevertheless tolerant towards language variation on television (as opposed to variation in schools). Television speakers were strongly associated with Standard Dutch, and NOS television newsreaders have an exceptional position in this respect. Harmen Siezen and Joop van Zijl, two respected retired male NOS newsreaders, and Pia Dijkstra and Hennie Stoel, two respected female NOS newsreaders, were put forward most often as exemplary famous speakers of Standard Dutch.

Looking at the question regarding the number of speakers, two approaches to the standard language appear. On the one hand, it is considered the language of the elite, whereas a parallel view is that it is the language that binds speakers, both elite and not. Disagreement amongst respondents was considerable, however.
8. INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

8.1 INTRODUCTION

Seventeenth Century colonialism was dominated by the English, the Spanish, the Portuguese, and the Dutch. The first three of these successfully shipped their languages abroad to function as national languages in large countries, and English and Spanish have even become international lingua francas. Dutch, on the other hand, has not settled outside the Netherlands as a national language for similarly large numbers of peoples, nor does it act as a lingua franca in international relations. A combination of circumstances has led to this situation, but another factor may be that the Dutch were more concerned with establishing trade relations than imposing their language. It may be that the Dutch attitude towards their own language deviates from that of other countries, including the attitude towards their standard language.

Kruisinga (1936:15) considered the question as to the extent to which other countries have achieved linguistic unity fundamental in the discussion on the unity of Dutch¹. Beliefs within a country regarding the standard language are indeed influenced by the position of the country relative to other countries. The urge to have a well-defined standard language may be particularly strong in a country with a relatively unknown and ‘small’ language (for instance Icelandic) that is affected by larger, more international, languages. Besides position in an international context, the specific circumstances within countries play a part. The national language plays a sensitive role in countries the shape and size of which have changed due to wars and other circumstances. Examples are Poland and the Balkan countries. The protection and furtherance of the language and its standardisation in those situations becomes an issue, whereas in a ‘safe’ country such as Denmark such threats are less relevant. The age of a standard language is another factor. Standard languages are most likely to be well defined and part of tradition in a country that has experienced centuries of language standardisation, such as Germany. Australia, on the other hand, does not have such a history, and the pronunciation of the standard language is much less fixed in this country.

So, evaluations of the standard language are inevitably affected by local² situations. The previous two chapters focussed on the Dutch language situation as Dutch laymen perceive it. Some of the results were in line with what could have been predicted looking at Dutch history and at the Dutch literature on the topics discussed. These results may well be typical of the Netherlands only and determined by the specific situation in the Netherlands. Certain results, on the other hand, may be part of a more general sociolinguistic trend. To distinguish between local and general trends in the Dutch language situation, the Dutch results are in this chapter compared with those in four other countries.

---
¹ He was talking about pronunciation in particular.
² In this chapter, ‘local’ refers to a situation within a country.
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For two reasons, limitations exist in the interpretation of the International Survey results. First of all, the situations in the countries regarding the core and peripheral linguistic areas are too diverse to make comparisons. It would, for instance, be interesting to see whether there are differences between the respondents from the peripheral and core area within each country. The problem is that these areas cannot be defined in terms that would apply to all countries. Regional origin of the respondents is therefore not taken into consideration.

The second reason why the results should be interpreted with care is that the nature of the response categories in some of the questions in the surveys makes an in-depth comparison of the countries problematic. As the surveys were adjusted to local situations, response categories occur in the questionnaires in some of the countries that were not present in the questionnaires of the other countries. This means that the nature and number of categories the respondents were able to select in a specific question were not always the same for all countries. Categories that were selected by only a small percentage of respondents are not discussed. These results will be discussed only in those cases where they are relevant to a specific research question.

Chapter overview

In Section 8.2, the four countries that served as comparative material are presented. The rationale behind the selection of these particular countries is given, and the histories of these countries are outlined briefly. Sections 8.3 to 8.5 give the results of the International Survey. The results related to intrinsic characteristics are presented in Section 8.3, and user characteristics are in Section 8.4. Section 8.5 looks at the origin of beliefs regarding the standard language and the respondents’ perceived own command of this language. Section 8.6 compares the countries.

8.2 THE COUNTRIES

Countries were selected whose language situation could provide insightful contrastive material for the Dutch results. Flanders was considered an obvious choice because of the close historical connections between the Netherlands and Flanders, due to which the same language is spoken in both countries. These two countries are culturally similar from an international point of view, but subtle idiosyncrasies are noticeable nonetheless. The other three countries are geographically and culturally removed from the Netherlands. These three were Poland3, New-Zealand, and Japan. Below, a short history is given of these four countries, with special reference to the local language situation.

---

3 The Polish results are discussed in more detail in Smakman (1999).
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Flanders

Flanders is not a country as such, for it is a linguistically delimited area within Belgium. The border between the Romance and Germanic language families cuts (horizontally) across Belgium and divides the country linguistically into two areas with a similar size. Flanders lies north of this border. Brussels, the capital of Belgium, lies in the Flanders area and is officially a bilingual city.

After having been conquered by Germanic tribes, Christianised around the 7th Century, and carved up during the Frankish Empire in the 1100s, much of Belgium enjoyed a golden age during the 14th Century. This golden age began to deteriorate in the mid 15th Century, when the Low Countries (roughly present-day Flanders, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg) were inherited by Spain, causing a long battle against Catholic Spanish rule. The revolt of the Low Countries lasted 80 years, and in the end Holland and its allied northern provinces resisted the Spaniards, while today’s Belgium stayed under Spanish rule. Napoleon’s defeat led to the creation, in 1814, of the United Kingdom of the Netherlands, after which Belgium became part of the Netherlands again. However, the Belgians revolted, winning independence in 1830. This independence remains today. After the Second World War, Belgium enjoyed an economic boom, which was later accentuated by Brussels’ appointment as the head quarters of the European Union and the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation.

The standardisation of Dutch in Flanders was halted by the split between the northern and southern part of the Low Countries in the 16th Century. Until then, the Flemish cities had played a leading role in the standardisation of Dutch, and a written standardised variety had developed in these cities. However, from the split until the mid 19th Century the Flemish people were cut off from the standardisation process taking place in the Netherlands. French was the cultural language during this period, and the ordinary people spoke dialects of Dutch. By the end of the 19th Century, Dutch had strengthened its position in the area, and in 1932 Dutch became the official language in Flanders. Initially, the cultural language in the Netherlands was adopted as a point of reference and a mould, due to the absence of a Flemish national model. Flemish Brabant nevertheless exerted considerable linguistic influence.

The historical overview of the standardisation of Dutch in the Netherlands in Chapter 2 showed that there are close links between the Dutch language as it is spoken in the Netherlands and the one in the north of Belgium (see Section 2.5 in particular). Two standard varieties of the same language have come to existence, which on many linguistic levels are moving towards each other. Pronunciation is not one of these levels. The history of these two varieties, however, is markedly different. The southern Dutch variety has been subject to pressures from outside considerably more than the northern variety, and the first serious steps towards the standardisation of the southern variety were taken much later.
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Poland

Polish is an old Slavonic language with a rich range of dialects and a highly developed standard language. Due to historical developments, Polish is spoken in many areas outside its borders, but it is now increasingly becoming confined to Poland. Most of Poland’s many trials were caused by foreign influences and not by internal turmoil. Numerous European empire builders have tried to invade Poland since the Polanie settled in the area in the 10th Century, and Poland over the centuries flourished under energetic rulers. Through the ensuing centuries of territorial expansion and contraction, and of wealth and poverty, the infrastructures were held firm by these rulers. By the late 19th Century, Poland was nevertheless in disarray, and about one fifth of its 20 million people emigrated, mostly to the USA. Polish was thus shipped abroad, although it never became an international lingua franca.

Szweyron (1999:230) indicated that the pride that the Polish take in their language stems from the fact that for long periods of time the Polish language was the only means to maintain a national identity. In the 20th Century, this national identity was once again challenged. In both World Wars, Poland was overrun violently by a foreign force, and the country suffered immense losses of life. By 1945, Poland was left ruined, having lost over six million of its population. At the Yalta Conference in February 1945, Poland was left under Soviet control. From the Second World War until the late 1980s, the Polish language was used by the communist regime as a tool in aid of the totalitarian range of thought. This showed in particular in the strictness of language rules and in the unnaturalness of the language of the Polish media, in which, due to a strong language policy, a homogenous language style was preferred. Poles never wholeheartedly embraced communism, and the communist period featured many waves of strikes. In the 1980s, Poland’s workers found each other in the Solidarity trade union, and semi-free elections were held in 1989. From this time onwards, the media language of Poland became more liberal and diverse.

Although the core of Polish literature has remained relatively pure since the 16th Century, loan words were over the centuries absorbed from medieval Czech and German, from Latin, and, more recently, from such languages as Belarusian, Ukrainian, French, and English. As the Polish language is still subject to serious change, committees have existed that describe and protect the language. In the decades after the Second World War, for instance, the Polski Komitet Normalizacyjny (‘Polish Committee for Standardisation’) looked after the purity of the Polish language. Traditionally, the language of the Polish capital is taken as the norm.

The new Poland is now gathering international credibility and is making explicit attempts to economically hook on to Western Europe. However, social adjustments to recently acquired material wealth are problematic, and despite its westernisation Polish society still reveals the old Slavonic and communist influences. Moreover, the widespread adherence to traditional Catholicism makes Polish culture to many westerners an example of tradition and anti-liberalism, and far from western.
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New-Zealand

It is generally agreed that eastern Polynesians in the central Pacific reached New-Zealand more than 1,000 years ago. In December 1642, Abel Janszoon Tasman was the first European to arrive in New-Zealand. In 1769-70, James Cook completed Tasman’s work by circumnavigating the two major islands; North Island and South Island. Colonists as well as other explorers followed Cook in the subsequent 50 years. Initially, the original inhabitants, the Maori, welcomed the newcomers; the tribes could remain secure, while the European influence was convenient and useful. A process of mutual adjustment began, which continues today, and the Maori have adjusted to the western life style of their white neighbours. By the 1830s, there were at least a few hundred settlers, and by the late 19th Century many New-Zealanders were coming to regard themselves as a new nation. After the Second World War, New-Zealand began to play a relatively independent role in world affairs. The 1970s and 1980s were economically difficult for New-Zealand.

Even in the early 1900s, visitors to the country were making comments on the emergence of a New-Zealand accent. Crystal (1997:37) named three factors that have shaped the distinctive New-Zealand English variety. First of all, there is the close connection that many New-Zealanders have with Britain. Due to this, many speak with an accent that displays clear British influence. Secondly, due to the similarity of New-Zealand English to Australian English, the attention of New-Zealanders is drawn to differences between these two varieties. Finally, there has been a concern to take into account the rights and needs of the Maori people, resulting in an increasing use of Maori words in New-Zealand English.

Despite the efforts of the indigenous Maori, who constitute about 14.5% of the population, New-Zealand remains a relatively monolingual country. The New-Zealand variety has a recognisable ring to it, although it is often confused with Australian English, and even with South African English. It is a new language variety, and therefore the standard/non-standard opposition is not dominant. New-Zealand English is remarkably homogeneous compared to ‘old’ western European languages. Its standardisation is somewhat of a mystery, and the question why the New-Zealand accent is like it is has not yet been answered satisfactorily. Suggestions have been made. Wall (1938), for instance, claimed that New-Zealand English is a direct transportation from London English. Others have suggested that it owes much to the Australian influence (Bauer 1994 and Gordon & Deveron 1998), while some have emphasised the strong Scottish influence (Trudgill, Gordon & Lewis 1998 and Bauer 1997).

Japan

The island of Japan has experienced relatively few foreign attacks in its long lifetime. The history of Japan can safely be qualified as isolationist. The small states within the country had gradually unified by as early as the 4th Century. With the introduction of the writing system from China, the Japanese people began to
extensively record their language through poetry and prose. Contacts with China were interrupted towards the end of the 9th Century, and from this time onwards Japan’s civilisation began to take on its own identity. The Tokugawa shogunate even took the drastic step of virtually closing Japan’s doors to the outside world in 1639.

Japan came under increasing pressure around the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th Century to open up its harbours to the outside world. In the 19th Century, Japan changed into a constitutional monarchy. The unification of the language was an issue of serious concern for the centralised government. In the Meiji era (1868-1912), Japan took the first steps towards the creation of a modern industrial nation. Emperor Meiji transferred the imperial capital from Kyoto to Edo (the old name of Tokyo), and Edo city grew into the linguistic focus from then on. The Kinki area (with historical cities such as Osaka, Kyoto, and Nara) had been a linguistically dominant centre for more than 1,000 years before that. When Edo became the political focus, the Kinki area remained a linguistic and cultural hub, and it has since. The Meiji government established *Hyoujungo* (‘Standard Japanese’) on the foundation of the Tokyo uptown variety and diffused it with force. This government tried to reform dialects and even installed a Dialect Eradication Movement.

In August 1945, Japan accepted the surrender terms of the allied powers. Various social and political reforms were subsequently carried out. Since 1945, Japan has enjoyed a remarkable degree of domestic political stability. The country has developed into one of the most hi-tec societies in the world, one in which modern technology and the old culture exist side by side and even blend together naturally.

The Japanese population is racially highly homogeneous, and Japanese is an isolated language that is hardly spoken outside its borders. Since the Second World War, the population of Japan has undergone drastic changes; not merely in size but also in its demographic makeup. There has been a large increase in number and a move from rural areas to urban areas. Dialects have thus mixed and this has enhanced standardisation (Nomoto 1975:33). The Japanese language is highly standardised, and according to Nomoto it is in its final stage of standardisation. According to Neustupný (1978), this high degree of standardisation has been achieved through modernisation, urbanisation, industrialisation, widespread literacy, high levels of education, and the influence of television. There is nevertheless a large number of dialects throughout the four main islands and the smaller islands. Some dialects, such as those spoken in the southern parts of Japan (Kyushu, Okinawa) are virtually incomprehensible to the speakers of other dialects, requiring the use of the standard (or ‘common’) dialect for communication. The two dialect families with the largest number of speakers are those spoken in and around Tokyo, which is equivalent to the ‘common’ dialect, and the dialects of the Kansai region spoken in western Japan, i.e. the ‘old’ standard language. Due to the spreading of the common dialect through television and radio, most people outside the Tokyo region are said to be able to speak something close to the common dialect as well as the dialect of their own area.
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8.3 INTRINSIC CHARACTERISTICS

In Table 8.1, characteristics can be seen that the respondents used to define the standard language. The question did not involve response categories, and instead characteristics were defined on the basis of the answers respondents gave. The percentages are of respondents within a country who answered this question.

The characteristics are ordered on the basis of dominance/frequency. A hierarchy of clusters of characteristics is created (in the ‘cluster’ column in the table). Cluster I contains characteristics that were mentioned in all five countries, and this is therefore the most dominant cluster. Cluster II contains characteristics that were mentioned by respondents from four of the five countries, and this is the second-most dominant cluster, and so on. Within these clusters, the characteristics themselves are ordered hierarchically; for each characteristic, the average percentage of respondents in each country that used it is calculated, and the characteristic with the highest average percentage over five countries is considered most dominant within the cluster (see the ‘average’ column).

The characteristics that more than ten percent of the respondents mentioned in at least one of the five countries can be seen in Table 8.1. All other characteristics appear in the VARIOUS category (Cluster VI). The greyed boxes denote the most popular characteristic in each country. The respondents in many instances used more than one characteristic in their answers.

LINGUA FRANCA (30.5%)

In this ordering system, the LINGUA FRANCA characteristic is most dominant; it was mentioned by respondents from all five countries and by the highest average number of respondents. The LINGUA FRANCA characteristic is really the only characteristic that was popular in all of the countries studied. The Dutch respondents were least outspoken on this feature. The lowest percentage that this characteristic obtained is 20.6 (by the Dutchmen). All of the subsequent characteristics were used by between 0% and 2.2% of the respondents from at least one of the countries. This leads one to hypothesise that the lingua franca function of standard languages is the most fundamental and universal characteristic, existing relatively independently of local circumstances.

MEDIA LANGUAGE (15.7%)

The second-most dominant characteristic is the MEDIA LANGUAGE characteristic. This dominance is due mainly to the Japanese respondents, who push up the average considerably, and this is not surprising for a society that is so highly mechanised. Inoue (1991:51) described the standard language in Japan simply as the media language, and Neustupny (1978) also talked about the powerful influence of

4 To make this system clearer, the clusters are indicated in Table 8.1. NB: Some clusters contain one member only.
television in the standardisation of Japanese. In the other four countries, this characteristic does not seem to count quite as strongly as in Japan. For the New-Zealanders, and to a lesser extent for the Poles, this characteristic was in fact of particularly little importance.

Table 8.1: Characteristics used to answer the question: *Define the standard language* (multiple responses): NL=Netherlands, FL=Flanders, PL=Poland, NZ=New-Zealand, JP=Japan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cluster</th>
<th>characteristic</th>
<th>percentage of respondents (N=606)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NL (n=136) FL (n=100) PL (n=113) NZ (n=89) JP (n=168) average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>LINGUA FRANCA</td>
<td>20.6 25.0 38.1 33.7 35.1 30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEDIA LANGUAGE</td>
<td>10.3 14.0 6.2 1.1 47.0 15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPP. OF DIALECT</td>
<td>19.1 18.0 27.4 2.2 6.0 13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NON-REGIONAL</td>
<td>34.6 10.0 8.0 2.2 5.4 12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>CORRECT</td>
<td>38.2 11.0 55.8 - 14.9 24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FORMAL</td>
<td>5.1 18.0 - 1.1 19.6 8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LINGUIST ITEMS</td>
<td>4.4 7.0 17.7 5.6 - 6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RARE/NON-EXIST.</td>
<td>2.9 21.0 0.9 6.7 - 6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
<td>8.8 11.0 1.8 3.4 - 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>DIAL. AVERAGE</td>
<td>5.1 17.0 - 3.4 - 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>EXT. LANGUAGE</td>
<td>- 19.0 - 14.6 - 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>SLANGY</td>
<td>- - - 27.0 - 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAPITAL</td>
<td>- - - - 18.5 3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXCEPTIONAL</td>
<td>- - - 15.7 - 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td>30.9 18.0 46.0 21.3 6.5 24.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPOSITE OF DIALECT (13.5%)**

The OPOSITE OF DIALECT characteristic was reasonably popular in three of the five countries, namely the Netherlands, Flanders, and Poland. In Poland in particular, this characteristic was used by a high percentage of respondents. The New-Zealanders were obviously aware of the fact that their country does not have dialects like countries in Europe and other parts of the world; the OPOSITE OF DIALECT characteristic therefore simply could not apply to New-Zealand. The Japanese did not apply this argument, despite the existence of dialects in Japan.

**NON-REGIONAL (12.0%)**

A striking result is the emphasis that Dutch respondents placed on the non-regional nature of the standard language, compared with respondents from other countries. More than one in three of the Dutch respondents indicated that the standard
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language is the non-regional language, while in none of the other countries more than one in ten respondents used the NON-REGIONAL characteristic. Moreover, all of these Dutch respondents pos it as the main (the first) or the only characteristic in their description and never as a secondary characteristic. Degree of regionality is a frequently used characteristic by Dutch linguists to estimate the standardness of Dutch too. It seems, then, that from an international point of view Dutchmen value non-regionality to a disproportionate degree. Jespersen’s (1925) non-regionality stance may therefore be an overgeneralisation, one that possibly applies most strongly to small western countries like the Netherlands and Denmark or generally to countries with an old established standard language, where dialects exist.

The NON-REGIONAL characteristic is easily associable with the LINGUA FRANCA characteristic. It can be hypothesised that to Dutchmen someone speaks the lingua franca if their speech is typical of the country as a whole and not of a certain region. It is likely that in other countries regional traces carry some prestige and do not necessarily undermine the lingua franca nature of the ‘own speech’, as the regional traces are still from within the country in question. Further research is required to determine the relationship between non-regionality and lingua franca.

CORRECT (24.0%)

The final characteristic that on average carries considerable weight is the CORRECT characteristic. For the average percentage of respondents that mentioned this characteristic is high: almost one in four respondents across the countries. The disagreement on this characteristic is considerable, and this high average is mainly due to the Dutch and Polish respondents (38.2% and 55.8%, respectively). The CORRECT characteristic is not used by any of the New-Zealand respondents and by only 11% of the Flemish respondents. What these two countries have in common is that they have a relatively new standard language. However, Japanese respondents also did not mention this characteristic frequently, meaning that the age of a standard language cannot be used to account for the use of this characteristic.

The schooling system in a country may explain the use of the CORRECT characteristic, more specifically the degree to which correctness is addressed in the classroom. In Poland, for instance, an explicit language policy was current during the communist era. However, this factor does not satisfactorily explain the responses of other countries, as an explicit language policy was also the case in Japan for some time.

EXTERNAL LANGUAGE (4.5%)

Both the New-Zealander s and the Flemish referred to an EXTERNAL LANGUAGE. The Flemish respondents contrasted their own variety of Dutch with northern Dutch (Dutch as it is spoken in the Netherlands). Southern Dutch for a long time conformed to northern Dutch. In the last few decades, southern Dutch has been developing increasingly independently, especially in the field of pronunciation.
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The New-Zealanders often referred to British English. In most cases, these respondents considered British English to constitute the roots of New-Zealand English. Indeed, Deterding (1997:47) considered British English (as it is spoken on BBC World Service broadcasts) a style of speech that may be regarded as a kind of reference speech, in the sense that it is used as a model for pronunciation in many parts of the world. In some of the Commonwealth countries, this function of reference speech is particularly dominant, and New-Zealand is one of them. Looking at the answers by New-Zealanders, it seems that ‘Standard New-Zealand English’ was by them equated with ‘yet another international variety of English’ as opposed to ‘one of the varieties of New-Zealand English within New-Zealand’. The situation in New-Zealand is partly on a par with the situation in the United States of America, where the English language was also imported. There, British English for a long time also remained ‘the old standard’. Although the United States developed its own standard language over the centuries that followed, British English still enjoys special favour in the eyes of many Americans (Langacker 1973:55). This special favour may remain for some time in New-Zealand too.

There is a noticeable difference in the appreciation of this external language between the respondents from the named two countries. New-Zealand respondents seemed proud that their roots lie in Britain, while the Flemish respondents were generally critical towards the northern Dutch linguistic influence and towards the attitude of Dutchmen towards Flemish Dutch. The New-Zealanders did not show any such critical attitude towards British influences. It seems that in the perception of the Flemish respondents Flemish Dutch has developed into a language that has its standardness roots within Flanders, while New-Zealand English according to the New-Zealand respondents continues to borrow standardness qualities from abroad.

SLANGY & EXCEPTIONAL (5.4/3.1%)

More than a quarter of the New-Zealanders considered New-Zealand English to be lazy and slack, and often also slangy (the SLANGY characteristic). In fact, this characteristic was used most often after the LINGUA FRANCA characteristic by this group of respondents (27.0%). This is in line with the common stereotype regarding the carefree atmosphere of New-Zealand society and its language. This stereotype may have caused the language spoken in these areas to have become associated with a carefree attitude, even in the eyes of speakers themselves.

The fourth characteristic used by New-Zealanders is that New-Zealand English is EXCEPTIONAL. The New-Zealand respondents seemed to be referring to New-Zealand English being like no other type of English, having its own distinctive qualities, and that it should - despite its small size and tender age - not be confused with other (more well-known) types of English. This characteristic can be explained through the similarity of New-Zealand English and Australian English. Australian English is internationally more well known, and the respondents were possibly emphasising the differences between these two varieties.
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CAPITAL (3.7%)

Quite a few of the Japanese respondents (18.5%) indicated that the standard language is the language of the CAPITAL of Japan, Tokyo. The respondents in the Japanese section of the International Survey were mainly from the Tokyo area, which may account for this result. According to Inoue (1991), the speech of Tokyo is mistakenly understood to be near the standard language. He claimed that it is a language myth that is widespread amongst Tokyote. Inoue (1991:52) believed his research had shown that the daily speech of Tokyote does not coincide with Standard Japanese, and he expressly distinguished between Tokyo speech and Standard Japanese.

This Tokyo myth (Japan) does not compare with the Haarlem myth (Netherlands; see Section 7.2). Reasons can be invented to support the suggestion that Tokyo speech is likely to influence other varieties of Japanese and is involved in the standardisation process; Tokyo is the largest city of Japan, it is the Japanese capital, it is the most important trade centre, and it has the most prominent university, Tokyo itself is comparable to the Dutch Randstad in the sense that it covers a large area with various urban centres. Tokyo people and their Tokyo accent can be seen and heard on Japanese television on a daily basis. None of these circumstances are true for Haarlem.

Other intrinsic characteristics

Further down the hierarchy are two striking results. First of all, there is the relatively strong emphasis that the Japanese respondents placed on the FORMAL (19.6%) nature of Standard Japanese. Standard Japanese is indeed heavily influenced by formal literary Japanese. Secondly, there were the Flemish respondents, who indicated that Flemish Standard Dutch is rare or even non-existent (the RARE/NONSEXISTENT (21.0%) characteristic). This is not surprising, as many Flemish speakers do not speak Standard Dutch regularly.

The results of Table 8.1 support the notion that the LINGUA FRANCA characteristic is the only universal characteristic. So, the standard language is the language that in various respects (mainly linguistic) connects people within a country. Presumably, the characteristics used by the Dutch respondents other than the LINGUA FRANCA characteristic are largely due to the specific situation in the Netherlands. Various other salient characteristics were mentioned besides the ones discussed above, but none of these were embraced by respondents from all of the five countries. The possible source of some of these other characteristics can directly be traced back to the local situation.

From the above, we can conclude that the original definition of the standard language (see Section 6.3) partly stands. This original definition applied to the Dutch standard language only and consisted of one characteristic besides the LINGUA FRANCA characteristic, namely culturedness. The international data above, however,
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contradict any suggestion that culturedness is internationally considered relevant with respect to the standard language.

Correctness (which is part of culturedness) was considered an important characteristic of the standard language by the Dutch respondents, and the same went - albeit to a noticeably lesser extent - for the Polish respondents, but the New Zealanders did not mention this characteristic, and the Flemish and Japanese respondents did not consider it of much importance either. Culturedness was in 6.3 used as an umbrella term covering several other characteristics (CORRECT, POLISHED, THE TRADITIONAL STANDARD, FORMAL, RARE/NON-EXISTENT, DIFFICULT, and EDUCATED). In the international results, such characteristics referring to culturedness were put forward on occasion in various countries, but they did not systematically occur across the countries. When we distribute the characteristics of Table 8.1 in the categories of Section 6.3, we get Table 8.2.

Table 8.2: The Table 8.1 characteristics redistributed into the categories of Table 6.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>category of characteristics</th>
<th>percentage of respondents (N=606)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURED</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIA</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUALITATIVE FEATURES</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOGRAPHICAL ORIGIN</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.2 illustrates the importance of the general function of the standard language across countries. The perceived culturedness of the standard language is laid bare in all countries except New Zealand. Only if one argued that New Zealand and other such young societies have no real standard language could one adopt culturedness as a compulsory feature of established standard languages. In addition, the strong emphasis of the Japanese on MEDIA is revealed. Let us look at the Dutch definition of the standard language and see if a broader definition can be made, incorporating these international data.

Standard Dutch was defined in Section 6.3 as ‘the common linguistic reference point of Dutch people; the lingua franca. It is associated with culturedness’. Taking into consideration the international data in this chapter, the general definition of the standard language is the following: ‘The standard language is the common linguistic reference point of people of a country or area; the lingua franca. For each country/area, specific secondary characteristics apply, the most common one being culturedness’. There is only a minor adjustment. Culturedness has been replaced by a broader reference to secondary characteristics. The New Zealand results are an important cause of this, although they may be exceptional.
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8.4 USER CHARACTERISTICS

Now, the results pertaining to user characteristics are discussed: the place where it is spoken, the profession of speakers, the sex of speakers, and the medium in which it is spoken.

Where

A standard language often has a regional origin. This regional origin developed through a combination of political, cultural, historical, and other circumstances. Due to such circumstances, in England the counties around the capital (the Home Counties) and the capital itself are associated with the standard language, while in France mainly the capital city itself is said to be associated with Standard French. A standard language, however, does not necessarily have a strongly defined regional origin. For instance, no one kanton has had a consistently dominating position in Swiss society in this respect. As for the United States of America, according to Preston (2000:41) a commonplace in United States linguistics is that every region supports its own standard variety; no one region is the locus (or source) of the standard language. According to Falk (1978:289), too, each region of the United States has its own standard language, and what is considered Standard English in New York City would not be considered standard in Forth Worth, Texas. To some, however, ‘general’ American English is widely considered to be spoken in the Midwestern states.

The next question of the questionnaires was aimed at finding out where the standard language was spoken in each of the five countries. Presented in Table 8.3 are the responses to the ‘where’ question.

The respondents were presented with response categories that were adapted to the local situation. Such as was the case with the Dutch survey, geographical entities were defined of various sizes, some of which overlapped. Important cities were on the list of response categories, of which some were put forward as response categories so as not to direct the respondents towards certain responses. Furthermore, areas were given, depending on the local situation. The respondents could also write down a place of their own choosing (ANOTHER PLACE).

The responses that obtained less than ten percent in a particular country constitute the VARIOUS category, which therefore contains several types of responses. In the table, a three-way division is made, based mainly on whether respondents actually named a specific place; the responses are subdivided into ‘place’ (a specific place; references to various responses), the EVERYWHERE THE SAME category, and the NO OPINION category. The grey cells represent the category that was selected most often within a country.

When we compare the portion of respondents who selected one of the three main categories defined above, and which are visible in the table (i.e. ‘place’, EVERYWHERE THE SAME, and NO OPINION), we see significant differences between the countries ($\chi^2=90.470$, $df=8$, $p<.01$). Each country will now be discussed separately.
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Table 8.3: Responses to the question: ‘Where is the standard language spoken in particular?’ (one response per respondent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>country</th>
<th>response</th>
<th>percentage of respondents (N=691)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL (n=139)</td>
<td>RANDSTAD (urban area)</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HAARLEM (city)</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WEST (area)</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EVERYWHERE THE SAME</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO OPINION</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL (n=127)</td>
<td>FLEMISH BRABANT (province)</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAST FLANDERS (province)</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EVERYWHERE THE SAME</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO OPINION</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL (n=140)</td>
<td>WARSAW (city)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALOPOLSKA (area)</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAZOVIA (area)</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EVERYWHERE THE SAME</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO OPINION</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ (n=103)</td>
<td>NORTH ISLAND (island)</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EVERYWHERE THE SAME</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO OPINION</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP (n=182)</td>
<td>TOKYO (city)</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KANTO (area)</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EVERYWHERE THE SAME</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO OPINION</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Netherlands

Van Haeringen (1924a:66) linked the degree of unification of a country to the acceptance of a cultural centre. The stronger this acceptance is, so he said, the more readily people will pick up on features regional. He considered France and Denmark to be ahead of the Netherlands in this respect. Indeed, the origins of Standard Dutch
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do not lie in a particular city but in an urban area, whereas in France and Denmark
specific cities are associated with the standard language.

Many Dutch respondents referred to a specific city (HAARLEM; 19.4%). The
RANDSTAD (20.1%) and the WEST (18%) are where the economic and political
centres of the Netherlands lie, as they have for centuries. It is probable that Haarlem
was put forward as the place where the standard language is spoken not because
respondents personally experienced this to be the case but, rather, were reacting on
the basis of hearsay. The respondents were students and were therefore relatively
young, and the fact that amongst the Dutch respondents the city of Haarlem was a
popular response indicates that popular myths do not necessarily lose strength with
each following generation. The EVERYWHERE THE SAME category was mentioned by
almost one in seven respondents in the Netherlands. This is likely to refer to regional
neutrality.

Flanders

One specific area was mentioned most often by the Flemish respondents, namely
FLEMISH BRABANT (29.9%). The cities within Flemish Brabant, namely Antwerp and
Leuven, are culturally and economically dominant, and their local image is much
like that of Dutch cities in the Randstad. Similar to the Dutch respondents, the next
most popular response after this specific area was EVERYWHERE THE SAME (26.0%).
The Haarlem myth strongly influences the Dutch responses, while Flanders does not
have an equivalent to the Haarlem notion, and this may explain why the Flemish
responses were structured differently. Without the Haarlem myth, the Netherlands
might have received descriptions that were structured similarly to the Flemish
responses.

Almost 12% of the respondents mentioned the EAST FLANDERS province. This
area borders on Flemish Brabant and is likely to have obtained its status as a
consequence.

Poland

In Poland, the capital city of WARSAW was a popular response (20.0%) and to a
lesser extent its surrounding region (the MAZOVIA region) too. MAŁOPOLSKA (‘Little
Poland’) (12.1%) is another large region in Poland. It lies in the west and borders on
the Mazovia region. Together, these two regions cover a large area in central Poland.
Various other places were mentioned by one in four Poles (VARIOUS). The status of
the capital city and its surroundings is obvious, although less obvious than that of
the Dutch Randstad. The Polish respondents did not put forward Warsaw in the
general question about the definition of Standard Polish (Table 8.1), so regional
origin is a secondary rather than a primary characteristic.
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New-Zealand

Almost half of the New-Zealand respondents (47.6%) opted for EVERYWHERE THE SAME, thus indicating that Standard New-Zealand English is spoken in no specific place in particular. The next most popular response of the New-Zealanders was NO OPINION (12.6%), which could easily be interpreted as meaning more or less the same as EVERYWHERE THE SAME, i.e. no specific area. It is likely that the New-Zealanders were not referring to non-regionality the way that the Dutch respondents were. Over one in ten New-Zealand respondents (12.6%) selected NORTH ISLAND. The North Island is more urbanised than the other of the two islands (i.e. South Island, where most of the respondents were from). On the North Island are the two largest cities, namely Auckland and Wellington. The latter is the capital city.

The New-Zealand respondents obviously based much of their responses on personal experience and common sense rather than tradition. This is not surprising; in a country where the standard language has hardly been an issue so far, there is obviously little tradition regarding its geographical origin. The light tendency to refer to the more urbanised of the two islands points to the development of a geographical locus and the association of cities with the standard language.

Japan

The Japanese results suggest that there is a specific place from where standardisation operates; well over two fifths (42.3%) of the respondents selected the capital (TOKYO). Besides the arguments used already, the dominance of Tokyo city in this respect can be explained through the once aggressive language policy of the Japanese government in which the Tokyo dialect was with some force spread across the country, at the expense of dialects.

The second most popular response (40.1%) was the KANTO area, which is the area around the capital. The Kanto area is one of the most densely populated urban areas in the world. More than four fifths of the Japanese respondents selected either the KANTO area or TOKYO, making the Japanese results comparable to the Polish results. The difference between responses from these two countries is that 18.5% of the Japanese put forward Tokyo in the open question. It can therefore be concluded that the language in Tokyo is more strongly associated with the standard language.

Profession

The literature on the standard language does not usually report specifically on the relationship between occupation and the standard language, but casual comments hereon are numerous. Radio and television news presenters, for instance, are often put forward as good speakers of the standard language.

The respondents in the five countries were asked which profession they associate most with the standard language. The response categories for each country needed to be adjusted to the local situation. Seven or eight (depending on local circumstances) professions were presented to each group of respondents. The
response categories that were selected by more than ten percent of the respondents in at least one of the countries can be seen in Table 8.4. The greyed cells represent the most popular response category within each country. The responses are categorised on the basis of whether a specific profession was mentioned (in the table: ‘profession’) or not (in the table: ALL PROFESSIONS EQUAL and NO OPINION). As four professions clearly surfaced as popular responses, these four are presented in the table below in one particular order: NEWSREADERS, LANGUAGE EXPERTS, TEACHERS, and EDUCATED PEOPLE. The VARIOUS category contains all the other professions that were put forward.

When comparing the portion of respondents falling into one of the three main categories in the table (‘profession’, ALL PROFESSIONS EQUAL, and NO OPINION), significant differences appear between the countries ($\chi^2=211.693$, df=8, $p<.01$). It is obvious that the New-Zealanders are the odd ones out. Less than half of these gave a profession, while this percentage is well over 90 for the other countries. NEWSREADERS are mentioned far most often.

**Newsreaders**

The Dutch and Flemish preferences for the NEWSREADERS category are close to each other: 45.7% and 57.3%, respectively. There was a clear preference for NEWSREADERS in both countries; the other professions did not even come close. The supremacy of NEWSREADERS in Japan (86.9%) is striking, especially compared to New-Zealand (11.7%). About one in five of the Polish respondents selected NEWSREADERS.

It seems that the Netherlands occupy an intermediate position as far as the linguistic supremacy of newsreaders is concerned. The common belief that newsreaders are exemplary speakers of the standard language is largely supported by these results, but this most of all seems true for the three western(ised) countries with old standard languages.

**Other professions**

The Polish respondents associated the standard language predominantly with education, so it seems. More than a quarter of this group opted for TEACHERS. It is possible that these respondents considered schools to be the place where the norms regarding Standard Polish are formed. Ten percent of the Poles selected LANGUAGE EXPERTS. It seems that the Poles felt that those who professionally occupy themselves with the Polish language are the most exemplary speakers of the standard language.

In the New-Zealand results, NEWSREADERS were preceded by the ALL THE SAME and NO OPINION categories. Again, the New-Zealand respondents were undecided. It is possible that the 11.7% of the New-Zealanders who selected the NEWSREADERS category were aware of these speakers being associated with the standard languages in other countries, without feeling that this was the case in New-Zealand.
Table 8.4: Responses to the question: ‘People with which profession speak the standard language in particular?’ (one response per respondent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>country</th>
<th>profession</th>
<th>response</th>
<th>percentage of respondents (N=685)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NL (n=139)</td>
<td>NEWSREADERS</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>LANGUAGE EXPERTS</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>TEACHERS</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>HIGHLY EDUCATED PEOPLE</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL PROFESSIONS EQUAL</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO OPINION</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL (n=124)</td>
<td>NEWSREADERS</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>LANGUAGE EXPERTS</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>TEACHERS</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>HIGHLY EDUCATED PEOPLE</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL PROFESSIONS EQUAL</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO OPINION</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL (n=136)</td>
<td>NEWSREADERS</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>LANGUAGE EXPERTS</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>TEACHERS</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>HIGHLY EDUCATED PEOPLE</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL PROFESSIONS EQUAL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO OPINION</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ (n=103)</td>
<td>NEWSREADERS</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>LANGUAGE EXPERTS</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>TEACHERS</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>HIGHLY EDUCATED PEOPLE</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL PROFESSIONS EQUAL</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO OPINION</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP (n=183)</td>
<td>NEWSREADERS</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td>LANGUAGE EXPERTS</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td>TEACHERS</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td>HIGHLY EDUCATED PEOPLE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL PROFESSIONS EQUAL</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO OPINION</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Sex

Women are oftentimes considered to approximate the standard language more than men (see also Section 7.4). This is most usually suggested by linguists, and the arguments used to support this suggestion come from linguists as well. To see whether this is perhaps a notion that is also felt by ordinary speakers across countries, the respondents were asked whether women or men in particular speak the standard language. This question had four response categories, all of which can be seen in Table 8.5. The greyed cells highlight the most popular response categories in each country.

Table 8.5: Responses to the question: ‘Do men or women in particular speak the standard language?’ (one response per respondent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>response category</th>
<th>NL (n=140)</th>
<th>FL (n=129)</th>
<th>PL (n=141)</th>
<th>NZ (n=101)</th>
<th>JP (n=183)</th>
<th>average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEN/WOMEN</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO OPINION</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The greyed cells show that a strikingly consistent section of the respondents in the five countries (about three quarters) agreed on both women and men approximating the standard language to the same degree. Consequently, when comparing the portion of respondents selecting MEN/WOMEN with the portion selecting one of the other three response categories, it turns out that there is no significant difference between any pair of countries.

Looking at the other categories, we do see significant differences. The Dutch, Flemish, and Japanese groups contain a significantly higher number of respondents who consider female speech to be more standard than men’s (Netherlands: \( \chi^2 = 8.048, df=1, p < .01 \); Flanders: \( \chi^2 = 12.462, df=1, p < .01 \); Japan: \( \chi^2 = 11.524, df=1, p < .01 \)). This preference is in line with common linguistic theories and with comments often heard. Within the Polish group, the opposite tendency is visible; in those cases where a choice was made between the sexes, MEN were selected significantly more often (\( \chi^2 = 10.704, df=1, p < .01 \)). This can be explained through the specific role of women and men in relationships in Poland. Of the five countries, Poland is the one in which it is perhaps most natural for a husband to go out to work and for the wife to - as a matter of course - stay home. This may have led to the idea in Poland that men are more inclined to speak the standard language, because they use it to communicate at work. In the New-Zealand results, there is no significant preference for MEN or WOMEN.
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Medium

In the Netherlands, television and radio have become an integral part of daily life. Television speech in particular is heard, at least more frequently than radio speech. In other societies, radio and television play a role as well. As large groups of people are exposed to speech from radio and television on a daily basis, this speech is likely to influence the establishment of a linguistic norm.

To compare the perceived contributions of radio and television in establishing and continuing the standard language, the respondents from the five countries were asked whether they perceive a difference in the degree to which speakers on radio and television approximate the standard language. The results can be seen in Table 8.6. Again, the categories are ordered like in Table 8.1. The greyed cells represent the most popular response category in each country. All four categories in the questionnaire are present in the table.

Table 8.6: Responses to the question: ‘Is the standard language spoken on radio or television in particular?’ (one response per respondent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>response category</th>
<th>percentage of respondents (N=692)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NL (n=140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RADIO/TV</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RADIO</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEVISION</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO OPINION</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Netherlands and Flanders, the RADIO category was more popular than any of the other categories, and RADIO speech was selected significantly more often than TELEVISION speech (NL: \( \chi^2=7.053, \, df=1, \, p<.01 \); FL: \( \chi^2=15.909, \, df=1, \, p<.01 \)). Although the New-Zealanders selected RADIO/TELEVISION most often, as did the Poles and the Japanese, the New-Zealand results show a significant preference for RADIO over TELEVISION (\( \chi^2=9.383, \, df=1, \, p<.01 \)). The Polish and Japanese respondents opted for RADIO and TELEVISION similarly frequently. The preference for one of the two media in these two countries is not significant.

The respondents from the countries behave in unpredictable ways. Most strikingly, at least about half of the respondents in each country actually made a choice between RADIO and TELEVISION. In addition, in none of the countries there was any striking preference for one of the three main categories (RADIO, TELEVISION, and RADIO/TELEVISION). It is possible that individual listening and viewing behaviour determines beliefs on the standardness of the speech used in the two media mentioned. It may depend on the preference of individuals for radio or television, on the amount of personal exposure to either medium, as well as preconceived ideas. Overall, the Dutch results do not deviate considerably from the international results. Both radio and television are associated with the standard
language in the Netherlands, and the Dutch results strongly resemble the Flemish results.

Famous speakers

In earlier questions, a description was looked for of standard-language speakers. Presumably, everyone knows people whose speech functions as a standard-language model; either groups of people or individuals. Such individuals may be part of the personal sphere of respondents, but they could also be widely known, i.e. celebrities. The latter group is most likely to help establish widely accepted ideas on what the standard language sounds like, as large groups of listeners are exposed to the speech of these individuals.

The respondents were asked to name an exemplary famous individual who speaks the standard language. The results are in Table 8.7. The famous speakers mentioned by at least five percent of the respondents in a country are named explicitly, the others are in the VARIOUS category. In the most left-hand column, the total number and percentage of respondents within each country that actually named a famous speaker is included, because there were large differences between countries in this respect. Only the respondents who answered this question are taken into consideration; the percentages in the right-hand column are calculated over this number. The most popular answer in each country is greyed.

The Dutch respondents had a clear preference for one television presenter and four television newscasters. The Flemish were even more outspoken and put forward two newscasters, one of which is supported by a particularly high percentage of respondents. The Polish respondents agreed on a famous speaker of the standard language even more strongly than did the Flemish. The Polish role model was not a newscaster but a famous Linguistics professor presenting a language programme on Polish television. The New-Zealanders not only put forward few speakers (less than a third of the respondents answered the question), they also did not agree strongly on one particular role model. The speaker who was mentioned most often by the New-Zealanders was a newscaster, but the second and third places are not occupied by anyone with that profession. The Japanese respondents seemed to agree on the profession of role models (newscaster) but not on one role model in particular.

There are large differences between the countries in the agreement on linguistic role models. The differences between the Polish and New-Zealand results illustrate this. First, 85.0% (n=119) of the Polish respondents actually named a speaker, while 29.8% (n=31) of the New-Zealanders did so. Due to this low number, the New-Zealand results may well have been different if a different group of respondents had been approached, for JUDY BAILEY (the top speaker) was mentioned by only three respondents, while JENNY SHIPLEY was put forward by only two. In contrast; of the 119 Polish respondents who named a name, 55 selected JAN MIODEK.
Table 8.7: Responses to the question: ‘Give the name of an exemplary famous speaker of the standard language’ (one answer per respondent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>respondent origin</th>
<th>profession</th>
<th>speaker</th>
<th>percentage of respondents (N=413)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NL (n=74; 52.9%)</td>
<td>television newsreader</td>
<td>HARMEN SIEZEN</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PIA DUKSTRA</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JOOP VAN ZUL</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PHILIP FRERIKS</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>television presenter</td>
<td>PAUL WITTEMAN</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL (n=102; 76.7%)</td>
<td>television newsreader</td>
<td>MARTINE TANGHE</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BAVO CLAES</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL (n=119; 85.0%)</td>
<td>television newsreader</td>
<td>KRYSTYNA CZUBOWNA</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>television linguis</td>
<td>JAN MOCIEK</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>OWN TEACHER</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ (n=31; 29.8%)</td>
<td>television newsreader</td>
<td>JUDY BAILEY</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>politician</td>
<td>JENNY SHIPLEY</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>actor</td>
<td>TENUEA MORRISON</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAM NEIL</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP (n=87; 47.5%)</td>
<td>television newsreader</td>
<td>KUME HIROSHI</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUZUKI SHIRO</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TSUKUSHI TETSUYA</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MATSUDAIRA SADATOMO</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KAGAMI SACHIKO</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note the second category from the top in the results pertaining to Poland. Almost one fifth of the Polish respondents put forward their own teacher as their famous speaker; they simply gave the name of a university lecturer or a teacher at secondary school. This is the only category in Table 8.7 that does not consist of one speaker but of the names of several speakers who apparently played more or less the same role in the lives of the respondents who named them.

Comparing the Netherlands with the other countries, we see that the Netherlands do not stand out. There was a preference for one speaker (HARMEN SIEZEN), but this preference was not as strong as the Polish and Flemish preferences for a speaker. Sjeen occupied a position similar to that of the most popular Flemish
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speaker; MARTINE TANGHE. Siezen was by far the most prominent Dutch television newsreader until recently, and, like Martine Tanghe, he worked for the national television broadcasting station with the longest news-broadcasting tradition. Martine Tanghe at the time when the survey was done had been a television news broadcaster for a long time and, on top of that, she had won a prize for her eloquent use of Dutch (the Groenman Prize, in 19955). Furthermore, these two speakers did not possess any striking physical appearance or other obvious special characteristics. Both Harmen Siezen and Martine Tanghe are by some considered uncharismatic, but perhaps that is what gave them much of their credibility and standing. It seems that their seniority and the attitude and composure that go with it were the most important factors in their popularity. This would mean that a distant, inconspicuous air finds favour and respect with the audience.

Although it is still possible that in Japanese and New-Zealand society there was less of a tendency to adhere to individual role models, the Dutch, Flemish, and Polish results illustrate the unpredictable rise of famous speakers in certain positions. In Poland in particular, it seems a coincidence that there should be a famous professor presenting a television programme on correct Polish. If this programme had not existed, the agreement of respondents on a speaker may also have been less outspoken. This suggestion is supported by the fact that there is no famous Polish speaker whose popularity even comes close to Miodek’s. The Japanese results may be indicative of a situation in which a famous speaker happens to be nonexistent.

Professions of famous speakers

The next step was to look at the professions of the famous standard-language speakers. In an earlier question, the stereotypical professions of speakers of the standard language were dealt with. If the agreement on the professions of celebrities agrees with the general stereotypical status of certain professions, then it becomes likely that role models are by respondents looked for in certain professions.

The results are in Table 8.8. They are ordered based on dominance (the usual way), with the most popular profession in each country greyed. All professions that occur more than once within a country’s group of respondents are put in the table; the ‘various’ category contains the remaining professions, i.e. the professions that occur only once.

---

5 She, in addition, won a media prize (ANV-Mediaprijis) for her use of Dutch, in 1999.
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Table 8.8: The professions of famous speakers of the standard language (see Table 8.7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>profession of famous speaker</th>
<th>NL (n=74)</th>
<th>FL (n=102)</th>
<th>PL (n=119)</th>
<th>NZ (n=31)</th>
<th>JP (n=85)</th>
<th>average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tv newsreader</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tv presenter</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>politician</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>queen/emperor</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>journalist</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio presenter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers/lecturer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>various</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results are largely in agreement with the earlier question on professions of speakers of the standard language (see Section 8.3). Television presenters, and news presenters in particular, were associated with standard speech across most groups of respondents. Newsreaders clearly dominate in three of the countries. The Dutch association of standard speech with television newsreaders and other television presenters is quite strong, but the Japanese results suggest that the position of newsreaders in this country is even more dominant than in the Netherlands. The Japanese situation shows that the preference for a certain profession is not always dependent on an individual celebrity, as seems to be the case with Poland. The New-Zealand responses are not numerous enough to draw any conclusions.

It may be that famous speakers can have any profession, but ordinary listeners need to be exposed to these speakers a great deal for these celebrities to become role models. Television is the most obvious medium to realise this exposure. So, the default speakers of the standard language are newsreaders, except when individual speakers appear regularly in the media and take over this position.

8.5 OWN OPINIONS AND USE

Origin of opinions on the standard language

The next question dealt with the perceived origin of beliefs on the standard language. The respondents were presented with three categories, which are in Table 8.9. Besides these, they were given the opportunity to give another origin of beliefs; this is represented in the table through the VARIOUS category. This category consists of responses given by less than five percent of the respondents. The categories are in the usual way highlighted and ordered on the basis of dominance.
Table 8.9: Responses to the question: ‘Where did you obtain your opinions on the standard language?’ (one response per respondent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>response</th>
<th>percentage of respondents (N=686)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NL (n=140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO OPINION</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READ IT</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The differences between the countries are significant ($\chi^2=169.534$, $df=16$, $p<.01$), and the table is highly irregular. Some of the results may be explained by using culture as the decisive factor, but these explanations are tentative.

Surprisingly, respondents did not come up with references to television. The Polish preference for SCHOOL is not surprising when we consider that quite a few of the Polish respondents (18.5%) indicated in an earlier question that their personal teachers and lecturers were important role models to them (see Section 8.3). The New-Zealanders were undecided, and whatever norm they were aware of they apparently obtained mainly from school. This is in line with earlier responses by New-Zealanders, but due to the equally irregular Dutch and Japanese results no broader conclusions seem reasonable.

Overall, the results show that respondents were undecided about the origins of their beliefs. This is not surprising, as this is a difficult question, requiring considerable introspection.

Own use of the standard language

It is hard to predict what respondents from various countries would answer if asked whether they speak the standard language. Arguments can easily go both ways. Inhabitants in a country with a relatively old standard language may be less inclined to feel they speak the standard language, as various aspects of the language in question have over the centuries been meticulously described. This may have caused feelings of insecurity as to whether the own speech meets the elaborate and fixed rules. At the same time, they may feel that because they are able to recognise the standard language, because of the widespread knowledge of the shape of that language, they are also able to follow the rules and speak it. Speakers in countries that have a standard language that is still in an early stage of development may feel they do not know whether they are following these rules, as their standard language is not described extensively yet. On the other hand, they may be liberal in their judgement as to what is standard and what is not, and in that line of reasoning they may be willing to consider themselves speakers of the standard language.

So, the respondents were asked whether they themselves speak the standard language, and the results are in Table 8.10. In this table, the order of the original
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questionnaire is maintained, because the response categories form a continuum. All existing categories are visible. The most popular categories are again greyed.

Table 8.10: Responses to the question: “Do you speak the standard language yourself?” (one response per respondent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>response</th>
<th>percentage of respondents (N=687)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NL (n=126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFTEN</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGULARLY</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RARELY</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO NOT KNOW</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all five countries, between about a third and almost half of the respondents believed that they OFTEN spoke the standard language\(^6\). The effects of the age of a standard language or other such features on the perceived own command of this variety seem unpredictable. An illustration of this is the striking resemblance between the Dutch and the New-Zealand results, i.e. a country with an old and a country with a new standard language. None of the New-Zealand categories deviate more than 1.6 points from their Dutch counterparts. The results of these two countries also have in common that they have a high (the highest and one but highest) number of respondents who did not know whether they ever spoke the standard language.

The results are hard to interpret. The categories can be redistributed into larger groups, to see whether clearer patterns arise. This is done in Table 8.11. The respondents are split up on the basis of whether they feel they speak the standard language (the ALWAYS, OFTEN, REGULARLY, and RARELY categories) or do not (NEVER); the new categories are called ABLE and NOT ABLE. Presumably, those respondents who claimed never to speak the standard language were not able to do so, whereas the other respondents can be categorised as speakers capable of producing the standard language (according to themselves).

---

\(^6\) When we weigh the percentage of each category from 1 (never) to 5 (always), the resultant percentages are within the small range of 64-70%.
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Table 8.11: Redistributed categories of Table 8.10, derived from responses to the question: ‘Do you speak the standard language yourself?’ (one response per respondent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>category</th>
<th>percentage of respondents (N=687)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NL (n=126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABLE</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT ABLE</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO NOT KNOW</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all countries, the large majority of the respondents indicated that they were able to speak the standard language. There are nevertheless significant differences between the portions of respondents from these countries who claimed to speak the standard language (ABLE): \( \chi^2=67.816, df=8, p<.01 \). The Flemish group contains the highest percentage of respondents who were certain that they never speak it (NOT ABLE). This can be explained through the language situation in Flanders, where dialects are an important means of daily communication. The percentage of respondents in Japan and Poland who considered themselves speakers of the standard language is high to such an extent that those not considering themselves capable of speaking this language, or not knowing whether they do, are the exception. The Dutch and NewZealand results are similar, which emphasises that the age of the standard language cannot be used to explain results. It has become clear, also, that the Dutch and the New-Zealanders had a different language in mind when answering questions.

Local cultural norms are most likely to lie at the heart of much of the variation in respondent behaviour. Nationalistic feelings may, for instance, lie at the heart of the Japanese and Polish results. Speakers from these countries may consider it obligatory to state that they speak the standard language. This would explain the high percentages in these countries.

8.6 CONCLUSION

The agreement between countries and the agreement on the characteristics is visible in Table 8.12. Only the strongest tendencies are looked at as only the results are visible that are represented by grey boxes in Tables 8.1 to 8.11 (i.e. the most popular response categories within each country). Furthermore, only those characteristics that the respondents from two or more countries found most important are portrayed. So, characteristics can be seen in the table that two or more countries viewed as being the most dominant of all.
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Table 8.12: Agreement on characteristics to define the standard language (derived from Tables 8.1 to 8.11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>table with results</th>
<th>most dominant resp. category</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>NZ</th>
<th>JP</th>
<th>agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.5 (sex)</td>
<td>MEN/WOMEN</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9 (own speech)</td>
<td>OFTEN</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.10 (own speech)</td>
<td>ABLE</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 (general definition)</td>
<td>GENERAL</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 (place)</td>
<td>place/area</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 (profession)</td>
<td>NEWSREADERS</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6 (medium)</td>
<td>RADIO/TELEVISION</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.8 (famous speaker)</td>
<td>tv newsreader</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1 (general definition)</td>
<td>LINGUA FRANCA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1 (general definition)</td>
<td>CORRECT</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6 (medium)</td>
<td>RADIO</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.8 (famous speaker)</td>
<td>tv presenter</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9 (origin opinions)</td>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ‘agreement with other countries’ row (bottom of the table) shows the degree to which each country agrees with other countries on the characteristics⁷. So, for instance, the Netherlands and Flanders agree most often with other countries on the most popular characteristic, and New-Zealand in particular disagrees with other countries. The ‘agreement on characteristic’ column shows the number of countries that agree on the importance of a certain characteristic.

In Table 8.13 is an overview of which countries agree with each other most. Derived from Table 8.12, this table presents for each country the number of times it agrees with each of the other countries on the preference for a certain characteristic.

Table 8.13: Agreement on the use of characteristics to describe the standard language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>NZ</th>
<th>JP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

⁷ For instance, Poland agrees on the GENERAL characteristic with three countries. These scores for every characteristic add up to the ‘agreement with other countries’ row.
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Most strikingly, the Netherlands and Flanders agree most often within this system. This is in the line of expectation, as these are neighbouring countries with a common history. The Dutch and Flemish disagreed on the origin of beliefs, but, more interestingly, the Flemish did not embrace the correctness of the standard language as convincingly as did the Dutch. This may be because the Dutch are more secure in their perceived knowledge of the shape of their standard language than the Flemish. It may be that the Dutch consider their language to be relatively fixed and stable, whereas in Flanders it is considered to be in transition. This accords with the history of these two standard languages.

Furthermore, New-Zealand does not stand out consistently, despite having an exceptional standard-language situation. New-Zealand only deviates strongly from two of the four countries with an old and established language (Netherlands and Japan).

The generalisability of the Dutch results

It has turned out that the history of languages and countries is to a degree a useful tool to explain evaluations related to the standard language, but in most cases the dissimilarities and the agreement between groups of respondents were not predictable on the basis of what was known of the history of their language and home country. Only in certain cases can century-long tendencies be used to explain a certain attitude (for instance the neutral, or even positive, attitude of New-Zealand respondents towards British English versus the critical attitude of Flemish respondents towards Dutch from the Netherlands). Some results seem due to a coincidental circumstance in a country, most notably the existence of high-profile speakers (such as a famous and charismatic linguist in Poland and the absence of such a celebrity speaker in Japan).

The agreement between countries is more telling. Across these countries, considerable agreement exists on the lingua francares of the standard language. The lingua franca characteristic does not obtain the highest score in all of the countries, but it is the only characteristic intuitively put forward by high numbers of respondents across the five countries. Furthermore, there is considerable agreement on the idea that the standard language is spoken by men and women to a similar extent, and the view that one (i.e. the respondent) is able to speak the standard language. This would suggest that a broad view of the standard language is applied. As for the place where the standard language is spoken; if there is such a place (for historical reasons), then generally respondents were also aware of this origin and roughly agreed on it (some countries have one such regional origin, others do not have any or have several ‘weaker’ ones).

Disagreement exists on the characteristics with which to describe the standard language besides its lingua francares and on the existence of a specific geographical locus as regards the standard language. Furthermore, there is disagreement on the professions associated with the standard language (newsreaders are influential, but they are not universal linguistic role models and neither are people in any other profession), and on the prominence of individual famous
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speakers of the standard language (some countries have a limited group of such speakers, others do not focus on a limited group of speakers in this respect). The strongest disagreement exists on whether the standard language is spoken on radio or television (some selected RADIO, some TELEVISION, and some opted for both) and on the origins of beliefs on the standard language (which are highly irregular).

The tendency to have a specific (Randstad/west) or very specific (city of Haarlem) regional origin is typical of the Netherlands, and it is not universal. This association is obviously typical only of established standard languages like Standard Dutch. Perhaps it is typical of established western standard languages. Jespersen (1925) was the most well-known early advocate of this stance. He was from Denmark, another western country with an established standard language.

Furthermore, the strong connection that Dutch respondents felt between a small group of newscasters and Standard Dutch may be coincidental. The international results show that circumstances may or may not be such that there are such influential role-model speakers. It may also just as well have been a Dutch speaker with another profession who had been exposed to the general audience regularly. Another characteristic that was not universal but that was popular in both the Netherlands and at least one other country was correctness. Together with the Poles, the Dutch respondents associated correctness with the standard language. The Poles may have been guided by the Linguistics professor who on television indicates what is correct and what is not. The reliability (and correctness) of news broadcasts may cause respondents to associate the news with correctness.

Most of all, Dutch respondents put a strong emphasis on non-regionality. In the Dutch literature, too, there is such an emphasis on this feature. Suggestions as to why the Netherlands deviate from other countries in this sense are tentative. The various regions that form today’s Netherlands used to be more independent, and they have in history slowly grown towards each other. The country now consists of several regions that to some degree still deviate from each other culturally and linguistically. The pluriformity in pronunciation of the various dialects may have created the need for a language that is different from all of them and does not carry the connotations that certain regional and local varieties do. Similar research in dialectologically diverse countries such as Germany, Russia, and England, may reveal whether a certain type of country is sensitive to this need for non-regionality.
9. EVALUATION

9.1 INTRODUCTION

Section 1.6 explained that there are various ways to find speakers of Standard Dutch. Although comments in the literature are taken into consideration, norms of ordinary speakers are the main point of departure in the present research. Some of these norms can be logically deduced from the language situation (for instance through popular assumptions), while the language behaviour of speakers and the way they evaluate speech reveal norms more explicitly. In chapters 6 and 7, all of these norms were used to describe prototypical speakers. The present chapter describes how these speakers are evaluated by listeners and which speakers speak Standard Dutch most purely.

This chapter crosses over from the general description to the phonetic description of Standard Dutch speech. Selected results from the Speech Evaluation Experiment will be discussed. There were two aims to this experiment. The main aim was to select speakers whose speech approximated Standard Dutch to a high degree. This selection process is discussed in the present chapter, and the speech of the three selected speakers provide the speech material for the perceptual and acoustic description (presented in Chapters 11 and 12, respectively), together with the four speakers already selected (see Section 4.3). Besides having a selection function, the Speech Evaluation Experiment looked at the effects of a number of listener variables on the evaluation of the degree of standardness of speech.

Chapter overview

Section 9.2 summarises the method of the Speech Evaluation Experiment, and Section 9.3 presents the listener variables in some detail (age, regional origin, educational level, and sex). Section 9.4 reveals which speakers were selected, and how, for the phonetic description and what the degree and nature of agreement was on the high standardness of the speech of these speakers. Section 9.5 discusses the effects of the various listener characteristics on the evaluation of the degree of standardness of the speech. Section 9.6 concludes the chapter.

9.2 METHOD

The complete method of the Speech Evaluation Experiment was described in Section 5.2. In total, 114 listeners of different age groups, regional backgrounds, educational levels, and sexes evaluated the speech of 30 news presenters with highly non-regional speech from five periods in time (1950s-1990s) and also the speech of five distracter fragments with regional speech. They evaluated the degree to which

---

1 This research is described in more detail in Smakman (2002).
2 The regional fragments are not included in the results unless specifically stated, and
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this speech was standard. Section 9.1 explained that the two aims of the Speech Evaluation Experiment were to find speakers who produce highly standard Dutch speech and to lay bare the effects of the most common listener characteristics on standardness evaluations. This means that only one of the eight rating scales used in the Speech Evaluation Experiment was relevant, namely the one ranging from NOT STANDARD DUTCH (=1) to STANDARD DUTCH (=10). In the results below, only the results relating to this particular scale are therefore discussed.

9.3 LISTENER VARIABLES

Four listener characteristics that possibly influence evaluations of degree of standardness were considered: age (three levels), regional origin (two levels), educational level (two levels), and sex (two levels).

The group of listeners was subdivided into the following age groups: the Young Group (18 up to and including 27 years of age), the Intermediate Group (38 up to and including 47 years of age), and the Old Group (58 years of age or older). Between subsequent age groups, there was a ten-year gap. The ages of the listeners in the Young Group and Intermediate Group had a range of ten years. The Old Group did not have an upper age limit (the oldest listener was 82), as listeners in the age range of 58 up to and including 67 were hard to find.

The listener group was subdivided on the basis of regional origin the following way: Authoritative Listeners (from the west of the Netherlands) and Peripheral Listeners (from the non-authoritative area, containing all other parts of the country. The authoritative area consists of the provinces of North Holland, South Holland, and Utrecht. This area includes the Randstad cities and contains the roots of Standard Dutch. The average educational level of the listeners in the Speech Evaluation Experiment was relatively high. Two levels were defined: low (listeners who had finished primary or secondary education, and who had not continued into any type of higher education after this) and high (all other listeners, including students at institutes of higher education). Finally, both male and female listeners participated in the Speech Evaluation Experiment.

It should be noted that actual age, sex, regional origin, or level of education may be of relative importance. One of the forces that influence the effects of these listeners characteristics on attitudes towards language varieties is the willingness to identify oneself with a certain group. In fact, the strength of identification may count more strongly than actual regional or other origin. Just as people’s use of linguistic variables depends on the degree to which they are influenced by norms in their community (Trudgill 1974), so evaluations of a local variety (or local varieties in

furthermore, one of the regional fragments obtained high standardness ratings and was for that reason rejected. The high ratings it received were an indication that it was not suitable to be a regional distracter, as it was too much like the standard-like fragments. It is not used in any calculation that includes regional fragments. So, only four of the five regional fragments are included in some of the calculations below. The Non-regional Original Fragments (see Section 5.2) are referred to as ‘non-regional fragments/speech’ and the Regional Additional Fragments as ‘regional fragments/speech’.
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general) and the standard language vary depending on the degree of sensitivity to norms. Integration in a community depends on, for instance, the extent to which one feels one speaks a certain language variety. And even in cases when attitudes in a certain group of speakers can be determined with some precision, in a different social environment they may change shape. Attitudes towards language varieties, therefore, depend on the speaker’s origin - social, regional, and other - in combination with the origin of the person they are talking to. This makes research on the effects of listener characteristics tentative.

Age

In society, age is an important factor in social interaction and social organisation. The most obvious differences between people of various ages are physical. Changes in pitch are perhaps the most noticeable result of physical changes, and another linguistic indicator of age is progressive creakiness in voice quality. The effects of age on speech are not the object of interest in the present research but evaluative differences between people of different ages. There is no specific literature on the effects of the age of listeners on their ratings of the standardness of speech. Evidence exists, especially anecdotal, that the awareness of the social significance of variation in speech forms exists at an early age. Rosenthal’s (1974) research even suggested that children are aware of status differences between accents as early as age three. Hudson (1990:18) claimed that we can safely assume that prejudices go on developing throughout childhood and adolescence, and he saw no reason to believe that the process ever stops completely.

The ‘language experiences’ of speakers presumably determine their evaluation behaviour. Having been exposed to speech from more periods in time, older language users have generally met with a wider range of speech than younger ones. For many old language users, most of the speech they hear around them was acquired in their lifetime, while for young language users much of the speech they hear came to existence before they were born. Some of the older users also grew up in times when the country was occupied, which may have raised their awareness of the role of a strong and homogenous national language. Also, younger language users are more likely to have been exposed to a different range of language varieties in their youth. Older language users were generally less mobile when they were young than today’s youth is and the effects of the media have seriously taken off in the last few decades, bringing with them exposure to language varieties from all over the country. Older people in most cases heard more non-standard speech around them when they grew up. Pronunciation norms as they exist today are relatively recent. Until the late 1960s, pronunciation as an indicator of degree of standardness was markedly less prominent than it is today. Having a regional accent was less stigmatised than today. Distinguished local speakers of Standard Dutch (such as doctors and teachers) usually had regional accents. Even famous linguists some decades ago spoke with regionally identifiable accents (Daan 1993:8). This could mean that for older listeners accent is less important in determining degree of accent. Instead, they may focus more on content. Because the content in the
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fragments was made stylistically neutral (see Section 5.2), it is likely that older listeners will distinguish less between the fragments. A final point of interest here is that members of the Intermediate Group (38-47) were most likely to have jobs and be aware of standardness norms, because in professional situations language users with various linguistic backgrounds oftentimes meet.

The bottom age of 18 was chosen because it seems safe to say that at this age listeners will have formed a mature and reliable opinion of what Standard Dutch sounds like. Around the age of 18, an independent life style is commonly entered, and the most primary attitudes have been formed by this time. A common assumption is that if people do not move from one place to another in the course of their youth, their speech as developed when entering young adulthood largely remains fixed for life. This viewpoint is also taken in apparent-time production experiments with people with different ages, which are set up to replace real-time studies with people of the same age from different periods.

Looking at our listeners, and keeping in mind that the Speech Evaluation Experiment was performed in the late 1990s, we see that the members of the Old Group (58+) entered adulthood mainly in the 1950s, for the Intermediate Group (38-47) this was approximately in the 1970s, and the members of the Young Group (18-27) did so in the 1990s. It can be hypothesised that these age groups developed most of their basic attitudes in the named decades, and that the speech of these decades represents their norm.

Regional origin

There are compelling reasons to believe that regional origin is a determining factor in language beliefs in the Netherlands. In the period after the Fall of Antwerp in the 16th Century, the western cities in the Netherlands became the new focus of economic and cultural expansion. Standardised Dutch subsequently spread across the cities that today constitute the Randstad (see Section 3.4). Due to this and other historical developments, the standard language in the Netherlands is still predominantly western-based. Consequently, to people from the western region of the country Standard Dutch is the language of the area where they live, whereas to people from outside the west it is not.

Looking specifically at the effects of regional origin and language evaluations in the Netherlands, Stoop (1998) assumed that listeners from the west and outside the west have similar attitudes towards (what he considered to be) the future Dutch prestige language, namely Polder Dutch. Indeed, Van Bezooijen and Van den Berg (2001) found that the same attitudes were held by listeners from the west and those outside the west regarding this language variety. Van Bezooijen (1998), furthermore, found that listeners find Standard Dutch more beautiful than other varieties of Dutch, irrespective of their own regional origin. This may be true in our results as well.
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Educational level

There is no literature that deals directly with the effects of educational level on standardness evaluations. Educational level is one of the factors that determine social class. A low educational level is typical of members of the less powerful classes. The lower social-class members are less likely to speak the standard language. A low educational level can therefore be associated with non-standard speech. However, the increased social mobility today reduces the predictability of speakers’ own degree of standardness and their evaluative tendencies.

The attitudes towards the standard language of people with low educational levels are affected by their awareness that their group typically does not speak this language variety. It is possible that persons with low educational levels are more inclined to consider news-presenter speech standard, as they look up to news presenters and view them as representatives of the privileged standard-speaking classes. Highly educated speakers, however, may personally associate with speakers with a high degree of standardness and ‘reward’ newsreaders with high standardness ratings as well. In other words, the effects of level of education are unpredictable.

Sex

Sex is predetermined and is only in exceptional cases changed in later life. The relative differences between the personalities of men and women are present in everyday observation. Oakley (1991:49) summed up the stereotypes as follows: “Men are more aggressive and independent than women; they are braver, more outgoing and extroverted, and confident in their ability to control and manipulate the external environment. Women are more sensitive and perceptive in their relationships with other people; they are more dependent on these relationships. They are introverted, domesticated, and emotionally labile.”

In sociolinguistic research, sex has emerged as an important variable and is often found to be reflected by specific linguistic items. Research reveals that in some languages there are items that are used exclusively by men or women (Haas 1944, Taylor 1951:103, and Trudgill 1974:84). Besides these absolute differences, relating only to specific linguistic items, there are sociolinguistic differences, which are more difficult to validate and quantify. Such differences do not usually function as distinctive markers of sex, since they would not distinguish a female from a male. The most common claim is that female speakers tend to use prestigious forms more often than males with the same social background. The notion that women’s pronunciation is on average closer to the standard language than men’s is widespread. This particular finding was reported in an impressive number of communities, including rural New England (Fischer 1958), North Carolina (Levine & Crockett 1966, Anshen 1969), New York City (Labov 1966), and Edinburgh (Romaine 1978). But, these findings are not universal or unchallengeable; later studies (for instance Milroy 1980 and Thomas 1987) have shown that the classic sociolinguistic pattern whereby women are more standard in their speech than men is indeed an overgeneralisation. An interesting edge to the suggestion that women
adopt certain speech forms more eagerly than men is provided by Watt and Milroy (1999:43), whose research suggested that men tend to retain localised forms while women adopt ‘supra-local forms’ (which may or may not be prestigious). This suggestion is supported by research by Van Bezooijen and Van den Berg (2001). Researchers have tried to propose explanations for the apparent differences between male and female speech habits. Such sociolinguistic differences are likely to be the consequence of women and men having a different attitude towards the standard language. Labov (1966) and Trudgill (1975) suggested that women have a more positive attitude towards the standard language. Coates (1993:67-68) believed that the fact that women tend to use a higher proportion of prestige forms than male speakers means that the prestige norms exert a stronger influence on women than on men.

The common assumption that men and women evaluate speech differently has led to a number of investigations on sex differences directly related to the perception and evaluation of speech. Trudgill (1975) found clear evidence that men and women evaluate some phonological variables differently. Elyan, Giles, and Bourhis (1978) found that women raters were more discriminating between standard and non-standard speech than were men, giving Received Pronunciation speakers exceptionally high ratings and regional British speakers lower ones, on six semantic scales: egotism, intelligence, independence, job possession, occupational status, and occupational salary. Brouwer (1989) found that the Amsterdam women in her study tended to evaluate the standard language most positively, whereas men were more positive towards the local variety of Amsterdam. Based on contemporary research findings, Smith (1979:133) expressed the conviction that women are more attentive and accurate observers of verbal style than men are. Several studies (Mazanec & McCall 1975, 1976, McCall, Mazanec, Erickson & Smith 1974) have found that women indeed recall features of style with greater accuracy and in more detail than men.

On the basis of these stereotypes and research data, one could expect women to be more sensitive to differences in pronunciation. Tentative predictions can be made as to how this sensitivity would affect standardness ratings to the - generally highly standard - speech presented to them. One could argue that women are ‘kinder’ in their evaluation and generally give higher standardness ratings, and one could expect women ‘to reprimand’ speakers for deviating from the standard language and this would mean that regional speech would receive low standardness ratings. Men, on the other hand, may be indifferent to much of the variation they perceive. They may, for instance, give less varied ratings than women. It may be assumed that female evaluations are more varied.

9.4 SPEAKER SELECTION

Three speakers

Figure 9.1 contains a ranking order of speakers on the basis of the average standardness rating they received from the listeners. The four regional fragments are
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included in the figure. The evaluations of the speakers are put in descending order from speaker 1 on the left end (the speaker with the highest standardness rating) to speaker 34 on the right end (the speaker with the lowest standardness rating). The three striped bars on the left end represent the three highest-scoring speakers, who stand out for reasons explained below. The black bars to the right represent the four regional fragments.

![Graph showing ranking of 34 speakers on the basis of average standardness rating.]

Figure 9.1: Ranking order of 34 speakers on the basis of average standardness rating, going from left (highest rating) to right (lowest rating).

There is a gradual decline of standardness scores from Speaker 1 until Speaker 27. The three highest-scoring speakers nevertheless stand out to some degree, because after speaker 3 the average makes a drop of .2 points. Speakers 27 to 31 reveal a strong decline in the scores, and speakers 32 to 34 represent the three lowest scores.

The difference between the three top speakers and speaker 4 in the hierarchy is not significant (2-tailed, .05), namely .11, and neither is the difference between speaker 3 and 4 (also .11). On the other hand, the average rating of the top three speakers (7.6) is significantly (2-tailed, p<.01) different from the average ratings of the rest of the speakers (6.5). This significance remains when the regional fragments are excluded (in which case the average goes up to 6.7). So, although it is subtle, this suggests a difference between these three speakers and the others.

To make clear the degree of agreement on the above ratings, and to gain more insight into the agreement on the top speakers, the standard deviations of the standardness ratings are placed in Figure 9.2. The speakers are in the same left-to-
right order as in Figure 9.1. The bars pertaining to the exceptional three speakers are again striped, and the bars representing regional fragments are again black.

![Bar Chart](image)

**Figure 9.2: Standard deviations of the standardness ratings of Figure 9.1.**

The above figure affirms the impression that speakers 1, 2, and 3 stand out. The listeners agreed most on the high standardness of the speech of these three speakers over all the other speakers. So, these three speakers not only emerge as a group on the basis of their average standardness ratings, but the agreement on the (high) standardness of their speech is highest of all as well.

Table 9.1 presents additional information on the ratings of these three speakers. As a comparison, the speaker with both the lowest standardness rating and the highest standard deviation (not including the regional fragments) is included, namely GW (speaker 30 in Figure 9.1 and 9.2), the oldest speaker in the material.
CHAPTER 9

Table 9.1: The three highest-scoring speakers and the lowest-scoring speaker on the NOT STANDARD DUTCH - STANDARD DUTCH scale. The three highest-scoring speakers constituted the First Corpus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rank</th>
<th>speaker</th>
<th>at time of recording</th>
<th>standardness rating</th>
<th>recording decade</th>
<th>standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>highest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>33-35</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>1990s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>35-37</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>1970s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>30-32</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>1990s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lowest</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>GW</td>
<td>48-50</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>1950s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Matching these mean standardness ratings with the labels used in the Dutch educational system³, we see that the speech of the highest-scoring three speakers can all be qualified as being between ‘highly sufficient’ (=7) and ‘good’ (=8). These three ratings are closer to ‘good’ than to ‘highly sufficient’, and this is true for none of the other speakers. The standardness ratings for JJ and NS are the smallest of all standard deviations. This is not due to a strong ceiling effect (as will become clear from Figure 9.3). The lowest mean standardness rating is just below ‘sufficient’ and pertains to GW. The standard deviation of the ratings for this speaker (2.30) is the largest of all standard deviations. Figure 9.3 shows the distribution of ratings of the three highest-scoring speakers and GW.

The top three speakers were not given less than a 3 (‘very insufficient’) by any of the listeners, and JJ (number 1) did not obtain anything less than 4 (‘insufficient’). It should be clear that although speakers JJ, NS, and TH received the highest average standardness ratings and the lowest standard deviations, there is nonetheless considerable variation amongst listeners. The top three speakers received both high and low ratings, and so did GW. This listener disagreement is dealt with next.

---

³ The names of the speakers are John Jaspers (JJ), Noud Smelt (NS), Tom Herlaar (TH), and Guus Weitzel (GW).

⁴ This system qualifies grades as follows: 10=excellent (uitmuntend); 9=very good (zeer goed); 8=good (goed); 7=highly sufficient (ruim voldoende); 6=sufficient (voldoende); 5=almost sufficient (bijna voldoende); 4=insufficient (onnodoende); 3=very insufficient (zeer onvoldoende); 2=poor (slecht); 1=very poor (zeer slecht).
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Figure 9.3: Distribution of standardness ratings for four speakers: JJ (1st position in the standardness hierarchy), NS (2nd position), TH (3rd position), and GW (4th position).

Subgroups of listeners

The reliability of the ratings by listeners is high, namely .94 (alpha, raters random, n=105). This reliability is .93 when the regional fragments are excluded. As was said earlier (and see Figures 9.2 and 9.3), not all listeners agreed in the same way on the degree of standardness of the speech of the speakers. In fact, when we look at the standardness ratings by individual listeners we see that in a number of cases the speakers who obtained the highest average ratings were in fact given the personal lowest ratings by a number of listeners. An effort was made, therefore, to see whether the group of 114 listeners could be broken down into smaller groups on the
basis of individual evaluative behaviour. The correlation coefficients (Pearson, 2-
tailed) were calculated between the individual ratings of each listener and the overall
average ratings. The listeners whose ranking behaviour deviated significantly
($p<.05$) from the overall average ratings were looked at separately. There was a
number of listeners for whom this was the case, and this group of listeners can be
called the Deviant Group ($n=31$), as opposed to the Regular Group ($n=83$). The
evaluations of the latter group were to a high degree in sink with the overall average.
The average standardness rating of each individual speaker by the Deviant Group
was put side by side with the average standardness rating of each speaker by the
Regular Group. In other words; for each speaker, two standardness ratings were
calculated: the one by the Deviant Group and the one by the Regular Group. These
two standardness ratings for each speaker were compared, and differences were
encountered of up to 2.5 points for certain fragments/speakers. Only differences of
over 1.0 between these two ratings were considered ‘large’. This threshold yielded a
group of five fragments, including the four regional fragments. The fifth fragment
was a non-regional fragment from the 1970s. The disagreement between the two
groups on the sixth speaker in this hierarchy was .98, and this drop in the difference
after the fifth speaker (from 1.49 to .98) was considered enough to separate these
fragments from the remaining ones.

It is clear that the difference in the evaluative behaviour between the Regular
Group and Deviant Group can largely be attributed to the disagreement on the
standardness of the named five fragments. Table 9.2 shows these fragments. Their
ranks amongst the other fragments are visible, along with their average standardness
rating and the standard deviation of these ratings. The difference between the
standardness ratings of each of the five fragments between the Deviant Group and
the Regular Group is indicated as well. This ‘difference’ column (on the right end of
the table) is the basis of the way the fragments are ordered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>fragment</th>
<th>Deviant Group ($&lt;.05, n=31$)</th>
<th>Regular Group ($&lt;.05, n=83$)</th>
<th>difference rel. to Regular Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rank</td>
<td>standard-ness rating</td>
<td>st. dev.</td>
<td>rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regional 1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regional 2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regional 3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-reg. 70s</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regional 4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regional fragments seemed to be crucial in the coming to existence of the
subgroups. Disagreement on these fragments in particular was considerable between
the groups. Although the regional fragments were distracters, the evaluations by
respondents of these fragments provide relevant insights into the evaluative
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behaviour of listeners. The members of the Deviant Group were considerably more liberal towards the idea of giving high standardness scores to regional speech than the members of the Regular Group were. The two ‘rank’ columns show this most clearly.

Significant differences existed between the number of members of these two groups in the three age groups and between the number of listeners with different educational levels (age: $\chi^2=10.12$, $df=2$, $p<.01$, educational level: $\chi^2=6.20$, $df=1$, $p<.01$). The Deviant Group was significantly older and significantly less educated$. The average age in the Deviant Group is 52.7 years old and 40.9 in the Regular Group. The evaluations by the Deviant Group support what was hypothesised in 9.2, namely that older listeners distinguish less between fragments and do not reject regional fragments as much as younger listeners do. Indeed, the range of the ratings by the Deviant Group (i.e. the older group) was smaller than that by the Regular Group. The low educational level of the Deviant Group in combination with the tolerance towards regional speech makes sense, as those with lower educational levels are more likely to speak with regional accents than those with a high educational level. So, the results suggest sympathy and tolerance towards varieties that are sociolinguistically similar to the listeners own speech themselves.

Within the Deviant Group, three subgroups can be distinguished on the basis of evaluations of the five speakers of Table 9.2. Seven listeners gave higher standardness ratings to the regional fragments than to non-regional fragments. So, these listeners viewed regional speech as being more standard than non-regional speech. This may reflect some type of moral stance. Eight listeners gave their personal lowest rating$^5$ to the 1970s speaker, while the overall group of listeners ranked this speaker high$. This may be due to one or more specific phonemes, or other characteristics, that other listeners were not sensitive to, in the 1970s stimulus fragment. Six listeners hardly differentiated between speakers, or not at all; the range of the standardness ratings each of these listeners gave was 0, 1, or 2. The fact that this group contains no members of the Young Group is yet another indication that the pronunciation variation within the fragments was apparently no cause for them to distinguish between fragments on the standardness dimension. An equally plausible explanation is that older listeners experienced difficulties in performing the tasks, as a result of bad hearing, or other factors, and, perhaps, were not comfortable evaluating monotonised (distorted) speech.

---

5 Note that level of education and age correlate to a degree, as younger people are generally more highly educated.
6 This could mean that this speaker was the only one who received this low rating by a specific listener, but it could also mean that he was amongst the speakers who received the personal lowest rating.
7 Two stimulus tapes were used, and because to some of the listeners speaker 30 was the first speaker in the experiment (after the five introductory fragments), while for others he was the last, it was suspected that an order effect had occurred. This was not the case; the eight members of group 2 consisted of three listeners who had used a stimulus tape with one order, and five who used a stimulus tape with the other order.
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If we group together the listeners in these three groups (taking into consideration that certain listeners belonged to more than one of the groups), we get a total of 15 listeners. The other 16 listeners in the Deviant Group cannot be categorised in any way. (This does not tell us anything about the quality or reliability of the rating behaviour of these 16; it only means that the ratings each of these listeners gave had a unique pattern.) A subset of the 15 listeners may give an idea of the size and nature of the listeners in Dutch society who genuinely disagree with the majority.

9.5 EFFECTS OF LISTENER CHARACTERISTICS

The effects of four listener characteristics (age, regional origin, educational level, and sex) on standardness ratings were tested. Interactions were looked for between listener characteristics. The only significant interaction was between sex and regional origin.

Age (in combination with period of recording)

The standardness ratings of each recording decade by each age group were calculated. In Table 9.3, the relevant data are given. The bolded dates represent the decades when the majority of the members of each age group did most of their growing up. The decade with the highest rating for each age group is greyed.

Table 9.3: Mean standardness ratings of five recording periods by three age groups of listeners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>listener age group</th>
<th>standardness all decades (N=30)</th>
<th>standardness per decade</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1950s (n=5)</td>
<td>1960s (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-27 (n=41)</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>6.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-47 (n=27)</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>7.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58+ (n=46)</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td><strong>6.14</strong></td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no significant differences between the groups (df=2, F (2.111)=1.403, p>.05). If each generation of listeners preferred the speech of their own generation of speakers (see Section 9.2), then the Old Group would give the highest standardness ratings to speech from the 1950s (or earlier), the Intermediate Group to speech from the 1970s, and the Young Group to speech from the 1990s. This suggestion is not borne out at all. It is true that in the case of the Young Group and Intermediate Group this ‘norm decade’ obtained the highest standardness rating, but the development of standardness ratings over time by these two age groups is unstructured. In the Young Group, the standardness rating of the 1990s fragments (7.02) is the highest, but the lowest rating (1970s=6.49) lies between (in time) the highest rating and the second highest rating (1960s=6.89). The ratings of the Intermediate Group are also not in line with what one would expect, for the standardness rating of the 1990s fragments (7.25) does not deviate significantly (<.05) from the 1970s standardness rating (7.29). The standardness ratings for the
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Old Group are altogether opposite to the hypothesis: their lowest average
standardness rating (6.14) was given to the speakers who are supposed to be their
norm speakers, namely 1950s speakers.

A general analysis of variance shows no age effect, but there is an effect for
decade ($F=8.792, df=4, 444, p<.01$) and for the decade-by-age interaction ($F=3.018,$
$df=8.444, p<.01$). An analysis of variance was performed per decade, to explore
the age differences: only the 1970s showed a significant difference between the age
groups. The difference between the Young and the Intermediate age groups was .80
(6.49 and 7.29), and this difference was significant (post-hoc analysis, Tukey
procedure: $p<.05$). As for the decades, $t$-tests were performed (Bon Ferroni
procedure). All significant differences were between the 1950s and the other
decades.

Regional origin, level of education, and sex

The difference between the Authoritative and Peripheral Listeners is not significant
($r=.45, df=112, p<.05$). This corroborates the findings of Van Bezooijen and Van
den Berg (2001) on the evaluations of Polder Dutch and Standard Dutch by western
and non-western listeners. Regional origin apparently plays no considerable role in
standardness evaluations of non-regional speech. The difference between the
standardness ratings by highly and lowly educated listeners is not significant either
($r=.812, df=112, p<.05$). Educational level is apparently not a factor in the evaluation
of non-regional speech although the listeners with a lower educational level were
less likely to speak Standard Dutch.

The expectation was that men and women would somehow give different
ratings, but it was also established that it would be difficult to predict how these
differences in evaluative behaviour would turn out. It was suggested that female
listeners would give more varied ratings and endorse a high degree of standardness
in speech. There was a main effect for sex; the women respondents gave
significantly higher standardness ratings ($F=5.647, df=1, 95, p<.05$). Perhaps the
female listeners rewarded the high degree of standardness. Another explanation of
our results could be that the women attached more importance to standard-like
speech than men and therefore gave this type of speech higher standardness ratings,
as a type of reward to the speaker for speaking ‘properly’. The difference between
the standard deviations is not significant (Levine: $F=1.937, p<.05$), so the suggestion
that women gave more varied ratings is not borne out. There was a significant
interaction between regional origin and sex, and this puts the higher female
standardness ratings into perspective. In Table 9.4 are the results.
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Table 9.4: Interaction (standardness) between regional origin and sex.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sex of listeners</th>
<th>Authoritative Listeners</th>
<th>Peripheral Listeners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>standardness rating</td>
<td>standard deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>standardness rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>standard deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>men (n=62)</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women (n=52)</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Female Peripheral Listeners gave significantly lower standardness ratings than female Authoritative Listeners (2-tailed, \( F=6.162, df=1, 95, p<.05 \)). All other differences are not significant. This result sheds light on earlier results on the rating behaviour of the two sexes and of listeners with various regional origins. It seems that female Authoritative Listeners are the odd ones out, giving exceptionally high standardness ratings, and they are mainly responsible for the sex difference found earlier. It is possible that members of this group in particular are forerunners in the establishment of standardness norms, resulting in progressive rating behaviour. This group may be outspoken because they feel that they determine much of the norm. This is in line with suggestions by Stroop (1998:83-91).

The evaluation of regional speech

It was found that the evaluation of regional speech is structured in specific ways. To find out whether indeed systematicity exists in this area, the effects were tested of listener characteristics on the evaluation of regional fragments. Earlier results (see Section 9.4) suggested that non-regional speech is evaluated similarly by listeners with certain demographic features, while at the same time attitudes towards regional speech are what distinguishes these groups. Only the difference between the age groups was significant (\( p<.01 \)), specifically between the youngest and intermediate age group (\( df=1, F=7.481, p<.01 \)) and between the youngest and oldest age group (\( df=1, F=7.00, p<.01 \)). The Young Group reacted strongly to regional speech, giving it particularly low standardness ratings (4.94 versus 5.60/5.60 for the other two age groups). This contradicts Daan (1983:474), who had experienced younger listeners to be less critical towards regional speech. Our results seem to imply that regional traces in speech are becoming less accepted. Younger listeners distinguish more between regional and non-regional speech. This is in line with the hypothesis made earlier that to older listeners regionality is not as relevant in determining whether speech is standard.

9.6 CONCLUSION

This chapter focussed specifically on the evaluations of the degree of standardness of Dutch speech. With these evaluations, two aims were satisfied. First of all, a selection was made of speakers whose degree of standardness was highest according to a majority of listeners. These speakers provide part of the speech material for the phonetic description of this dissertation (described in chapters 11 and 12). The
named selection procedure yielded three male radio presenters, two of which were from the 1990s, the time when the listening experiment was done. One of them was from the 1970s.

The second aim of looking at standardness evaluations was to gain insight into the nature of agreement, specifically under the influence of listener characteristics. There was agreement on the high degree of standardness of the speech of these three speakers, yet subgroups of listeners could be distinguished on the basis of evaluative behaviour. The evaluations by a subgroup were not in accordance with the general tendency. Roughly a quarter of the listener group somehow gave consistently deviant evaluations. The group that deviated from the general trend was older and less educated. This group may generally represent listeners whose view of the standardness of speech deviates from the majority of Dutchmen, albeit that a further look at the evaluations yielded the impression that part of this group had less control over the tasks to be performed, giving highly irregular evaluations. Amongst them, for instance, were those who considered regional speech to be more standard than non-regional speech. Another possible reason is that these listeners were less capable of doing the listening experiment reliably. The evaluations of regional speech by various listener groups were also looked at. Only age played a significant role, and younger listeners reacted most negatively to regional speech.

Regional origin and level of education of listeners did not affect evaluations of non-regional speech significantly. Interestingly, listeners did not systematically award the highest ratings to the speech from the period when they grew up. Men gave significantly lower ratings than women. There was, furthermore, a significant interaction between sex and regional origin. Female authoritative listeners gave the highest ratings.
STANDARD DUTCH PRONUNCIATION
10. PHONEMES IN THE LITERATURE

10.1 INTRODUCTION

In 1795, French troops entered the Netherlands and continued the revolution that had started in France in 1789. In the subsequent period, serious attempts towards language construction were made in the Netherlands, which were initiated by the French. These construction efforts led to an archaic and unnatural style in writing. By the start of the 19th Century, this development was increasingly met with critical discussion, resulting in a large amount of reactionary literature on this subject appearing from this time onwards (see Van Beers 1855:V). The effects of this lively and constructive discussion on Dutch are still visible nowadays, and Hagen (1990:32) believed that today’s spoken Standard Dutch is actually mainly a remnant of the 19th Century. He was convinced that before this time there was considerably less agreement on the standard pronunciation.

This interest in Dutch brought about a steady flow of language descriptions, which continued into the 20th Century. As a result, numerous insightful descriptions of the pronunciation of modern-time Dutch are today available. In this chapter, the 19th and 20th Century literature on the pronunciation of Dutch is looked at, i.e. the literature from the moment when elaborate descriptions became more common.

Chapter overview

Section 10.2 lists a number of practical and theoretical issues and the consequences that these had for the research. The general nature of sound descriptions in the two named centuries are explained in that section, and the relevance of the distinction between short-term and long-term variation is explained. This section also explains the selection of the phonemes under investigation and describes the empirical part of this chapter, namely the Phoneme Evaluation Survey.

Sections 10.3 to 10.7 contains the literature from the 19th and 20th Century on the phonemes under investigation: on (v) and (z) (Section 10.3), (g) (Section 10.4), (r) (Section 10.5), (ee), (eu), and (oo) (Section 10.6), and, finally, (ei), (ui), and (ou) (Section 10.7). Section 10.8 presents the results of the Phoneme Evaluation Survey, namely the hierarchy of acceptability of various controversial pronunciation tendencies in modern-day Standard Dutch. Section 10.9, finally, summarises the tendencies found and makes predictions regarding future tendencies and about the results of chapters 11 and 12.

10.2 PRELIMINARIES

When presenting a literature overview of descriptions of segmental vowel and consonant qualities in the 19th and 20th Century, the former period will inevitably be over-represented. This is due to the 19th Century booming interest in the Dutch language. Literature from the 20th Century, on the other hand, is generally more
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reliable due to its superior scientific basis and is generally affected less by personal convictions. Phonetic descriptions from the 19th and 20th Century are generally of a different nature. Descriptions in the course of the 19th Century became progressively more detailed, and the emphasis shifted towards actual language usage and away from theoretical norms. By the beginning of the 20th Century, descriptions that were of a prescriptive nature, and that were to a considerable degree inspired by spelling, had started to give way to a more objective descriptivism. From this time onwards, sounds were considered the primary building blocks of the language, and the written letter became a matter of secondary concern in the representation of living language.

This new approach boosted the study of the phonetics of language. The detailed physiological study of sounds advanced considerably due to the use of measuring instruments, moving the examination of pronunciation from the study to the laboratory. Due to the collaboration between physiology and linguistics, the understanding of human speech really took off in the 20th Century. In the Netherlands, the most notable product of this was the Leerboek der phonetiek ('Course in phonetics') by Zwaardemaker and Eykman from 1928, and the synergy of disciplines continued after this noticeable publication. In the course of the 20th Century, other disciplines were increasingly turned to to describe and explain pronunciation, such as sociology and psychology. Today's literature almost as a rule incorporates such non-linguistic disciplines in the description of language, including pronunciation.

Phonetic descriptions of the 19th and 20th Century

Phonetic descriptions from the 19th Century are notoriously hard to interpret. Until the midst of that century, orthography was regularly used as a starting point and a handle to prescribe pronunciation models, and today's readers of these writings often find themselves wondering whether actual speech or spelling is discussed. Phonemes that were likely to be monophthongal were sometimes referred to as diphthongs on the basis of their spelling (for instance eu). Also, early descriptions were not always complete, and oftentimes several reference works need to be consulted to obtain descriptions of the place and manner of articulation of a phoneme. The obscurity of articulatory descriptions, too, makes reading 19th Century descriptions problematic. Voiced sounds were, for instance, regularly referred to as 'soft' sounds, while the term 'softness' was used with respect to tension as well. Some writers described uvular sounds as 'throat sounds', whereas others used this qualification for velar realisations. Many 19th Century writers in fact did not make this important distinction between velar and uvular when discussing sounds produced in the back of the mouth. Other examples of obscure descriptions exist as well, such as those describing the number and type of speakers who speak the standard language (for instance a description like 'certain respected speakers') and regional references ('from the central part of the east of the Netherlands') and references to the nature of sounds ('a clearly vulgar pronunciation').

Another obstacle in the interpretation of literature from the 19th Century in particular is the definition of the language variety discussed. It is not always clear
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whether writers were referring to the accepted standard language, the Dutch
language in general, or the language from the Holland area (and Holland cities in
particular). It is up to the reader to assess whether a standard-like variety is referred
to. Moreover, not only the phonemes of Standard Dutch have been changing since
but the standard-language concept as well, making any interpretation and
comparison with today tentative.

To deal with some of these obstacles, the descriptions used by writers are in this
chapter in most cases translated into IPA symbols, and words and descriptions are
converted into modern terminology. This is done only in cases where the writer’s
intended meaning was clear. In some cases, the terminology and use of symbols
used by the writers themselves are maintained for practical reasons. Also, the text
distinguishes between Standard Dutch and the Dutch language in general.

To get an idea of the variation in the pronunciation of the standard language
today, a distinction should be made between variation that is recent and variation
that has existed for a longer period. Variation may be a potential precursor of
language change, and one of two or more pronunciation alternatives existing side by
side may start to gain dominance. Variation that has existed for a longer time is
more likely to be indicative of alternatives existing alongside each other, in a
relatively stable situation. Some variation appears in both old and new literature, and
the evaluations of this variation appear not to change much, whereas other variation
started to be noticed only recently. Certain variation, finally, has come and gone.

Our investigation focuses on both old and new variation and incorporates the
‘age’ of variation to make predictions as to future realisations in Standard Dutch.

Selecting phonemes for investigation

Phonemes were selected for the present description. The choice to describe certain
phonemes and not others makes sense for two reasons. First of all, there is the range
in possible articulations of a phoneme and in their perceptual salience. Some
phonemes can be articulated in a limited number of ways, while the differences
between various articulations of these phonemes are hardly audible. Examples of
such phonemes are intervocalic (m) and (b), which are in Dutch pronounced
bilabially and most usually with voice, for instance, in words such as nemen (‘to
take’) and debet (‘debts’). Articulatory differences between realisations of these
two phonemes, especially in this position, are not perceptually dominant or relevant.
Another class of phonemes is subject to realisational variation but is not subject to
any great debate as to their realisation within the standard language. Examples of
such phonemes are (aa) and syllable-initial (i), for instance in the words aap
(‘monkey’) and tegel (‘tile’). In certain varieties of Dutch, the latter phoneme is
strongly aspirated. Any strongly aspirated syllable-initial (i)¹ is widely considered

¹ Italicise denote written occurrences, parentheses are used to refer to pronunciation
variables. The latter are inspired by the written shape of the variable, but there is no one-
to-one relationship between the letters between parentheses and the way the variable
appears in writing: (ou) refers to the written forms au and ou, (ei) refers to ei and ij, and
(g) incorporates the written forms g and ch.
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not part of Standard Dutch. The backing of (aa) takes place in, amongst others, certain Brabant (area in the south of the Netherlands) varieties, but the non-standardness of this realisation is undisputed.

The focus in our research is on ‘controversial’ phonemes, namely those that are subject to variation and change within standardised Dutch, both from a production and a perception point of view. It is assumed that these phonemes in particular play an important role in the evaluation of Standard Dutch.

The prime source of information in the selection of phonemes for the present and next two chapters is the literature, which gives us a good idea of which phoneme realisations have over the years been regarded as controversial as to their standardness. After looking at the literature and previous research into the pronunciation of Dutch in the Netherlands, four consonants were selected, namely (v), (z), (g), and (r), and six vowels, namely (ee), (eu), (oo), (ei), (ui), and (ou). These phonemes are mentioned by far most frequently in both old and contemporary literature.

The Phoneme Evaluation Survey

In the Phoneme Evaluation Survey (see Section 5.7), respondents were presented with a number of pronunciation phenomena in Dutch. They were asked to what extent these phenomena were acceptable in Standard Dutch. The phenomena are listed in Section 10.4. The respondents were given this list of realisations (explained in lay terms), and they were asked to evaluate them using a scale from NOT AT ALL ACCEPTABLE IN STANDARD DUTCH (=1) to REQUIRED IN STANDARD DUTCH (=5). The results of this survey are discussed in Section 10.4.

10.3 (v)/(z)

Voiced versus voiceless

The devoicing of voiced fricatives (v) and (z) regularly appears in the literature as a change that is taking place in Dutch today (Gussenhoven 1992, Van der Wal & Van Bree 1992, Van de Velde 1996). The difference between voiced and voiceless depends on the presence or absence of activity of the pharyngeal constrictor muscle. This muscle influences the volume of the pharynx, the position of the larynx, and consequently the pressure drop across the glottis and the vibration condition of the vocal cords. These are all activities taking place in the back of the speech tract. In the front part of the tract, variation in the tension of the lips, tongue tip, and tongue blade can cause audible variation too. This variation is easily (perceptually) confused with variation in voice; relaxed muscles in voiceless fricatives may evoke associations with voicedness. Unfortunately, in the older literature on this subject this important distinction between voiced and lax is not usually made explicit, making it hard for the reader to know whether voice is present in the sounds described.
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Another important phenomenon that is not generally dealt with explicitly in the older literature is the effect that neighbouring phonemes have on each other. The literature does not always reveal unambiguously whether devoicing that takes place under the influence of neighbouring segments is referred to or devoicing that depends less on phonetic context. This distinction is relevant, as the devoicing of voiced fricatives in word-initial position is generally considered less marked than the devoicing of voiced fricatives in intervocalic position (Van der Wal & Van Bree 1992:413). In fact, the former type of devoicing seems to be turning into a pronunciation requirement in Standard Dutch.

Voice of context and degree of muscle tension

There are numerous instances of 19th Century and early 20th Century writers calling attention to the devoicing of fricatives under the influence of neighbouring voiceless consonants: Mulder (1846:26), Te Winkel (1863), Brill (1864:5, 1871:10,39), Hoogvliet (1908:16), Rijpma and Schuringa (1917:16), Den Hertog (1919:220). The devoicing of fricatives irrespective of phonetic context started to be mentioned by a growing number of writers a few decades into the 20th Century, in particular in relation with (v) and (z). Van Haeringen (1924b:14, footnote) observed that certain Dutch speakers were ‘sharpening’ their (v)’s and (z)’s. Van Haeringen did not condemn this tendency. Zwaardemaker and Eijkman (1928:179), a few years on, were more outspoken - and seemingly worried - about this devoicing process, and they referred to the realisation of (v) as (f) as a feature of uncivilised and dialectal speech. Varieties in which in their view this devoicing took place in particular were the Amsterdam and Frisian dialects.

By the middle of the 20th Century, the rise of devoiced (v)’s and (z)’s in voiced contexts in Standard Dutch was still a popular topic in the literature. The Flemish linguist Blancquaert (1942:116) felt that in the Netherlands all (v)’s were transforming into (f)’s, irrespective of where they occurred in the syllable, and he believed that the same thing was happening with (z), which in his perception had started to sound like (s). He did not see any reason to support anlaut (f) and (s) over (v) and (z). De Voogys (1946:23) said that for many Dutchmen word-initial (f) and (v) were not easily distinguishable, and Blancquaert (1950:43), a few years later, even suggested that the distinction between Dutch voiced and voiceless consonants may disappear eventually. Speakers from Holland, Blancquaert said, were forerunners in this shift, having realised approximately three quarters of this merging process. Blancquaert objected to this development but nevertheless considered it unstoppable.

Later research focused on a feature other than voice to explain the change that was obviously taking place, namely the degree of muscle tension of the lips and the tongue during production. According to Rijpma and Schuringa (1968:50), (v) and (z) were often devoiced at the beginning of words, while the difference between (v) and (f) on the one hand, and between (z) and (s) on the other, remained audible, due to (in their view) the weaker breath movement during the production of ‘devoiced’ (as opposed to ‘voiceless’) sounds.
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Devoicing today

The degree of devoicing of (v) and (z) is still subject to discussion today, despite the fact that this tendency has obviously existed for a considerable period of time already. Van Bree (1977:293, 298, 303) pointed towards a trend in the Dutch language to dispose of the voiced/voiceless distinction in fricatives and for the voiceless members of these pairs to be dominant. Van der Wal and Van Bree (1992:413) considered the devoicing of voiced fricatives a peculiarity from the Holland area, which is starting to penetrate the standard language (thus, like Van Bree, making it sound almost like a recent tendency). A more realistic and up-to-date view came from Daan (1983:484), according to whom the pronunciation rules for Dutch fricatives should include calling the various realisations allophones or free variants because of the absence of, according to Daan, a voiced-voiceless correlation in the use of fricatives, especially in those of Hollanders.

As for the question which of these two fricatives has devoiced furthest, Van der Wal and Van Bree (1994:413) and Gussenhoven (1981) hypothesised that the devoicing of (v) is more acceptable than that of (z). Gussenhoven’s (1981) research suggested that this devoicing order (of acceptability) - i.e. (v) before (z) - is indeed realistic. Van de Velde’s (1996) research corroborated this.

A minor practical problem arises should (v) merge with (f), or (z) with (s). For (f)/(v) and (s)/(z), minimal pairs can be formed. Examples are: *fee/vee* (“fairy”/’cattle’) and *saai/zaaien* (’dull’/’to sow’). Although such minimal pairs are relatively rare, the awareness of such merging may be a reason why a complete merge has to date not occurred. More plausible reasons are the urge to maintain existing pronunciation distinctions and the influence of spelling.

10.4 (g)

Voiced versus voiceless (g versus ch) in the 19th Century

In Standard Dutch, two dominant realisations of (g) have traditionally existed. They are the voiced realisation, which was usually written as g, and the voiceless realisation, which was usually written as ch. Words with ch have always been considerably less numerous than words with g, which means that (g) is in most cases voiced within this system. The devoicing of (g) in a word with g could today only in some exceptional cases cause ambiguity, for instance in *Wijchen/wijgen* (Dutch toponym/’to rock’).

Most 19th Century writers presumed the existence of a voice distinction; for instance Mulder (1846) and Van Beers (1856:11). This is also indirectly demonstrated by the literature repeatedly placing the g/ch pair alongside the v/f and z/s pairs. Van der Wal and Van Bree (1994:413) considered it likely that the devoicing tendency of the Dutch voiced fricatives ((v), (z), and (g)) started with (g) and that voice differences in (g) realisations were only rarely distinctive.
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Gussenhoven (1981), in accordance with this, believed the voice/voiceless distinction in (g) to simply be less relevant than in (v).

Unfortunately, the literature on (g) is not always clear on whether spelling or pronunciation is referred to. Early writers were sometimes referring to voiced sounds, because these were denoted with the letter g, irrespective of whether they were actually pronounced with voice. This makes the interpretation of the literature on (g) tentative.

Velar versus uvular in the 19th Century

Today, the two main places of articulation of (g) mentioned are velar and uvular. In the 19th Century literature on (g), a distinction between velar and uvular places of articulation was not as a rule explicitly made yet. It is not always clear which of the two pronunciation places writers had in mind, as they tended to refer to either g or ch as a ‘throat letter’ (Beyer 1820:213, 1839:171, Mulder 1846, Van Beers 1856:10, Te Winkel 1884:66, Cosijn 1886). In Cosijn’s (1886:20) view, for instance, throat letters were produced by means of the back of the tongue and the soft palate, i.e. uvularly. However, some writers gave descriptions of throat letters that came down to a velar place of articulation.

Certain writers did distinguish explicitly between places of articulation of (g). Brill (1846:14-15), as for instance, distinguished between the throat and the velum. These writers agreed on the more fronted (velar) articulation of the voiced realisation, which makes sense (it can be physically strenuous to produce a voiced uvular fricative). The voiceless realisation was, then, a proper ‘throat sound’, i.e. with a uvular place of articulation. Bilderdijk (1826:7, 43) distinguished between the throat and the palate, the former apparently meaning the hard palate. He described ch as being produced by means of the throat and the palate and g in the throat. He said that ch was ‘almost retrieved from the chest’, which most likely hints to the (h)-like quality of ch, i.e. with a considerable, audible flow or air (or a scraping sound).

The early 20th Century situation

In the first few decades of the 20th Century, the grown awareness of the voiced/voiceless distinction, the effects of phonological context, and the velar/uvular distinction gave rise to a multitude of speculative and intuitive descriptions in the literature. Rijpma and Schuringa (1917:14) called (g) a guttural sound that was velar but sometimes also pronounced between the velar and uvular place of articulation. To Verdam (1923:41), (g) was a fricative pronounced through the hard or soft palate, depending on the nature of the preceding vowel. Van Haeringen (1924b:22-23) felt that rasped uvular (g) was the most common realisation of (g) (but he did not approve). He considered the strong perceptual similarity of burred (r) to rasped uvular (g) a reason to favour palatalised (g). According to Zwaardemaker and

2 Original Dutch citation: hyna van uit de borst opgehaald.
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Eijkman (1928:X-XII, 194-196, 214), finally, the two most common realisations of (g) were a voiced and a voiceless velar fricative, but they also discussed retracted, uvularised versions, which, so they claimed, were equally common.

So, after at least a century of presumed certainty on (g) there turned out to be little agreement as to place and manner of articulation and the presence of voice in this phoneme in the early 20th Century.

The first half of the 20th Century

A few decades into the 20th Century, the disagreement was settled partly, and the conviction arose that the voiced/voiceless distinction was surely disappearing in the speech of speakers of Standard Dutch. (It is likely that in practice this distinction had already disappeared some time earlier and was only kept alive in the literature.) De Vooys (1946:16), for instance, distinguished between voiced and voiceless (g) but noted that word-initially devoicing of (g) took place. It became widely acknowledged that voice in Standard Dutch was dependent on phonetic context, but different views existed between writers as to the degree of acceptability of devoicing. Zwaardemaker and Eijkman (1928:195) wondered whether the voiced/voiceless distinction for (g) was still characteristic of standard-like speech, and so did Van Wijk (1939:195) and Van Haeringen (1949b:8).

The second half of the 20th Century

Some years into the second half of the century, Rijpma (1964:12) still described (g) as voiced or voiceless, depending on its phonological position, and so did Rijpma and Schuringa (1968:51), but by most other writers the devoicing of (g) in Standard Dutch had started to be considered a rule rather than an exception. According to the Flemish linguist Goossens (1974:27), the voiced/voiceless opposition was absent in the Holland area. He did leave open the option of variation and considered both the existence of a voiced/voiceless distinction and the devoicing of all (g)’s to be typical of standard-like speech. Paardekooper (1978:XIII) said something similar. Mees and Collins (1982) had the impression that only few speakers of Standard Dutch actually distinguished between voiced and voiceless (g) and instead produced the voiceless version in all cases, and so did Boves (1992:81). Like Van Haeringen, over 40 years earlier, they considered voiceless (g) to be the standard pronunciation.

Not all contemporary writers have been convinced that the complete devoicing of (g) has been finalised. Van der Wal and Van Bree (1994:413) in fact considered the devoicing of Dutch fricatives, including (g), a tendency on its way to becoming part of the standard language, especially at the beginning of words, so in their view it is not yet fully finalised.

The articulation place remains a point of discussion. The devoicing of (g) has in the 20th Century literature run parallel to hints towards retracted places of articulation. Van de Velde (1996) found a development towards uvular pronunciations in Standard Dutch in the Netherlands, at the expense of various other realisations.
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A marked realisation of (g) is the so-called ‘soft (g)’ (zachte (g)). This type of (g) is soft in the sense that it contains relatively little rasping and carries voice. Mees and Collins (1982) described zachte (g) as velar (or post-palatal), and they suggested that it may contain voice. Van den Berg (1969), Goeman (1993), and Van de Velde (1996:90) all suggested that place of articulation rather than voice is the main determinant of the softness (or not) of (g).

Rasp

From the early 19th Century onwards, writers occasionally referred to an upcoming rasped pronunciation quality of (g). Bilderdijk (1826:7), for instance, mentioned friction in the throat during the production of (g). Brill (1871) described both g and ch as phonemes that were produced by means of a scratching sound. Unfortunately, it is unclear whether these early writers were referring to a degree of additional rasping or were merely referring to the natural and inevitable scratching quality of (g), particularly uvular (g).

Van der Wal and Van Bree (1994:413) talked about the occurrence in the 19th Century literature of a ‘hawkings’ pronunciation3 of (g) in the Holland cities (resembling the sound of someone clearing their throat), and Haarlem in particular. Rasping had gained ground in the 20th Century, they said. The Flemish linguist Blancquart (1934:120) indicated that in the Netherlands quite a few people were pronouncing both (g)’s further in the back of the mouth and pointed out that this had led to a rasping sound. He (1950:15, 113-114) some years later talked about the strongly rasped version (and also about the version with too little friction, and he rejected both). The time when rasping actually started to become adopted by large groups of speakers is difficult to determine. Today, rasping seems to be growing in frequency and degree in the speech of certain speakers; Van de Velde (1996) in his research found an increasingly loud rasping in the production of (g) in the 1930s-1990s period. He (1996: 109-111) found a relationship between degree of rasp and place of articulation: the more uvular a sound is, the more likely it is to be rasped.

Empirical research

In the last few decades, empirical evidence has been looked for to gain insight into the nature of (g). Van den Broecke and Van Heuven (1979) did not come across any voiced realisations of intervocalic (g) in the speech of the four western speakers in their research. Cassier and Van de Craen (1986) looked at the use of ‘hard’ (g) and ‘soft’ (g) and found that ‘hard’ (presumably voiceless and possibly rasped) (g) did not occur in the speech of their 1934 speaker. In the speech of their 1950 and 1984 speakers, both ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ (g)’s were encountered, and these appeared to be free variants. Slis and Van Heugten (1989) also did not come across any voiced/voiceless distinction in the speech of the (western) speakers they investigated. Van de Velde (1996) registered a tendency to devoice (g)’s that were

3 Original Dutch citation: sterk rochelende uitspraak.
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historically voiced. His results suggest that the devoicing of (g) in Standard Dutch was well on its way by the mid 1930s and that it has since progressed even further.

Today’s situation

It is safe to say that today a strongly voiced (g) is no longer widely acceptable in Standard Dutch, irrespective of position in the syllable. It is a feature that is associated with certain regional varieties. Daan (1983:481) in fact felt that there is an anti-voiced-(g) attitude in the Netherlands. Nevertheless, it remains uncertain whether voice has completely disappeared in Standard Dutch (g). Looking at the literature, place of articulation remains debatable, although retracted realisations are clearly settling down. The degree of rasp in (g) is gaining ground too, which may be indicative of an increasingly retracted place of articulation.

10.5 (r)

The 19th Century

In the 19th Century, there were fixed ideas as to the standard pronunciation of (r) in Dutch. Generally, however, little attention was paid to the effects of position in the syllable. Early writers simply referred to (r) as having one basic pronunciation. It is likely that many of the early writers were in fact talking about the pronunciation of (r) in isolation or in syllable onset. It is likely that although one basic realisation was put forward as standard, or default, other realisations were current in the speech of authoritative speakers but were either not detected or somehow dismissed as irrelevant variation.

The named agreement was on place and manner of articulation. Beyer (1820:213, 1839:171), Mulder (1846:8), and Brill (1871:9) simply called (r) a tongue letter, thus indicating that at least the tongue was the main articulator. Cosijn (1886:20), more specifically, described Dutch (r) as a rattling tongue letter, and Brill (1846:14-15) considered (r) a phoneme that came to existence when the tongue connected with the front part of the palate, i.e. an alveolar phoneme. To Cosijn (1886:20), tongue letters were produced by means of the tongue and the upper lip or upper jaw. It can be assumed that Cosijn’s (r) represented an alveolar trill. In general, the literature reveals that throughout the 19th Century there was agreement on (r) being an alveolar trilling sound.

The first part of the 20th Century

In the early 20th Century, places of articulation other than alveolar were acknowledged in the speech of speakers of Standard Dutch, namely realisations in the back of the mouth. These ‘new’ realisations were even suspected to become more frequent. According to Schönfeld (see Van Loey 1959) and Van Haeringen (1949b:6, 1979:31-32), the change from the alveolar to the uvular realisation had its origin in Paris and was first adopted by the higher social classes in the city of the
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Hague. They claimed that it had started to conquer the Netherlands in as early as the 17th Century. This is a popular theory that has not been confirmed as yet.

Te Winkel (1904:17-18) distinguished between several (r)'s, both in the back and the front of the mouth. Alveolar (r) was the most common realisation, he said, and so did Rijpma and Schuringa (1917:14-15). According to Rijpma and Schuringa, some speakers were producing (r) in the very back of the throat, and they rejected this (r). Van Haeringen (1923:85, 1924:21-23) considered throat (r) a feature of contemporary Dutch speech. He (Van Haeringen 1923:103) was also expecting the more guttural realisation to spread at the expense of alveolar realisations, although he considered it provincial. He felt that because alveolar (r) was advocated in singing education it could start to be considered beautiful, and he considered this a factor in its possible comeback. According to Zwaardemaker and Eijkmam (1928:X, XII, 201-206), the spreading of the guttural realisation started in the early years of the 20th Century. They nevertheless considered tongue-tip (r) the most widely spread realisation. In the Holland cities, however, the guttural (r) was equally common, so they said. They believed that the popularity of tongue-tip (r) was enhanced by the schooling system, in which alveolar realisations were still the norm.

Generally, both articulations in the front and the back of the mouth were apparently considered standard, front realisations being the traditional ones and back realisations being up and coming. The acceptance of back realisations grew in the first part of the century, and by the mid 20th Century the front and back realisations were both widely considered standard. The latter was considered the variant typical of younger Standard Dutch speakers.

In the course of the first half of the century, the awareness of variation in manner of articulation grew. Descriptions started to focus more on detail. Zwaardemaker and Eijkmam (1928:X, XII, 201-206) gave two possible realisations of (r) in Dutch, namely as an (alveolar) tap or as a trill (alveolar or guttural). De Vooys (1946:16) considered (r) to be a trill (that was either alveolar or velar). Blancquart (1950:15, 113-114), condemned ‘exaggerated’ pronunciations of (r), for instance with too many taps. So, the disagreement on the manner of articulation of (r) was considerable.

The second half of the 20th Century

It seems that by the mid 20th Century the uvular realisation was becoming widely accepted (or noticed) in Standard Dutch alongside alveolar (r), and this led to an increasing uncertainty regarding the proper standard pronunciation of (r). This uncertainty became apparent in the ambiguous literature on the subject in the decades to come. Blancquart (1950:15, 113-114) considered tongue-tip (r) the most traditional realisation and (burred) throat (r) an upcoming ‘young’ realisation. Blancquart suggested that uvular (r) was dominating in cities and was spreading from there. He did not reject this place of realisation per se. Rijpma (1964:12)

4 Audibly strongly pronounced in the back of the throat.
described (r) as a dental sound and also gave the possibility of a burred (r). Cassier and Van de Craen (1986) found that in their Dutch data uvular and alveolar (r) were free variants, and Paardekooper (1978:XIV-XV) said something similar. Van de Velde (1996) came across a high number of reduced variants (in post-vocalic position) in his data from the second part of the 20th Century.

**The situation today**

The uncertainty regarding (r) is still current today. Dutch (r) is an obscure sound in the sense that it is subject to almost extreme inter- and intra-speaker variation. Its shape depends strongly on position in the syllable. Several realisations of the (r) phoneme coexist today, and the phonetic range in these realisations is striking. Vieregge and Broeders (1993) considered (r) the single most variable phonological segment in Dutch. They (Vieregge & Broeders 1993:267) found that coda occurrences of (r) are in particular variable between speakers. They pointed out that due to the high frequency of (r) in Dutch, in combination with its wide articulatory range, this phoneme is a potentially powerful cue for speaker identification. Voortman (1994) claimed that modern Standard Dutch in the Netherlands has four realisations of the (r) phoneme, namely the alveolar tap, the uvular fricative, the retroflex (r), and vocalic variants. Uvular (r) in particular seems to have become an accepted part of Standard Dutch, although some consider alveolar realisations most correct still, particularly those who have a professional interest in pronunciation. According to Van Reenen (1994:58), speech therapists, for instance, simply cannot accept that the uvular trill has been acceptable for a long time.

**Postvocalic Prominent Approximant (r)**

A stereotyped (r) today is approximant (r) that is produced with perceptual prominence in coda positions (here called Prominent Approximant (r)). This (r) realisation allegedly originates from the ‘t Gooi area in the North Holland province. It is said to be gaining popularity, as in this area much of Dutch radio and television broadcasting takes place, and many of the famous media presenters are from this area. Van de Velde (1996:128, footnote), amongst others, believed that the Kinderen voor Kinderen (‘Children for Children’) children’s choir has been an important force behind the spreading of retroflex (r), and it can be assumed that he was referring to Prominent Approximant (r)². The children from this choir are almost exclusively from the ‘t Gooi area, and the choir as a whole produces Prominent Approximant (r)’s in postvocalic position. This choir produced their first album in 1980 and has continuously made albums since. Although the suggestion that this choir has been a factor in the actual spreading of this realisation can safely be considered unrealistic⁶,

---

² The ‘t Gooi (r) is traditionally referred to as retroflex (r), although its retroflex nature has not been firmly established. Mees and Collins (1982) referred to the ‘t Gooi (r) as a prevelar bunched approximant. This seems the safest description, which does not exclude retroflex realisations.

⁶ The effects of this choir are sometimes exaggerated. There are no indications that those
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this choir has indeed become a symbol for the prominent realisation of approximant (r). Although the Kinderen voor Kinderen choir is no longer exposed to a great deal of media attention today, such as was the case during a short period in the early 1980s, their symbolical association with Prominent Approximant (r) remains.

Today, several media speakers use postvocalic approximant (r) with varying degrees of salience, but most of them do not produce the prominent realisation. It is possible that in decades to come Prominent Approximant (r) will gain acceptance, and the question is whether the acceptance of perceptually salient realisations will grow for approximant (r) only or simultaneously also for other postvocalic realisations of this phoneme.

10.6 LONG MIDVOWELS

The light diphthongisation of long mid-vowels (ee), (eu), and (oo) is an accepted part of Standard Dutch today. This phenomenon often remains unnoticed. In fact, many only recognise it when northern Dutch realisations of these phonemes are juxtaposed against their French, German, or Flemish counterparts.

When exactly this acceptance of diphthongisation started - in what was originally a monophthongal phoneme - is hard to say. Van de Velde (1996:161) claimed that since the 1920s a change has been taking place from a monophthongal to a lightly diphthongal pronunciation. However, the literature suggests this diphthongisation was common much earlier than that in standard speech and that in fact it has been present in actual speech but ignored or rejected in writing.

19th Century observations of diphthongisation

It is possible that in the 19th Century this light diphthongisation existed but was not acknowledged or recognised as such or was attributed to the diphthongising effects of subsequent consonants. Another obstacle in tracing its origins is that 19th Century remarks on pronunciation were usually influenced strongly by spelling. Beyer (1820:213, 1839:171) and Mulder (1846:8), for instance, categorised (eu) as a proper diphthong, presumably on the basis of spelling.

who were fans of this choir outside the ‘t Gooi area en masse adopted this Prominent Approximant (r) and maintained this pronunciation as part of their daily speech. Stroop (1998:38), for instance, noticed no influence of this choir on the production of (r) (outside the Randstad). Moreover, besides its popularity this choir suffered from considerable ridicule because of their realisation of coda (r), which is likely to have had an adverse effect on the popularity of this (r).

7 This may partly be due to the fact that in the early 1980s this choir’s speech was an early example of regional speech in the Dutch media. If a regional-sounding choir arose today, it would probably be much less stigmatised, because regional speech (and singing in particular) in the media is today more common than in the early 1980s.

8 The fact that Sacha de Boer (a famous user of Prominent Approximant (r)) is one of the main anchor persons of the most prestigious news broadcasts in the Netherlands is likely to enhance this acceptance (see Section 7.4).
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Other writers based their opinions on what they actually heard. Brill (1846:17) placed (eu) in the same category as the diphthongs he spelled as ej and ui, because, like these two diphthongs, it had a resonation much like a semi-vowel such as j. He felt that this diphthongising tendency was not strong enough for (eu) to be called a proper diphthong, and this way he positioned it halfway between diphthongs and monophthongs, i.e. as a semi-diphthong. Brill (1846:20) believed the addition of j or w (two semi-vowels; alveolar and labio-dental, respectively) to long vowels to be the first step in a diphthongising process. Bilderdijk (1826:24-25, 33-34) also talked about a diphthongising tendency and said that ee tended towards the diphthong ei, and oo towards au.

Not all writers were accepting towards this diphthongising tendency. A strict view came from Hoogvliet (1908:11-12), who put Dutch (ee) side by side with French monophthong e, and Dutch (oo) with French monophthong o. Hoogvliet compared (eu) to French monophthong eu. Writers such as these may have fed the idea that by the onset of the 20th Century Standard Dutch long mid-vowels were still pure monophthongs.

The 20th Century

From the early 20th Century onwards, the notion settled that (ee), (eu), and (oo) were generally produced with some diphthongisation in Standard Dutch (Rijpma & Schuringa 1917:12). An elaborate description of this diphthongisation can be found in Zwaardemaker and Eijkman (1928:124-125). They said that most people would not even notice this tendency. When one of these phonemes precedes a pause, it is more likely to show this diphthongisation, Zwaardemaker and Eijkman said. They considered the slightly diphthongal nature of (ee) and (oo) to be a feature of the standard language, and they suggested that the diphthongisation of (oo) had developed further than that of (ee). De Vooy’s (1946:19) also took into consideration position in the syllable and referred to ‘false’ diphthongs at the end of words, before a pause. This effect is most noticeable in the case of (ee) and (oo), he said. If this diphthongising effect is exaggerated, then this sounds less civilised, so he noted.

Research into the diphthongisation of (ee), (eu), and (oo) was performed in the Netherlands, focussing mainly on prototypical speakers of Standard Dutch. Cassier and Van de Craen (1986), for instance, looked at the speech of, amongst others, Dutch politicians, whom they considered to be speakers of Standard Dutch. Their 1930s speaker did not diphthongise at all, their 1950s speaker diphthongised most of his (ee)’s and (oo)’s, and their 1980s speaker only produced (lightly) diphthongised (ee)’s and (oo)’s. Van de Velde (1996) observed that in the speech of radio presenters (1935-1993) an increasing degree of diphthongisation of (ee) and (oo) could be heard. His data show that the tendency to diphthongise these vowels accelerated in the second half of the 1960s. Heavily diphthongised realisations of these two vowels did not occur in his corpus of standard-like speech. In the named research, (ee) preceded (oo) in its degree of diphthongisation.

A subtle phenomenon such as the diphthongisation of three monophthongal phonemes was thus noticed well over a century ago, but at the same time the same
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tendency keeps being described as a possible change in motion. One wonders whether slightly diphthongal realisations have quietly been acceptable in the speech of ’civilised’ speakers all this time (that is, including in the 19th Century), while purely monophthongal realisations have merely been the theoretical (written) norm that few met. This may have led to hypercorrect monophthongised realisations in formal situations, in which this norm was adhered to, such as early radio broadcasts. Kloke (1951:44-45) performed a small investigation involving (Dutch) student subjects, which revealed the discrepancy between perceived and actual own realisations. He found that the realisation of (ee) and (oo) was a sensitive criterion. His students were of the opinion that a monophthongal pronunciation of these two phonemes was the correct and most civilised. However, it turned out that the speech of a majority of these students did not in fact meet their own pronunciation criteria, and that they diphthongised more strongly than they themselves found acceptable. This illustrates how subtle deviations from the norm may be unnoticed by speakers.

10.7 DIPHTHONGS

Standard Dutch has three diphthong phonemes: (ei), (ui), and (ou). The spelling of these phonemes is as follows: (ei) is written as either ei or ij, (ui) as ui, and (ou) as either ou or au. Sound shifts in the 16th and 17th Century caused this inconsistency in the spelling of (ei) and (ou). Below are two tendencies in these diphthongs that the literature repeatedly mentions.

Diphthongisation

Writers at the end of the 19th Century and in the early 20th Century generally agreed on the diphthongal nature of these phonemes (Cosijn 1886, Hoogvliet 1908:12, Zwaardemaker & Eijkman 1928:155). According to Van Bree (1928:297), there was even a tendency for diphthongs to become ‘extreme’, i.e. to obtain (according to the writer) a disproportionately diphthongal nature, although at the same time in some circles these diphthongs were sounding more and more monophthongal, so he said. Hellings (1938:113, 191) claimed that the coming to existence of ‘extreme’ diphthongs was a natural tendency, but today disagreement still exists on the acceptability in Standard Dutch of strongly diphthongal realisations. Typically, this is frowned on.

Lowering of the first element

A parallel - and related - tendency in Standard Dutch diphthong phonemes is the lowering of their first element. Hellings (1938:191) considered this lowering a natural tendency and talked about speakers in the 17th Century replacing their ai’s with ei’s, the former having a lower first element. The ai realisation was in the 17th and 18th Century considered uncivilised, and for that reason it was not acceptable in the standard language (De Witte:1962:63). So, Hellings’s observation possibly reveals a reaction to an early negative awareness of first-element lowering.
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Stroop (1998:25) argued that there has been an increasing tendency towards the lowering of the first element of (ei). Today, the (ei) diphthong in the language of certain speakers may be subject to a shift towards the lowered realisation that was once considered uncivilised, and (ui) and (ou) are possibly also subject to a similar lowering of the first element. It is uncertain, however, whether in the traditional standard language this lowering is also becoming accepted. Stroop (1998) considered this tendency a likely indication of what Standard Dutch will sound like in the future. However, (ei)’s with first elements that were (audibly) lowered did not occur in Van de Velde’s (1996) (standardised Dutch) corpus, meaning that perhaps this lowering tendency was not part yet of the standard language but of another (possibly non-regional) speech style.

10.8 PHONEME EVALUATION SURVEY RESULTS

Selected phonemes have been sensitive to certain tendencies, roughly in the previous two centuries. These tendencies were generally described by linguists or by speakers who somehow had an expert insight into the Dutch language and the changes it experienced. To see how these tendencies were evaluated by laymen, we asked the respondents in the Phoneme Evaluation Survey to indicate to what degree the tendencies that the various phonemes may be undergoing are acceptable in Standard Dutch. The pronunciation phenomena that the respondents were asked to evaluate were the following:

1. the diphthongisation of (ee), (eu), and (oo) (see Section 10.6)
2. the lowering of the first element of (ei), (ui), and (ou) (see Section 10.7)
3. the realisation of (r) as a so-called Gooise (r) (Prominent Approximant (r), see Section 10.5)
4. the realisation of (g) as a so-called zachte (g) (“soft (g)”, see Section 10.4)
5. the devoicing of (v) and (z) (see Section 10.3)

The respondents were given the above list of realisations (explained in lay terms; see appendix 6), and they were asked to evaluate them using a five-point scale running from NOT AT ALL ACCEPTABLE IN STANDARD DUTCH (=0) to REQUIRED IN STANDARD DUTCH (=4). The average degree of acceptability is shown in Figure 10.1.
CHAPTER 10

Figure 10.1: Average degree of acceptability of ten realisational tendencies (191 respondents in the Phoneme Evaluation Survey). The numbers on the vertical bar represent the response categories: 0=NOT AT ALL ACCEPTABLE; 1=NOT REALLY ACCEPTABLE; 2=MORE OR LESS ACCEPTABLE; 3=ACCEPTABLE; 4=REQUIRED.

No differences exist between the group of western (n=48) and peripheral respondents (n=143). This suggests that tendencies that are typically from the peripheral area (for instance ‘soft (g)’) or the western area (for instance lowering of the first element of diphthongs) are evaluated the same by respondents from these two areas.

None of the tendencies are on average considered to be REQUIRED. Remarkably, ‘soft’ (g) is on average embraced as (more than) ACCEPTABLE by the respondents. The devoicing of (v) and (z) is between MORE OR LESS ACCEPTABLE and ACCEPTABLE, and so is Prominent Approximant (r). The only vowel phenomenon that has obtained this score is the lowering of the first element of (ou), meaning that this phenomenon is on a par with consonant phenomena. The strong diphthongisation of (ee) and (oo) and the lowering of the first element of (ei) and (ui) are between NOT REALLY ACCEPTABLE and MORE OR LESS ACCEPTABLE.

The tendencies related to the vowels meet with little acceptance. Only the lowering of the first element of diphthong (ou) is almost ACCEPTABLE. The lowering of the first element of the other two diphthongs is deemed quite less ACCEPTABLE. Generally, the idea of a strong diphthongisation is frowned upon.

The difficulty of interpreting these results is the subjective nature of the descriptions. An effort was made to describe phenomena in terms that would make a comparison of degree of acceptability feasible. With that in mind, one can conclude that the ‘softness’ in (g) is in the minds of Dutchmen most acceptable, and they even seem to defend it. Loyalty may be at the heart of this result. Also, it is the only
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phenomenon that is typical of the past rather than of modern speech. Fricative
devoicing is tolerated to some degree, as is Prominent Approximant (r). The
lowering of the first element of (ou) is possibly more acceptable, because
respondents perceive the lowering of this element to cause less of a deviation from
the original than the lowering of the first element of the other two diphthongs. The
diphthongisation of semi-diphthongs is considered quite less acceptable.

10.9 SUMMARY

Table 10.1 schematises tendencies mentioned in the present chapter. This table is to
some degree intuitive and does not do due justice to the subtendences and
disagreement that have continuously existed in the past two centuries. Most
importantly, the changed awareness of variation is not incorporated in these results.
The results of the Phoneme Evaluation Survey (Figure 10.1) are incorporated,
namely in the predictions of the future.

Table 10.1 shows that the amount of disagreement has not obviously decreased
or increased with time. Generally, disagreement for one phoneme disappears while a
new and upcoming realisation of another will cause debate again. The (r) and (g) are
opposites in the sense that the number of (r) realisations has gone from one to three,
whereas the number of (g) realisations has gone from four to two.

Expectations for Chapters 11 and 12

Looking at the literature, certain tendencies can be expected in the speech of the
speakers whose speech was recorded for the present research (see Chapters 11 and
12). They were presenters on Dutch television and radio and are not expected to be
pioneers of change, as they present traditional news broadcasts. Instead, they are
more likely to represent a conservative norm and not partake in the latest
pronunciation tendencies.

Specifically, for (v) and (z) the expectation is that generally devoicing is
realised but that through degree of tension a distinction is nevertheless maintained
between these two phonemes and (f) and (s). A perceptually salient devoicing, in
combination with a tenser realisation, would not be in line with the conservative
nature of our speakers. Realisations that would traditionally be voiced ((v) and (z))
are likely to be voiceless but lax.

Of all three fricatives studied, (g)’s are expected to be most convincingly
voiceless, with a minimum number of lax realisations. As for place, the uvular
realisation seems the most likely realisation, rather than velar or palatalised
realisations. Although ‘soft’ (g) has some standing according to respondents in the
Phoneme Evaluation Survey, in the literature it is not put forward as being highly
acceptable in the standard language (anymore). Another possible feature that is
likely to be present in our corpus is rasping; it can be expected that our data contain
much rasp, as it is not an upcoming feature anymore and has become more
acceptable.
The expectation for (r) is that syllable-initially both alveolar and uvular realisations will occur frequently. In syllable codas, reduced realisations are most likely to occur as well as approximant realisations, and generally a wide range of (r)’s is expected in this position.

Table 10.1: Overview of Standard Dutch realisations of various phonemes as of the 19th Century, based on the literature in this chapter and the Phoneme Evaluation Survey. Bolding represents a high degree of acceptance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>phoneme</th>
<th>19th Century</th>
<th>20th Century</th>
<th>possible future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(v), (z)</td>
<td>voiced lax</td>
<td>voiced lax</td>
<td>voiced lax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>voic. lax</td>
<td>voic. lax</td>
<td>voic. lax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>voic. tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g)</td>
<td>voiced velar</td>
<td>voiced velar</td>
<td>voiced velar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>voic. vel.</td>
<td>voic. vel.</td>
<td>voic. velar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>voic. uv.</td>
<td>voic. uv.</td>
<td>voic. uvular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>voic. uvular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>raps. voic. uv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onset (r)</td>
<td>alv. trill</td>
<td>alv. trill</td>
<td>alv. trill/tap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>uv. trill/tap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>uv. trill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>uv. trill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coda (r)</td>
<td>alveolar trill</td>
<td>alv. trill</td>
<td>alv. trill/tap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>uv. trill/tap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>approx./reduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prominent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid-vowels</td>
<td>monophthong</td>
<td>light diphth.</td>
<td>light diphth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diph-thongs</td>
<td>diphthong</td>
<td>diphthong</td>
<td>diphthong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lowered diphth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for the vowels, the semi-monophthongs are most likely to be pronounced as such, i.e. without sounding anything like proper diphthongs. The pronunciation of diphthong phonemes may be less straightforward. It seems that now that the door is open to the lowering of the first element, it is likely that some of our traditional speakers may go as far as to adopt this feature in their own speech. But, it is not expected that they will do it to any extreme extent, or regularly, only that they will show an occasional first-element lowering.
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11. PERCEPTUAL DESCRIPTION

11.1 INTRODUCTION

As the speakers in our investigation have in common that they are ‘top’ speakers of Standard Dutch, we wanted to see to what degree they are mutually consistent in the realisation of phonemes with a debated pronunciation. The speech of these speakers can reveal which realisations are today characteristic of Standard Dutch, and it can give hints as to which pronunciation variation is generally tolerated.

The two main techniques towards a description of segmental pronunciation qualities are transcriptions and acoustic measurements. While transcriptions are commonly applied to characterise both vowels and consonants, acoustic measurements are associated most strongly with vowels. A combination of these two techniques is also possible, and that is what was done for the present research; consonants were transcribed, and vowels were transcribed and measured. Both techniques were used for the vowels to enable a comparison of acoustic reality and perception. Another reason was that these two techniques complement each other, and together they form a valid phonetic description of the vowels under investigation. Vowels are generally difficult to qualify, more so than consonants. Vowels are mutually distinguishable through subtle changes in the shape of the speech tract causing a certain sound colouring rather than contact of articulators causing a type of friction that can relatively easily be located. Qualifying vowels through measurements, therefore, is a valuable addition to the phonetic description.

Chapter outline

The present chapter and Chapter 12 together form a segmental description of selected phonemes of present-day Standard Dutch. The present chapter contains the results of transcriptions. Chapter 12 deals with acoustic vowel measurements and presents a comparison of selected results of the two descriptive techniques.

Section 11.2 summarises the methodology of the transcriptions. Sections 11.3 discusses the results pertaining to (v) and (z), and the results pertaining to (g) and (r) are in Section 11.4 and 11.5, respectively. The vowel transcriptions are in 11.6. Section 11.7 tries to bring together the results to see if generalisations can be drawn. This section explains how the phoneme realisations can be categorised as either modern or traditional on the basis of the literature of Chapter 10. Subsequently, it categorises the speakers as modern or traditional on the basis of their speech habits.

11.2 METHOD

The perceptual description comprised selected vowels and consonants in the speech of seven speakers, namely three radio presenters and four television presenters. Two of the television presenters were females, the other speakers were males. One radio presenter was from the 1970s, all the other speakers were from the 1990s. The age
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range of the speakers was 29 to 63 years old. All speakers qualified as speaking Standard Dutch.

Four transcriber pairs participated in this description, and together they transcribed four consonants and six vowels in the speech of the speakers. Various phonetic and phonological contexts were selected. Up to 10 tokens of each of these vowels of each speaker in each context were transcribed. The complete method is outlined in Section 5.9.

11.3 (v)/(z)

Two qualities of (v) and (z) were transcribed, namely degree of voice and degree of tension. Three degrees of voice were distinguished (‘full’, ‘weak’, and ‘none’) and three degrees of tension (‘strong’, ‘intermediate’, and ‘weak’). Both in the case of voice and tension, this degree is determined by the air turbulence causing degrees of audible friction. In the case of voice, this friction is established by the vocal folds, and for tension it refers to the articulators in the mouth.

So, theoretically speaking, nine realisations could occur (three degrees of voice times three degrees of tension). However, it should be obvious that certain degrees of voice and of tension are more likely to coincide than others. In actuality, five variants were found for (v) and three for (z). The variants and the number of occurrences per speaker are in Table 11.1.

Table 11.1: (v) and (z) realisations in syllable-initial intervocalic position, split up over seven speakers [in a -(V)CV- context, for instance gezondheidszorg, de versies]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>realisation</th>
<th>speakers</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voice</td>
<td>tension</td>
<td>notation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full</td>
<td>weak</td>
<td>[v]</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weak</td>
<td>[y]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intern.</td>
<td>[y]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>[?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(z)</td>
<td>full</td>
<td>weak</td>
<td>[z]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weak</td>
<td>[z]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>intern.</td>
<td>[z]</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both in the case of (v) and (z), the overall preference is for the fully voiced lax realisation, although in the case of (v) this tendency is less obvious than for (z). There is considerable intra- and inter-speaker variation, especially for (v).

In the above grid, (v) has a stronger tendency to devoice than (z); 64% of the realisations of (v) are voiced (fully or weakly), and 94% of all (z)’s are voiced (fully or weakly). Moreover, 43% of the (v) realisations are fully voiced, whereas this is
true for 73% of the (z) realisations. Only two speakers in fact produced voiceless realisations of (z). There is nevertheless devoicing of (z) taking place, because 27% of the total number of realisations of (z) is produced with weak voice only or no voice at all. No (s)’s occur whereas there is a weak inclination towards [f]. All in all, the above results support the notion that the devoicing of (v) has progressed further than that of (z). This is in line with suggestions by Van der Wal and Van Bree (1994:413) and research by Gussenhoven (1981) and Van de Velde (1996).

When we look at degree of tension, we can distinguish between ‘weak’ and ‘intermediate’. As only two occurrences of (v) were produced with a ‘strong’ tension, they can be considered exceptional rather than representative of any tendency. If we do not take into consideration these two occurrences, we see that the difference between (v) and (z) is negligible as far as tension is concerned; for (v), six percent of the occurrences are ‘intermediate’, and this percentage is identical for (z).

Although fully voiced occurrences dominate, the voice in these two phonemes was never highly pronounced in the speech of these speakers. In other words, the various realisations of (v) and those of (z) were perceptually close to each other.

11.4 (g)

The phoneme (g) belongs to the class of potentially voiced fricatives, together with (v) and (z). For (g), there is not only variation in voice; place of articulation also varies in different contexts. Another difference in our research between (g) and the other two fricatives studied is that degrees of tension of (g) were not transcribed explicitly. Rasping was transcribed as well. The rasping phenomenon comes down to a strong degree of uvular tension, caused by a strong air turbulence, resulting in considerable perceptual prominence. Table 11.2 shows the realisations of (g) by the seven speakers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>phoneme</th>
<th>meaning of diacritic</th>
<th>notation</th>
<th>broad</th>
<th>narrow</th>
<th>no. of occurrences</th>
<th>no. of speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>voiceless uvular fricative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>/y/</td>
<td>[z]</td>
<td>[z]</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with rasp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>advanced short</td>
<td></td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no audible release</td>
<td></td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/k/</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.2: (g) realisations, by seven speakers [across three contexts: (-C_vowel -vowel)(C-V-), for instance lichtgewond; (-VCCc), for instance macht; (-V)(C-V-), for instance lugubers].
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The ‘description’ column explains the realisation, while the ‘notation’ column gives the actual (broad and narrow) transcription symbols. The ‘number of speakers’ column indicates the number of speakers producing a certain realisation at least once.

More than half the realisations are voiceless uvular fricatives without rasp ([χ/]). The same realisation with rasp ([χ]) occurs frequently too. Only 15 (of the 209) occurrences have a realisation other than these two ([χ], [χ], [χ], and [x]), and it therefore seems that voiceless uvular fricatives, either with or without rasp, are the most common in Standard Dutch. These two realisations were the only ones that were produced by six or seven speakers. Table 11.2 shows that six of the seven speakers have both of the uvular realisations as their default realisation (the ‘number of speakers’ column). The remaining realisations were produced by one or two speakers only. There are two main realisations, which may be distributed across contexts/speakers in some systematic way. Perhaps certain contexts induce rasp in particular and it is also possible that certain speakers in particular add rasp to their (g)’s. Also, the remaining four realisations may belong to certain speakers/contexts.

(g) in three contexts

Table 11.3 shows the distribution of (g) realisations across three contexts.

Table 11.3: (g) realisations across seven speakers, split up over three contexts. The most dominant realisation for each context is greyed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>context</th>
<th>example words</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>onset</td>
<td>(-V)(CV-)</td>
<td>degen</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-C&lt;sub&gt;obstr&lt;/sub&gt; VC&lt;sub&gt;-&lt;/sub&gt;)</td>
<td>lichtgewond</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coda</td>
<td>(-VC&lt;sub&gt;C&lt;/sub&gt;)</td>
<td>macht</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for [χ] and [x], the only striking difference between their division across contexts is that in coda position before a voiceless consonant (macht) the [χ] realisation occurs more than twice as often as [x]. It may be that coda occurrences of the uvular realisation are less likely to bear rasp, but the (t) that follows may also reduce rasping. It seems most plausible that the weak prominence of coda (g) reduces rasping. Coda occurrences in our corpus are notably less perceptually prominent than onset tokens and harder to identify than syllable-initial occurrences.

Realisations other than [χ] and [x] appear seemingly randomly across three contexts, although the five tokens of [x] are restricted to one onset context.
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(g) by seven speakers

The (g) realisations per speaker are in Table 11.4.

Table 11.4: (g) realisations, split up over seven speakers. The most dominant one for each speaker is greyed across three contexts: \((-\text{C}_{\text{med} \text{-con}})(\text{C})(\text{V})\), for instance lichtgewond; \((-\text{VC(C)(C)}\), for instance macht; \(\text{(V})(\text{C})(\text{V})\), for instance zugubere). 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>speaker</th>
<th>(\chi)</th>
<th>(\chi)’</th>
<th>(\chi)’’</th>
<th>(\chi)’’’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three of the speakers (JJ, TH, and HES) used \([\chi]\) and \([\chi]\) similarly frequently, while two other speakers (JZ and PD) used both but clearly preferred \([\chi]\) over \([\chi]\). For HAS, \([\chi]\) is likely to be the default realisation. JJ’s one \([\chi]\) is exceptional and perhaps not part of his usual phonetic inventory, while NS allows this realisation occasionally. Most importantly, the results show that uvular and velar realisations are not necessarily mutually exclusive in individual speakers’ speech, although the combination may be exceptional.

So, uvular fricatives are the basic realisation of all seven speakers. As for the other realisations of \((g)\); four speakers produced one or more of these; \([\chi]\) and \([\chi]\) were each produced by two speakers only, and \([\chi]\) and \([\chi]\) were each produced by one speaker only. The two \([\chi]\)-producing speakers were radio presenters, and if radio speech is more conservative than television speech (because radio was around before television), then the \([\chi]\)’s that occur in their speech make sense. In the literature, the disappearance of \([\chi]\) in Standard Dutch is noticed, while it used to be a common Standard Dutch realisation.

11.5 (r)

Occurrences of (r) in four phonetic contexts were transcribed. All realisations of (r), i.e. across contexts and across speakers, are in Table 11.5. For practical purposes, the vocalic and the uvular fricative categories are assigned non-IPA symbols, namely ‘/vowel/’ and ‘/uvfric/’. The remaining two columns contain the number of occurrences (by the total of seven speakers) as well as the number of speakers who produced the realisation in question.

Although the (r) transcriptions involved much detail, there is still a striking variation in the realisation of (r) by speakers. Both the place and manner of
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articulation are diverse; almost all parts of the mouth were used and almost every possible manner of articulation. Each speaker has their own subset of realisations, judging by the fact that none of the realisations, except schwa, were used by all speakers (see the ‘number of speakers’ column).

Looking at speakers and contexts separately, some patterns emerge. These are explained below. From here onwards, only the broad transcription of (r) will be used in the presentation of the results. It appears that the broad transcriptions (the ‘broad’ column) in most cases have one dominant narrow transcription (the ‘narrow’ column). In all cases except uvular fricatives, the narrow transcription without diacritics is most frequent. For example, by far most occurrences of /r/ are realised as [r] (without diacritics), and most occurrences of /s/ are [r] (without diacritics). In the case of the uvular fricatives (/uvfric/), the most common realisation is [g], i.e. the retracted realisation (with diacritics). Only in the latter case is a detail at the diacritical level lost in the results presented in Table 11.6.

---

1 This limited representation of the results has an additional advantage. Transcriber 2 (i.e. not the main researcher) dominated the narrow transcription of (r) (and (g) as well), while the broad transcription involved equal contributions by both transcribers and was thus a true consensus transcription.
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Table 11.5: (r) realisations by seven speakers [across four contexts: (-V)(C,V-), for instance *liberaal*; (C<sub>med</sub> <sub>-</sub> C<sub>V</sub>,C<sub>V</sub>-), for instance *centraal*; (-VC)(C<sub>med</sub>), for instance *vier dus*; (-VC,C<sub>V</sub>), for instance *gevoerd*].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>Tokens (N=277)</th>
<th>Speakers (N=7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General place</td>
<td>Place manner</td>
<td>Meaning of diacritic</td>
<td>Broad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>front</td>
<td>- retracted</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>voiceless</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none (no stricture)</td>
<td>Vowel</td>
<td>- rhotic</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- rhotic</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[o]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lowered short rhotic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[i]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[_]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>back</td>
<td>Uv. fricative</td>
<td>- retracted voiced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>voiced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>voiceless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uvular trill</td>
<td>- fronted short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fronted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(r) In four contexts

The realisations of (r) in the four contexts are schematised in Table 11.6.
### CHAPTER 11

Table 11.6: (r) realisations in four contexts (across speakers). The most common realisation for each context is greyed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>context</th>
<th>example word</th>
<th>place of articulation</th>
<th>front (alveolar)</th>
<th>no stricture</th>
<th>back (uvular)</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ons.</td>
<td>liberalism</td>
<td>liberal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>central</td>
<td>central</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coda</td>
<td>vier dus</td>
<td>vier</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gevoerd</td>
<td>gevoerd</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A two-way division is visible, namely between onset-position and coda-position realisations. In onset position, alveolar taps ([ɾ]) and uvular fricatives (ʼuvfricʼ) occur most frequently, while in coda position strictureless realisations occur most (and /vowel/ in particular). Onset realisations involving no stricture occur only in twelve cases (less than 9% of all onset realisations), while there are only 32 (a little over 23% of all coda realisations) constricted realisations of (r) (alveolar or uvular) in the coda.

Vocalised (i.e. /vowel/) and retroflex (ʼ/qʼ) realisations are used only in coda positions, while the uvular trill (ʼ/r/ʼ) is almost exclusively used in onset position. Looking at the pattern in Table 11.6, making a two-way division between coda and onset contexts seems realistic. This makes a comparison between speakers possible. This is done next.

**(r) by seven speakers across three contexts**

Table 11.7 combines and summarises the previous results (tables 11.5 and 11.6). Vierregge and Broeders (1993) found that postvocalic (i.e. coda) (r) was subject to considerably more interspeaker variation than (r) in syllable-initial and intervocalic positions, and our results corroborate this to some degree. Van der Toorn (1992) suggested that women are leading the way in spreading retroflex (r), i.e. /q/, which is at the moment amongst the most debated realisations of (r). The women in our corpus (PD and HES), however, cannot be distinguished from the men (the other five speakers) on the basis of (r) production, including the production of /q/. There are no consistent differences between radio speakers (JJ, NS, and TH) and television speakers (the other four speakers) either.
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Table 11.7: (r) realisations by seven speakers, over two contexts in the coda [\(\text{VC}_C\)](\(\text{VC}_C\)), for instance *liberaal* and *centraal* (VC middle), and two in the onset [\(\text{VC}_C\)](\(\text{VC}_C\)), for instance *vier dus and VC gevoerd*. The grey cells contain the most dominant realisation for each speaker in each of the two phonological positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>phonological position</th>
<th>speaker</th>
<th>place of articulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>front (alveolar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onset</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HAS</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HES</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coda</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HAS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HES</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, the speakers are qualified on the basis of specific speech habits with regard to (r). Two dimensions are looked at, namely place of realisation of onset (r) (front or back; Front Speakers or Back Speakers) and patterns in coda realisations. The importance of degree of perceptual prominence is discussed as well.

*Front Speakers versus Back Speakers*

Each speaker has turned out to be relatively consistent in their place of articulation of (r) in the syllable onset. They either produced it predominantly in the front of their mouth (i.e. alveolarly) or in the back (i.e. uvularly). The speakers can therefore be subdivided on the basis of place of articulation of onset (r), and thus speakers JJ, TH, HAS, and PD are ‘Front Speakers’, while NS, JZ, and HES are ‘Back Speakers’.

It can be hypothesised that onset (r) is the one phoneme that reveals the regional and/or social background of speakers of Standard Dutch. If it is assumed that people are by origin (by habit) Front or Back Speakers and that this is determined by regional/social origin, then (r) realisations in this position in the syllable may be the
only clear identifier of the original speech habits of speakers who have successfully adjusted their speech to the standard language. There is no need to make such a switch, as both onset alveolar and uvular (r) realisations are apparently equally standard. The fact that there seem to be two standard realisations of onset (r) may be due to the difficulty that some speakers have changing the place realisation of this phoneme after childhood.

The frontness/backness of onset (r) of speakers may largely be fixed for life after individuals have established it. It is uncertain whether speakers make the drastic move towards a syllable-initial (r) in the ‘other’ part of the mouth (front to back and vice versa) to accommodate their speech to their own idea of the standard realisation. For the switch from alveolar to uvular and vice versa may constitute a perceptually prominent and - perhaps - productively demanding move and is not on a par with subtle changes such as adding some rasp to (g) or lowering the first element of diphthongs (to meet the standardness norm). Making this change may have too radical an effect on the naturalness of speech, and this may prevent speakers from doing so.

It can be hypothesised that speakers can be subdivided not only on the basis of whether they are Front Speakers or Back Speakers but also on the basis of the degree to which they are able to switch between alveolar and uvular realisation in onset positions. For instance, it is known that some Back Speakers are able to produce an alveolar (r) when asked to do so, while others are not. Table 11.8 visualises this suggestion. This table contains four types of speakers, based on whether they are Front Speakers or Back Speakers and on their ability to produce (r) in the non-default (i.e. the ‘other’) side of the mouth. The ‘ability to interchange’ column indicates whether speakers can (‘+’ in Table 11.8) or cannot (‘−’) interchange between uvular and alveolar realisations. So, there are four types of speakers: Front Speakers who are able to produce back (r)’s (this is Type I in Table 11.8), Front Speakers who are not able to do so (Type II), Back speakers who are able to produce front realisations (Type III), and those who are unable to do so (Type IV).

Table 11.8: Four speaker types, defined on the basis of the ability to interchange between velar and uvular onset (r).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>speaker</th>
<th>ability to interchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Speaker</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Speaker</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type I and Type III speakers have the broadest range of ‘comfortable’ (r)’s on the front/back dimension (‘comfortable’ referring to a high degree of articulatory ease), and they are most likely to produce the occasional onset or coda (r) in the part of the mouth that they do not have as their default place of articulation. Type II and Type IV speakers under no circumstances produce such an (r), as it would require considerable effort and could lead to unnatural speech.
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On the basis of their speech habits (Table 11.7), our seven speakers can tentatively be categorised in accordance with the types of Table 11.8. This can be seen in Table 11.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>speaker</th>
<th>ability to interchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Speaker</td>
<td>TH, HAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Speaker</td>
<td>NS, JZ, HES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The seven speakers are distributed across three cells. TH and HAS are Front Speakers with some back realisations; NS, JZ, and HES are Back Speakers with some front realisations; and JJ and PD exclusively produced front realisations. This does not necessarily mean that the remaining cell (Type IV) constitutes a less likely type, for Back Speakers who are not able to produce alveolar (r)'s - or need to make a strenuous effort to do so - presumably do exist. Within this limited set of seven speakers, this type of speaker happens not to occur.

Patterns in coda realisations

When we look at the coda realisations (see Table 11.7), a subdivision in the speaker group does not appear anymore. It appears that place and manner of realisation of onset (r) cannot be used to make reliable judgements as to the realisation of (r) in the coda. Six of the seven speakers predominantly produced vowel-like realisations in the coda, irrespective of whether they were Front Speakers or Back Speakers.

Table 11.7 shows that coda (r)'s are articulatorily close to each other. In fact, coda realisations were as a rule harder to qualify (and mutually distinguish) during the transcription sessions than onset tokens. This may in fact be a requirement of Standard Dutch: no perceptually prominent (r)'s (both approximant and other) in coda positions. Vieregge and Broeders (1993) distinguished between various types of (r) realisations in terms of articulatory strength, assigning them to one of four categories: from articulatorily strong to articulatorily weak. Realisations involving stricture causing friction were categorised as the strongest, those involving a weak or near contact of the articulators were qualified as less strong, and vocalised and zero realisations were weaker and weakest, respectively. They found evidence that (r) realisations are stronger in the syllable onset than in the coda, and this finding is in line with what is known about Germanic languages in this respect. This articulatory strength can be assumed to run parallel to perceptual prominence: articulatorily strong (r)'s can be assumed to be perceptually more prominent than articulatorily weaker (r)'s. In this sense, our results are in line with Vieregge and Broeders.

So, perceptual prominence of (r) may be a factor in degree of standardness, especially in the coda. The attention that is often paid to Prominent Approximant (r) (see Section 10.3) may be a result of the fact that, judging from our results,
approximant realisations in the coda are only acceptable in Standard Dutch if they are not prominent. Our results even suggest that all prominent coda (r)’s are less standard, not only approximant ones.

Van Bezooijen and Giesbers (2003) investigated the spreading of Goosse (r), which is a type of (r) that falls into the category of no-stricture (approximant) realisations. This research distinguished between various degrees of Goosse (r) and concluded that the use of this (r) is growing amongst media presenters. In our speech data from media presenters, approximant (r) is indeed frequent in coda position. However, no occurrences of Prominent Approximant (r) were encountered. These prominent realisations can be assumed to be most strongly linked to the prototypical Goosse (r), and from this one can conclude that the media presenters in our corpus do not act as pioneers in the spreading of Goosse (r), while at the same time they do not resist the existing tendencies towards this (r).

Van Bezooijen and Giesbers (2003) indicated that, although approximant (r) is growing amongst prototypical Standard Dutch speakers, these speakers themselves often evaluate this realisation negatively. A tentative explanation for this is that Van Bezooijen and Giesbers (2003) distinguished between various degrees of Goosse (r), whereas to the named speakers only the perceptually prominent realisation was in fact a Goosse (r) and was thus the only one that was not tolerable.

Perceptual prominence

No perceptually highly prominent (r)’s were present in coda position, and onset (r)’s were clearly more pronounced than coda (r)’s. Onset (r)’s were nevertheless not the strongest possible, and with this in mind Table 11.10 is drawn. It represents a hypothesis on the perceptual prominence of onset and coda (r) in Standard Dutch. The ‘+SD’ and ‘-SD’ symbols indicate whether a certain perceptual prominence is in line with what Standard Dutch rules prescribe: ‘-SD’ signifies ‘not Standard Dutch-like’ and ‘+SD’ means ‘Standard Dutch-like’.

Table 11.10: Hypothesised acceptability of the perceptual prominence of (r) in onset and coda in Standard Dutch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>phoneme</th>
<th>perceptual prominence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onset (r)</td>
<td>-SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coda (r)</td>
<td>+SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The definition of the three degrees of perceptual prominence is of course subjective. Speech-evaluation experiments and measurements are required to quantify this distinction in prominence. If the speakers in our corpus (being speakers of Standard
Dutch) are taken as a reference point, then Weak (r) is as prominent as most coda (r)’s in our corpus, and Intermediate (r) is as prominent as most onset (r)’s in our corpus. Strong (r)’s would include the *Goose (r)*, i.e. Prominent Approximant (r).

The table suggests that the degree of prominence of coda (r) and onset (r)’s are mutually exclusive; an (r) realisation in the onset is automatically too prominent to be acceptable as a coda (r), and coda (r) realisations are too weak to be acceptable as onset (r)’s. Strongly prominent (r)’s are not acceptable under any circumstances in Standard Dutch according to this hypothesis. For (r)’s in this category to become accepted in Standard Dutch, possibly all strongly pronounced coda (r)’s must be accepted as a group. This would mean that the possible acceptance of Prominent Approximant (r) in coda position is not a relevant phenomenon in itself but part of a larger tendency related to coda (r)’s.

### 11.6 THE VOWELS

The realisations of the vowels can be seen in Table 11.11. They are ordered on the basis of the lowering of the first element (two levels: first element lowered (‘+’ in the table) and first element not lowered (‘-’ in the table), according to transcribers) and on the basis of degree of diphthongisation (three levels: monophthong, semi-diphthong, and diphthong, according to transcribers).

**Table 11.11: Realisations of midvowel phonemes (ee), (eu), and (oo) and diphthong phonemes (ei), (ui), and (ou) across two contexts: (-V)/C<sub>mid</sub>V<sub>onset</sub>, for instance *weten* and (-V)/C<sub>onset</sub>V<sub>mid</sub>, or instance *verden*. The most dominant realisation of each vowel phoneme is greyed.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>phoneme</th>
<th>monophthong</th>
<th>semi-diphthong</th>
<th>diphthong</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; element not lowered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; element lowered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>midvowels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ee (n=140)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eu (n=40)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oo (n=139)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diphthongs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ei (n=135)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ui (n=130)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ou (n=100)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A clear division appears between the phonemes that are traditionally categorised as monophthongs (namely the midvowel phonemes (ee), (eu), and (oo)) and those that are generally qualified as diphthongs ((ei), (ui), and (ou)). All three midvowel phonemes are in most cases perceived as semi-diphthongal and almost never...
diphthongal. A relatively small number is perceived as monophthongal. The
diphthongs are in most cases considered diphthongal, but semi-diphthongal
occurrences of this class of phonemes are frequent also. Generally, the diphthongs
have a wider range of realisations than the midvowels. An absolute difference
between the midvowel and diphthong phonemes is that the lowering of the first
element only occurs within diphthong phonemes. Table 11.11 suggests that (ui) is
more likely to be subject to this subtle lowering tendency than (ei) and (ou). Of these
three diphthongs, (ei) is perhaps most often associated with first-element lowering
(Stroop 1998:25).

As for the lowering of the first element of the diphthongs that were transcribed;
this was a weak tendency. During the transcription sessions, degrees of lowering
were only distinguished after repeatedly listening to the occurrences, and strongly
lowered first elements were not found in the speech of any of the seven speakers.
This means that the original diphthongs were in all cases recognisable as such and
did not change shape to such an extent that they sounded like other phonemes (for
instance (ei) in *hij* (meaning ‘he’) sounding like (aai) in *haai* (meaning ‘shark’)).
The degree of lowering of the first element of diphthongs in our corpus was far
removed from the Polder Dutch tendencies as described by Stroop (1998) (see
Section 3.4 and 10.2). The actual Hertz values of lowered and unlowered
realisations and of the difference between (our) Standard Dutch first-element
lowering versus (Stroop’s) Polder Dutch first-element lowering will be looked at in
12.3.

**Vowel realisations of individual speakers**

Table 11.11 shows a clear distinction between semi-diphthongal phonemes ((ee,)
(eu), and (oo)) and diphthongal phonemes ((ei), (ui), and (ou)) as far as
diphthongisation and first-element lowering are concerned. Individual speakers may
nevertheless have their own system; some may distinguish between these two types
of vowels, while others do not have exclusive degrees of diphthongisation and first-
element lowering for each type of vowel. Table 11.12 visualises this.

The highlighted most dominant realisation for each vowel type (midvowel or
diphthong phonemes) shows that six speakers to a high degree distinguished
between midvowel phonemes and diphthongs through degree of diphthongisation.
These six speakers pronounced (ee), (eu), and (oo) predominantly as semi-
diphthongs and (ei), (ui), and (ou) as diphthongs. The seventh - and exceptional -
speaker is NS, who produced semi-diphthongs for most diphthongal phonemes, and
at the same time he had the strongest tendency to monophthongise his midvowel
phonemes.
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Table 11.12: Realisations of midvowel phonemes ((ee), (eu), and (oo)) and diphthong phonemes ((ei), (ui), and (ou)) by seven speakers [across two contexts: (−V)VCwVw, for instance weten and (−V)VC_y, for instance ver/foot]. Each speaker’s most dominant realisation for each vowel type is greyed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>speaker</th>
<th>phoneme type</th>
<th>realisation</th>
<th>1st element not lowered</th>
<th>1st element lowered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>monophong</td>
<td>semi-diphong</td>
<td>diphthong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>midvowel (n=48)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>diphthong (n=50)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>midvowel (n=48)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>diphthong (n=58)</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>midvowel (n=39)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>diphthong (n=52)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAS</td>
<td>midvowel (n=51)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>diphthong (n=45)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>midvowel (n=43)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>diphthong (n=50)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>midvowel (n=44)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>diphthong (n=54)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>midvowel (n=46)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>diphthong (n=56)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three speakers (TH, HAS, and JZ) lowered the first element of diphthong phonemes only once or not at all. In the speech of the other four, this lowering recurs, both with semi-diphthongal and diphthongal realisations of diphthongs. There seems little relationship between the tendency towards diphthongisation and the tendency to lower the first element of diphthongs. Speaker NS, as for instance, produced diphthong phonemes with lowered first elements and at the same time had a tendency to monophthongise his midvowel phonemes. Speaker HAS realised only one diphthong phoneme with a lowered first element but nevertheless had a tendency to turn midvowel phonemes into light diphthongs.

First-element lowering

Chapter 12 deals with the degree of lowering by expressing this in Hertz values. Table 11.3 shows another way of quantifying the tendency to lower first elements by
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speakers, namely the percentages of tokens of each diphthong that were lowered by each speaker. The speakers are presented in the order of their tendency to lower (top to bottom) and so are the diphthongs (left to right).

Table 11.13: Percentages of lowered occurrences of three diphthongs by seven speakers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>speaker</th>
<th>(ui)</th>
<th>(ou)</th>
<th>(ei)</th>
<th>average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although some of the percentages are over low numbers, the general tendency becomes clear. On average, diphthong (ui) is responsible for most of the lowering, but speaker PD diphthongises her (ou)’s more than four times as often as her (ui)’s, which means that in individual speakers’ speech there is no diphthongisation hierarchy in which (ei) diphthongises before (ou), and (ou) before (ui). Such a hierarchy is only true for JJ and HES. Speakers JJ, NS, PD, and HES diphthongise considerably more often than the other three speakers, while - strikingly - speaker NS does not lower any of his (ou)’s. In other words, few generalisations about the tendency to diphthongise certain diphthongs can be drawn on the basis of this overview. Within this small group of speakers, who speak the same variety of Dutch, some lower while others do not, and little systematicity is visible in lowering tendencies.

Table 11.13 does not reveal any clear distinction between men and women in the tendency to lower the first element of diphthongs. The women on average diphthongised more often than the men, but the speaker who diphthongised most often was a male. Sex differences in this respect are explored further in 12.3. As for medium of the speakers (radio or television), there is no systematic difference between the two groups (JJ, TH, and NS (radio speakers) and the rest (television speakers)).

11.7 CONCLUSION

On the basis of the results relating to the various phonemes, we can make a general description of the speech behaviour of the seven speakers. The traditional/modern dimension is particularly revealing here, and, by means of the literature overview of Chapter 10, speech habits can roughly be qualified as traditional or modern. For each phoneme, the speakers are in Table 11.14 subdivided into the Traditional Group and the Modern Group. This division with respect to each phoneme is
CHAPTER 11

explained first. Only the distinctions that are somehow revealing of the modernness/traditionalness of speech habits are included.

Modern versus traditional (v) and (z): voice and tension

As for (v), the group of speakers can be subdivided on the basis of the tendency to realise (v) as [v] or [f]. Some speakers predominantly tended towards [v], while others predominantly tended towards [f]. This tendency involves degree of voice and tension: [v] is fully voiced and lax, while [f] is fully voiceless and tense. The same division can be made on the basis of the tendency to pronounce (z) as [z] or [s]. Traditionally, (v)’s and (z)’s are fully voiced and lax. The higher in the table (Table 11.1), the more [v]-like or [z]-like the pronunciation is and the less [f]-like and [s]-like.

The speakers can be subdivided into those that had a tendency towards realising a traditional (voiced lax) [v] or [z] (Traditional Group) and those that tended to devoice and produce fricatives with an increased tension (Modern Group). To make this subdivision, we can focus exclusively on the top bar in Table 11.1 and see which speakers realised the majority (>50%) of their (v)’s and (z)’s with a weak tension and full voice. Speakers JJ, TH, NS, and HES meet this criterion for (v), making them the Traditional Group, while the remaining speakers (HAS, JZ, PD) do not meet this criterion for (v) (i.e. the Modern Group). For (z), things are somewhat different, as all speakers except HAS predominantly (>50%) produced fully voiced (z)’s with a weak tension. Looking at the (z) realisations, HAS is, then, the only Modern Group speaker. The remaining speakers (JJ, NS, TH, JZ, PD, HES) are the Traditional Group.

Modern versus traditional (g): place, rasp, and voice

For (g), all realisations produced by five of the seven speakers are uvular fricatives. The remaining two speakers (JJ and NS) also had this uvular realisation as their default realisation, but they were the only ones who produced velar realisations too (one and four tokens, respectively). The one [x] of JJ may be considered too exceptional to bear any relevance. The speaker who produced more than one token of this traditional velar realisation (NS) constitutes the Traditional Group, while the other speakers are the Modern Group.

On the basis of rasping, a distinction can be made as well. HAS was the only speaker who rasped his (g)’s consistently, and therefore he is the only Modern Group member in this respect. Finally, the tendency to devoice points to modernness and the tendency to voice to traditionalness. All speakers in this respect belong to the Modern Group.

Modern versus traditional (r): place of onset realisations

The clearest division in the group of speakers exists in the production of (r), for speakers are clearly Front Speakers or Back Speakers (see Table 11.7) on the basis
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of place of articulation of onset (r). While coda realisations to some degree seem unstructured (see Table 11.6), some speakers predominantly produced onset (r) in the front of the mouth, and others produced onset (r) mainly in the back of the mouth. Alveolar realisations are traditionally considered ‘correct’, whereas uvular realisations are only acceptable today because they have over the decades gained acceptance. Therefore, Front Speakers (JJ, TH, HAS, and PD) are here qualified as the Traditional Group, and Back Speakers (NS, JZ, and HES) are the Modern Group.

Modern versus traditional vowels: diphthongisation

The results reveal that the variation in degree of diphthongisation and in the lowering (or not) of the first element in vowels each show a separate pattern, which suggests that these two dimensions should be looked at separately.

As for degree of diphthongisation, all speakers except one tended towards a semi-diphthongal realisation of (ee), (eu), and (oo) and a diphthongal realisation of (ei), (ui), and (ou). Speaker NS had a stronger tendency to monophthongise than the others, and this can be considered traditional. Speakers with the strongest tendency to diphthongise are thus categorised as belonging to the Modern Group (JJ, TH, HAS, JZ, HES, and PD), while NS is assigned to the Traditional Group.

Modern versus traditional diphthongs: first-element lowering

For the tendency to lower the first element of diphthongs (none of the first elements of the midvowel phonemes were lowered) there is also a division within the group of speakers. Speakers either lowered the first element of quite a few of their diphthongs, or they hardly lowered at all. Three speakers (TH, HAS, and JZ) lowered the first element of one or none of their diphthongs, while the other four speakers (JJ, NS, PD, and HES) lowered the first element of nine or more of each of their diphthongs. As this lowering is a modern feature, the speakers who had a tendency to lower the first element of diphthongs are categorised as the Modern Group, while the others can be categorised as the Traditional Group.

Patterns of realisational variability

So, the speakers are distributed across two groups on the basis of several dimensions. Table 11.14 summarises the criteria. The ‘phoneme’ column lists the phonemes, and the ‘tendency’ column explains the tendencies for the Traditional Group and Modern Group. Table 11.15 shows the division of speakers.
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Table 11.14: Subdivision of speaker types on the basis of modernness/traditionalness of pronunciation habits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>phoneme</th>
<th>tendency towards</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional Group</td>
<td>Modern Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v)</td>
<td>[v]</td>
<td>[f]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(z)</td>
<td>[z]</td>
<td>[s]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) place</td>
<td>some velar</td>
<td>uvular only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) rasp</td>
<td>weak rasp</td>
<td>strong rasp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) voice</td>
<td>voiceless</td>
<td>voice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) place (onset)</td>
<td>front realisation</td>
<td>back realisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ee, eu, oo, ei, ui, ou)</td>
<td>light diphthongisation</td>
<td>diphthongisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st element (ei, ui, ou)</td>
<td>no lowering</td>
<td>weak lowering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.15: Pronunciation behaviour of the speakers (T=traditional, M=modern).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>speaker</th>
<th>(v)</th>
<th>(z)</th>
<th>(g) place</th>
<th>(g) rasp</th>
<th>(g) voice</th>
<th>(g) place (onset)</th>
<th>diphthongisation (ee, eu, oo, ei, ui, ou)</th>
<th>first-element lowering (ei, ui, ou)</th>
<th>degree of traditionalness (number of T’s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditional realisations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table suggests that speakers NS and HAS are absolute opposites (if the one column with no variation ((g) voice) is not taken into consideration). If we consider that ‘T’s represent the traditional standard language, while the ‘M’s represent modern standard features, we see that the three radio presenters (JJ, NS, and TH) are predominantly traditional speakers (see the most right-hand column). Each of the radio speakers produced four or five of the phonemes (or phoneme classes) the traditional way, whereas for each of the four television presenters this was only true for two or three phonemes or phoneme classes. The two male television presenters (HAS and JZ), on the other hand, strongly tended towards modern Standard Dutch.
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This table highlights the fact that no absolute division can be made between men and women.

A hierarchy is distinguishable when we look at tendencies in the fricatives: (g) is realised the modern way (voiceless) more often than (v), and (z) is the least likely to be voiceless. When we look at individual speakers, we see that the modern realisation of (z) is only dominant when the modern realisation of (v) is dominant and that modern (v)’s are only dominant when modern (voiced) (g)’s are also dominant. This hierarchy agrees with what is suggested in the literature regarding the devoicing hierarchy of (v), (z), and (g); (g) is most prone to be devoiced and (z) the least. The results show that this hierarchy is true overall as well as in individuals’ speech.

Most importantly, one could conclude that pronunciation habits regarding one phoneme do not necessarily affect the production of another as far as modernness/traditionalness are concerned. None of the speakers are completely modern or traditional. Apparently, speakers can realise one phoneme the traditional way and be modern in their realisation of another. On the other hand, the tendencies that have been described were subtle to such an extent that modernness in none of the cases mentioned above amounted to an overtly progressive realisation.
12. ACOUSTIC DESCRIPTION

12.1 INTRODUCTION

For the previous chapter, selected phonemes were transcribed. Some of these were vowels, and for this type of phoneme acoustic analysis can complement transcriptions by expressing in numbers the nature of the speech sounds and by revealing to some extent the relationship between perception and acoustic reality. Acoustic description involves software that translates the most perceptually and articulatorily characteristic qualities of a vowel - called formants (F1 through F3) - into spectral values, which are expressed in hertz. A visual representation of the speech sounds (a spectrogram or spectrum) can be generated to check the accuracy of the formant values that automatic measurements turn out. With the formant values, vowels can be positioned on the front/back and the open/close dimension in a graph in such a way that it resembles a traditional vowel diagram.

The advantage of acoustic measurements is that the results are objective, as they are not dependent on who perform them. They are also repeatable. If manual corrections are necessary, however, researcher-dependent variation is introduced. A disadvantage of such measurements is that the link between acoustic reality and the perception of vowels is complex. In accordance with Ladefoged and Broadbent (1957), Adank (2003:1) distinguished three types of variation in the speech signal: phonemic, sociolinguistic, and anatomical. These make the interpretation of acoustic variation difficult. Finally, any technique of representing spectral values inevitably does not use all the information available but is instead limited to what are considered the most characteristic features (for instance peaks in a spectrum) of the speech-sound signal. This loss of information, too, poses a limitation.

Previous measurements of Dutch vowels

The present research has a descriptive purpose. Vowel measurements of standardised Dutch in the Netherlands for such a purpose are rare. We nevertheless wanted to compare our formant values with other measurements on Dutch speech. To find such comparative material, one could look back to the 1970s, namely to Koopmans (1971, 1973), Pols, Tromp, and Plomp (1972), or Van Nierop, Pols, and Plomp (1973). The latter two are said to represent the archetypal formant values for the vowels of Dutch (Adank, Van Hout & Smits 2004:1729). More recently, Adank, et al. (2004) performed measurements that were to a considerable degree comparable to ours.

To act as comparative material, Pols et al. (1972) and Van Nierop et al. (1973) would qualify from a theoretical point of view, as these are the best-known extensive measurements of Dutch vowels. Pols et al. (1972) measured the formant frequencies of twelve vowel phonemes of 50 Dutch males, and Van Nierop et al. (1973) measured these same phonemes in the speech of 25 female speakers. In both studies, a [CₐV/Cₒ] context was used (these phoneme sequences were read); for
instance, *hat*, *hoot*, and *heir*. The selection criteria for the speakers were unclear, however (see also Adank et al. 2004:1729).

Adank et al. (2004) looked at the measurements by Pols et al. (1972) and Van Nierop et al. (1973) and found that their 1990s vowel diagrams appeared smaller than the 1970s diagrams. Adank et al. (2004:1735) concluded that the differences could be attributed in part to differences in the consonantal context of the vowels (Adank et al. used a different context than the 1970s studies), to the uncontrolled regional variation of the 1970s speakers, and/or to the differences in techniques used to estimate formant frequencies. Adank et al. decided against an extensive comparison with the 1970s measurements for these reasons, and we have done so as well, for the same reasons.

Adank et al. (2004) measured formants at nine time points in long midvowels and diphthongs in the speech of western teachers of Dutch (ten male and ten female speakers). On the basis of their profession, these speakers were considered likely to produce standard-like speech. Adank et al.’s speakers, like our speakers, had a professional interest in speaking the standard language. The speakers read out vowels in a [Cn,VCn] context (for instance *soos*, *saas*, and *suus*). Another source of comparison was Edelman (2002), who measured the first element of diphthong (ei) in Polder Dutch. These data have been contrasted with our data on the degree of opening and/or lowering of the first element of this diphthong. We and Edelman (2002) used the Praat program for measurements, and the measuring techniques used were near-identical. Adank et al. (2004) used Nearey et al.’s (2002) formant-tracking tool to measure the first three formants.

Adank et al.’s speakers produced read speech and were therefore likely to speak carefully and well-pronounced and distinguish strongly between the various vowels produced. Edelman’s speakers produced (semi-)spontaneous and spontaneous speech. Our speakers produced semi-spontaneous speech.

**Chapter overview**

Section 12.2 summarises the techniques used in the present research to come to the vowel-formant measurements (described in Section 5.10) and presents the subdivision in the set of vowels between peripheral and focal vowels and - within the focal vowels - between long midvowels and diphthongs. Furthermore, it explains how degree of diphthongisation is measured and explains the use of indexation to express degree of openness. Finally, this section explains the decision to use both open-syllable and closed-syllable occurrences in our measurements.

Section 12.3 presents the measurement results. First up are the raw measurements of the vowels of our seven speakers. It includes a comparison of the formants of peripheral and focal vowels (see Section 5.10 and 12.2) and of tokens in open and closed syllables. These data represent a modern-day state of affairs regarding Standard Dutch vowels. Presented next are the normalised results. Together, the raw and normalised results provide an overview of the pronunciation variation within the group of seven carefully selected speakers of Standard Dutch.
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Section 12.4 compares our vowel measurements with those of Adank et al. (2004). In this comparison, men and women are looked at separately, and indexation is used. Two time points in the vowels are compared (25% and 75%). Furthermore, an overall comparison is given of the degree of diphthongisation of the two classes of vowels.

Section 12.5 looks at lowering of the first element of diphthongs. Lowering tendencies were transcribed, and diphthong phonemes were by transcribers qualified as ‘containing a lowered first element’ or ‘not containing a lowered first element’. Thus, the spectral values of ‘lowered’ and ‘unlowered’ realisations can be compared. These data were compared with Edelman’s (2002) measurements of the first element of diphthong (ei) in Polder Dutch.

12.2 METHOD

Section 5.10 elaborately describes the methodology of the acoustic measurements. That section explains how selected vowels of seven speakers were the topic of investigation. The speakers were coded as JJ, TH, NS, HAS, JZ, HES, and PD. They included two women (television newsmen PD and HES) and five men (radio presenters JJ, TH, and NS and television newsmen HAS and JZ). The vowels that were measured were three long midvowel phonemes, namely (ee), (eu), and (oo), and three diphthong phonemes, namely (ei), (ui), and (ou). Besides these, four other vowel phonemes were measured, to function as reference points: (a), (aa), (ie), and (oe).

Formant values were generated of up to 20 tokens of these six vowels in the speech of the speakers. The fundamental frequency (F0) and three formants (F1 through F3) were measured at one (for peripheral vowels) or three (for focal vowels) time points in the vowel duration: at 50% or at 25%/50%/75%. The vowel tokens that were measured occurred in stressed syllables followed by an obstruent and schwa or in stressed closed syllables ending in an obstruent.

To qualify the vowels, the hertz values of the formants are plotted in figures resembling vowel diagrams. The vertical axis represents the open/close dimension (F1), and the horizontal axis represents the front/back dimension (F3). The F0 and F3 values are in Appendix 8 but are not part of any graph or calculation. Both raw and normalised data are used in some of the data representations, to make clear the necessity of speaker normalisation, to reveal the effects of this procedure, and to mutually compare speakers.

Long midvowels vs. diphthongs; focal vs. peripheral vowels

The set of six vowel phonemes under investigation consists of two main types. Three of these six are traditionally called monophthongs ((ee), (eu), and (oo)), but in the literature they have increasingly become referred to as semi-diphthongs. Van de Velde and Van Hout (2003)1 measured them and concluded that these three vowels

1 They used Adank et al.’s (2004) data set for their measurements.
can be considered diphthongal on the basis of consistent $F_1$ (time) changes (i.e. within each vowel). These three vowels are called long midvowels in the results below, in accordance with the literature (see Section 10.3). The other three vowels ((ei), (ui), and (ou)) are traditionally called diphthongs, and Van de Velde and Van Hout (2003) found considerable differences between the degree of diphthongisation (again based on $F_1$ development within the vowels) of (ee), (eu), and (oo) and that of these three vowel phonemes in Dutch. Therefore, these three are here called diphthong phonemes, which is in accordance with the literature (see Section 10.4).

In the present chapter, long midvowel phonemes and diphthong phonemes are the ‘focal’ vowels in the vowel space, as opposed to the ‘peripheral’ vowels, namely (a), (aa), (ie), and (oe). The peripheral vowels were not subjects of study. Instead, they served as reference points, as they are said to represent the edges of the vowel space of speakers: (aa) is the most fronted open vowel, (a) the most backed open vowel, (ie) the most fronted closed vowel, and (oe) the most backed closed vowel. All the vowels under investigation should be viewed with reference to these peripheral vowels (for each speaker, an average for each of the peripheral vowels is calculated). This way, these other vowels can be qualified on the front/back dimension ($F_2$=horizontal) and the open/close dimension ($F_1$=vertical) of the speech tract.

Diphthongisation

Diphthongisation refers to changes in the shape of the speech tract during the production of vowels, resulting in an audible vowel glide. There is no widely acknowledged method of Transforming diphthongisation in figures.

Dutch (semi-)diphthongs without exception move from an open to a more closed position. Two measuring points will give an idea of the degree of diphthongisation. As vowel height is the main change in the diphthongisation of Dutch vowels, $F_1$ changes will be the main indicators of diphthongisation. Van de Velde and Van Hout (2003:488) considered the vowels in their research corpus diphthongal when there was a systematic move towards a more closed vowel, i.e. an increase in the hertz value of $F_1$. This method measured the difference between $F_1$ at 25% and 75% of the vowel duration. They found this method to be successful in establishing degree of diphthongisation. Adank et al. (2004) also used this method. The same method was therefore used here.

$F_1$ indexation

Results in hertz, both raw and normalised, impressionistically mutually contrast vowel phonemes. They do not reveal the relative position of vowels in the speech tract. Such a position enables a comparison between vowels and between speakers. Indexation provides an insightful representation of degree of diphthongisation. This is how the results are presented below, besides the raw results. Index numbers were calculated representing the openness dimension of vowels, namely by relating each speaker’s vowels’ $F_1$ at 25% and 75% to their largest (=100) and smallest (=0)
possible degree of openness. This is in line with Gerstman (1968; see also Adank et al. 2004:21). Our index numbers were calculated as indicated below. Symbol ‘$V_i$’ is the vowel under investigation at either 25% or 75%; ‘$CL_i$’ is the most closed reference point (either (ie), (oe), or the average between these two) at 50%, and ‘$OP_i$’ is the most open reference point (always (aa)) at 50%:

\[
100 \times \frac{F_1(V_i) - F_1(CL_i)}{F_1(OP_i) - F_1(CL_i)}
\]

So, the relative position of the $F_i$ of all vowels under investigation was positioned along the same vertical dimension. The $F_i$ of (ee) and (ei) is in a different area in the vowel chart than that of (oo), (ou), (eu), and (ui). Phonemes (ee) and (ei) start and end in a front position, and it is logical to position them on the (ie)/(aa) dimension. Our measurements (see Figure 12.1 and Section 12.2) showed that (a) did not act like a peripheral vowel in the same way that the other three did and could not be taken to represent the ultimate lower back position. After considering the position of (a) and (aa), it was decided to take (aa) as the most open reference point for all focal vowels. Phonemes (oo) and (ou) begin and end in a back position, and it is therefore most realistic to place them on the (oe)/(aa) dimension. Vowels (eu) and (ui) occur in the central (between front and back) dimension. For these two, therefore, the average of (ie) and (oe) was taken as the most closed reference point. This decision is illustrated in Section 12.3.

Table 12.1 gives an impression of the relationship between the index numbers and hertz values for the seven speakers by showing the ranges of the vertical dimension in each speaker’s vowel space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>(ie) to (aa)</th>
<th>(ie)/(oe) to (aa)</th>
<th>(oe) to (aa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAS</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that male and female speakers are not distinguishable on the basis of these values in hertz. As for instance, male speaker NS has a higher range than both female speakers.
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Open-syllable versus closed-syllable occurrences

For the investigation, both closed-syllable and open-syllable occurrences were measured, and therefore we needed to establish preliminarily whether in later calculations measurements in these two types of contexts could be merged. It turned out that significant differences existed between the open-syllable and closed-syllable tokens of the peripheral vowel phonemes of two of the seven speakers. There was a significant difference between the F3s of (aa) in open and closed syllables in the speech of speaker NS. The other significant differences existed in the speech of speaker JZ: F1 in (aa) and (a) and F2 in (ie). In the remaining five speakers’ speech, no significant differences were found between open and closed tokens of any of the vowels.

Given that significant differences were found only for a small subset of the speakers and vowels, it seems justified to pool tokens occurring in open and closed syllables. The fact that it concerned only peripheral vowels and that the named significances mainly occurred in F3, which is a formant of a lesser (perceptual) relevance in the acoustic make-up of vowels, motivated this decision. So, the averages presented below are over both open and closed occurrences.

12.3 ALL THE VOWELS

Raw (Hz) at 50%

In Figure 12.1, the F1 and F2 of the vowels at the 50% point are plotted in a space resembling a traditional vowel diagram. Each symbol in this figure represents the average of multiple occurrences (20 in most cases), per vowel for one of the speakers.
CHAPTER 12

Figure 12.1: $F_1$ and $F_2$ (Hz) at 50% of four peripheral and six focal vowels (up to 20 tokens), split up over seven speakers.

The plotted averages of each vowel take up a limited area within the figure, more or less in the expected places. The focal vowels are clotted together in a limited space, yet most of them overlap with one or more of the other vowels. In Figure 12.1, the long midvowels (the opaque symbols) occupy the higher central horizontal area, the peripheral vowels (the transparent symbols) are in the peripheral area, and the diphthongs (the crossed symbols) are in the lower half of the graph and partly overlap with the open peripheral vowel phonemes.

In the traditional IPA vowel diagram, (aa) and (a) are closer to each other than (ie) and (oe) are, but mutually distinguishable nevertheless, yet in our diagram (aa) and (a) almost overlap. The averages of (aa) and (a) of individual speakers nevertheless do not merge, and the average (aa) of each speaker is more open and more fronted than their (a). (This individual lack of overlap is not discernable from the figure.) The normalised data below show whether this overlap occurs when the effects of anatomical differences are minimised.
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*Normalised (z-scores) at 50%*

The representation of the measurements in Figure 12.1 clouds the agreement between speakers, as it incorporates differences between the speech tracts of speakers. A speaker normalisation procedure reduces the effects of these anatomical differences. There are various ways to normalise. The most common methods towards a realistic and insightful normalisation were evaluated by Adank (2003), who (179-180) concluded that the Lobanov procedure (Lobanov 1971) performed best of all in representing phonemic variation in the transformed acoustic vowel data. This procedure reduces the anatomical variation in the vowel through a conversion to z-scores. For perceptual/acoustic comparisons, Lobanov yielded acoustic data that could be used to model the variation in certain perceptual variables (amongst others, height) more effectively than other procedures. Therefore, it was decided for the present research to use this procedure for the normalisation of our raw acoustic data. When converting the Figure 12.1 results into z-scores, the agreement between our speakers becomes more obvious: see Figure 12.2.

![Diagram](image_url)

*Figure 12.2: F₁ and F₂ [normalised data (Lobanov; z-scores) of Figure 12.1] at 50% of four peripheral and six focal vowels (up to 20 tokens), split up over seven speakers.*
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A traditional pattern of a vowel diagram emerges, more obviously than in Figure 12.1. Figure 12.2 shows that after normalisation the long midvowel phonemes each occupy limited areas in the diagram. These normalised values reveal that even (aa) and (a) occupy distinct positions within the vowel diagram. This class is also separated (spatially) from the other vowels. Such a separation is not true for diphthongs (ui) and (ou). The 50% points in (ui) partly overlap with those of (aa), and the (ou)’s more or less coincide with the (a)’s. Phoneme (ci) is the only diphthong that stands separated from the other phonemes in this limited set of vowels.

Comparison with Adank et al. (2004)

Figure 12.3 shows the averages of Adank et al.’s (2004) and our male speakers.

![Graph](image)

*Figure 12.3: F₁ and F₂ (Hz) at 50% of four peripheral and six focal vowels of Adank et al.’s (2004) male speakers (N=10; 2 tokens per phoneme) and our male speakers (N=5; up to 20 tokens per phoneme). The transparent squares are Adank et al.’s, the opaque ones are ours. Adank et al.’s data form a slightly wider vowel chart than ours, but apart from some phonemes (for instance (oe)), the two vowel charts more or less overlap. Again, the

---

2 The phonemes (uu) and (i), for instance, are not included. These may have caused overlap.
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difference lies mainly in the vertical (open-close) dimension. Except for (aa), Adank et al.’s vowels are more closed than ours, although the differences are minor. The measurements for the female speakers are in Figure 12.4.

![Figure 12.4: F1 and F2 (Hz) at 50% of four peripheral and six focal vowels of our female speakers (N=2) and Adank et al.’s (2004) female speakers (N=10). The transparent squares are Adank et al.’s, the opaque ones are ours.](image)

Like the men, Adank et al.’s female speakers have a wider vowel chart than ours. The difference lies mainly in the vertical dimension. As was the case with the males, Adank et al.’s vowels in the top half of the chart are higher than our speakers’. This is most likely to be due to Adank et al.’s data having been elicited through a reading passage, while our speakers produced spontaneous and semi-spontaneous speech.

12.4 DIPHTHONGISATION

Section 10.3 showed that there is a tendency in the Dutch literature to qualify long midvowels as steady-state vowels while they are nevertheless commonly realised as semi-diphthongs. This class of vowels in northern Standard Dutch is as a rule semi-diphthongal. Whether their degree of diphthongisation is moving towards that of diphthongs even seems a relevant question.
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Midvowels

The results pertaining to the diphthongisation of vowels are presented next. Men and women are looked at separately, and our results are compared with those by Adank et al. (2004). Special attention is paid to the effects of sex.

Male speakers

Figure 12.5 displays the long midvowels by our five and Adank et al.’s ten male speakers at 25% and 75%. The connecting lines signify diphthongisation.

![Graph showing F1 and F2 frequencies for midvowels](image)

Figure 12.5: F1 and F2 (Hz) at 25% and 75% of three midvowels [(ee), (eu), and (oo)] by our male speakers (N=5, up to 20 tokens per speaker) and Adank et al.’s (2004) (N=10, two tokens per speaker). The transparent squares are Adank et al.’s, the opaque ones are ours.

Both groups of speakers produced light diphthongs, in the top half of the vowel diagram. These data suggest that the midvowels by Adank et al.’s speakers begin in a similar position as ours and end in a more closed position.

Below, the degree of diphthongisation is looked at more closely. Section 12.2 indicated how relative degree of diphthongisation can be shown through indexation of the F1 values. As we measured the speech of only five men and two women, indexation is particularly useful. Accidental anatomical variation is likely to have affected the average formant values in Figure 12.5.
To come to index numbers, two findings were taken into consideration. First of all, phonemes (ee) and (ei) are generally in the left-hand vertical area of the vowel chart, phonemes (oo) and (ou) in the right-hand area, and (eu) and (ui) in the central area (in Figures 12.1 to 12.5). Another relevant observation is that the vowel charts have basically turned out as a triangle in which (aa) was the most open vowel. Vowel (a) has therefore turned out not to be as peripheral as the other three peripheral vowels. The focal phoneme (ou) more or less coincided with peripheral (a). For these reasons, the two most closed vowels and the point exactly between them are taken to represent the most closed realisations for the vowels measured, depending on where in the diagram they appeared (left, centre, or right), and (aa) was the most open point for all the vowels. The most closed point of reference for (ee)/(ei) is (ie), for (oo)/(ou) this is (oe), and for (eu)/(ui) it is the average of (ie) and (oe). With this in mind, the index numbers for the midvowels of the male speakers are in Figure 12.6. It shows the $F_1$ values on a scale from completely closed (=0) to completely open (=100).

![Graph showing indexed degree of diphthongisation of three midvowel pairs](image)

**Figure 12.6 (derived from Figure 12.5): Indexed degree of diphthongisation of three midvowel pairs [(ee), (eu), and (oo)] of male speakers (five from our research and ten from Adank et al.’s), represented by $F_1$ values between completely closed [0=$F_1$ of (ie), (oe), or (ie)/(oe)] to completely open [100=$F_1$ of (aa)]. The thin lines are Adank et al.’s, the thick ones are ours.**

Figure 12.6 shows that there is consistent diphthongisation by both groups of speakers and that Adank et al.’s male speakers’ midvowels end in a somewhat more closed position than ours. Adank et al.’s speakers consistently diphthongise more
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than ours. The indexation lines are bundled close to each other, and no midvowel clearly deviates from the others.

**Female speakers**

Figure 12.7 shows the female midvowels.

![Diagram](image-url)  
Figure 12.7: $F_1$ and $F_2$ (Hz) at 25% and 75% of three midvowels ([ee], [eu], and [oo]) by our speakers (two female speakers, up to 20 tokens per speaker) and Adank et al.’s (2004) (ten female speakers, two tokens per vowel per speaker). The transparent squares are Adank et al.’s, the opaque ones are ours.

The female midvowels have overall higher values in Hz than the male midvowels, and [ie] and [eu] are more fronted than those of the male speakers (cf. Figure 12.5). This is true for both our and Adank et al.’s speakers. Strikingly, all Adank et al.’s female speakers start their midvowels at a lower $F_1$ than ours, which means that their realisations are overall more closed than our females’. On the basis of these values in hertz, no strong diphthongisation differences between the groups can be seen. Our females seem to diphthongise [ee] and [eu] more than our men, while Adank et al.’s men and women show a mutually similar pattern in this respect. Figure 12.8 displays the indexed comparison.
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Figure 12.8 (derived from Figure 12.7): Indexed degree of diphthongisation of midvowels ([ee], [eu], and [oo]) of female speakers (two from our research and ten from Adank et al.’s), represented by F1 values between completely closed [0=F1 of [ie], [oe], or (ie)(oe)] to completely open [100=F1 of [aa]]. The thin lines are Adank et al.’s, the thick ones are ours.

Figure 12.8 shows that our and Adank et al.’s female midvowels are comparable as far as degree of diphthongisation and degree of openness of the first element are concerned. The only minor exceptional midvowels are our females’ (oo)’s, which are somewhat more open than Adank et al.’s females’ (oo)’s and diphthongise more. Generally, the female midvowels end closer to each other than the men’s (cf. Figure 12.6).

Diphthongs

Midvowels are known to be relatively limited in their degree of diphthongisation. Differences between men and women are therefore limited as well. Diphthongs, on the other hand, may be expected to show more diphthongisation variation than midvowels and reveal differences between the sexes. Next are the diphthong results.

Male speakers

The male diphthongs are in Figure 12.9.
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Figure 12.9: F₁ and F₂ (Hz) at 25% and 75% of three long diphthongs [(ue), (ui), and (ou)] by our male speakers (N=5, up to 20 tokens per speaker) and Adank et al.’s (2004) (N=10, two tokens per vowel per speaker). The transparent squares are Adank et al.’s, the opaque ones are ours.

Generally, Adank et al.’s men have wider diphthongs than ours, and theirs end in a more closed position. They start in a similar position in the figure and extend further than our men’s. Adank et al.’s (ou) in particular stretches out considerably. Below are the indexed results.
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Figure 12.10 (derived from Figure 12.9): Indexed degree if diphthongisation of diphthongs [(ei), (ui), and (ou)] by male speakers (five from our research and ten from Adank et al.’s), represented by Fr values between completely closed [0=F1 of (ie), (oe), or (ie)(oe)] to completely open [100=F1 of (aa)]. The thin lines are Adank et al.’s, the thick ones are ours.

Generally, all the vowels occupy a limited space, and our speakers and Adank et al.’s show similar patterns in the results. Only Adank et al.’s speakers’ (ou)’s deviate from this and seem to diphthongise somewhat more strongly.

*Female speakers*

In Figure 12.11 are the female diphthongs.
Adank et al.’s female speakers seem to diphthongise more than ours. Their second elements in particular seem consistently more closed than our speakers’. The female diphthongs are produced in a more open position than the male diphthongs (cf. Figure 12.7), and they are generally wider than the male diphthongs. In Figure 12.12 are the indexed results.
Figure 12.12 (derived from Figure 12.11): Indexed degree of diphthongisation of diphthongs of female speakers (two from our research and ten from Adank et al.’s), represented by F1 values between completely closed [0%=F1 of (ie), (aa), or (ie)/(oe)] to completely open [100%=F1 of (aa)]. The thin lines are Adank et al.’s, the thick ones are ours.

Adank et al.’s speakers again behave similarly to ours. All diphthongs are close to each other in the figure and move in a similar direction, although our speakers’ (ui)’s are diphthongised somewhat more strongly. The female speakers’ first elements are generally more closed than the men’s (cf. Figure 12.10).

**Overall comparison**

The indexed differences between the degree of diphthongisation of the two types of vowels between our male and female speakers and Adank et al.’s are in Table 12.2.

Table 12.2: Indexed degree of diphthongisation of midvowels and diphthongs in the speech of our speakers and Adank et al.’s (2004), split up over men and women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>phoneme type</th>
<th>Smakman men</th>
<th>Smakman women</th>
<th>Adank men</th>
<th>Adank women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>midvowels</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diphthongs</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The lowest of the ‘average’ rows shows that Adank et al.’s speakers and ours have a similar tendency to diphthongise. The difference in overall degree of diphthongisation is mainly due to Adank et al.’s men, who diphthongise relatively strongly. This goes against any suggestion that women lead the way in change. Because Adank et al.’s speakers were from the west, one would have expected them to diphthongise more. However, this is only true for the men.

12.5 LOWERING OF THE FIRST ELEMENT

Lowering is a quality allocated to vowels by transcribers who take as their point of reference a personal degree of openness that they perceive as ‘not lowered’. Any realisation that is audibly considerably open may then be qualified as ‘lowered.’ Section 10.7 discussed the tendency of the first element of contemporary Standard Dutch diphthong phonemes to lower. Lowering can be linked to the F1 of the first element of vowels, represented by the 25% measurement point (in accordance with Edelman 2002). The closer this first element’s F1 of a vowel is to that of (aa), the more open that vowel is (and thus ‘low’).

The transcribers decided for all vowel phoneme tokens whether they were lowered. Table 12.3 contains the degree of openness of diphthong phonemes the first element of which was by the transcribers considered lowered (the ‘+low’ columns) and those where this was not the case (the ‘-low’ columns). Again, index numbers are calculated using Gerstman’s (1968) formula (see Section 12.2). The transcription results revealed that none of the first elements of the long midvowel phonemes were lowered, and therefore only diphthong phonemes are in the table.

Table 12.3: Degree of openness (index) of the first element of six vowel phonemes by seven speakers (0=maximally closed; 100=maximally open), split up over vowels of which the first element was lowered (+low) or not lowered (-low) according to transcriber pairs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>(e) F1 / 25%</th>
<th>(u) F1 / 25%</th>
<th>(ou) F1 / 25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+low</td>
<td>-low</td>
<td>+low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tokens (n)</td>
<td>tokens (n)</td>
<td>tokens (n)</td>
<td>tokens (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>6 95</td>
<td>14 80</td>
<td>10 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1 72</td>
<td>19 64</td>
<td>8 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>20 74</td>
<td>1 76</td>
<td>19 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAS</td>
<td>17 89</td>
<td>19 102</td>
<td>9 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>18 70</td>
<td>13 79</td>
<td>1 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>3 68</td>
<td>17 61</td>
<td>2 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>2 91</td>
<td>18 60</td>
<td>10 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>82 71</td>
<td>92 82</td>
<td>94 83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In almost all cases, the F$_1$ at 25% of each of these three diphthong phonemes is more open when the transcribers considered the first element lowered (see the ‘average’ row). The exception is the one occurrence of a lowered (ui) in the speech of TH.

The average difference between +low and -low realisations is quite consistent across the three diphthong phonemes: 11 points for (ei), 10 points for (ui), and 11 for (ou). The variation is considerable though. The largest difference between the openness of the first element of diphthong phonemes with a lowered first element and those without this quality is 31 (the difference between +low and -low (ei) by HES). The smallest difference is 7 points (the difference between +low and -low (ei) by PD). A $t$ test was done on each of the three diphthongs by each individual speaker. Three speakers had lowered and unlowered occurrences of all three diphthongs. In Table 12.4 are these three speakers and whether the difference between lowered and unlowered occurrences was significant$^3$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>speaker</th>
<th>(ei)</th>
<th>(ui)</th>
<th>(ou)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>+ (15)</td>
<td>+ (17)</td>
<td>- (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>- (7)</td>
<td>- (12)</td>
<td>- (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>+ (31)</td>
<td>+ (28)</td>
<td>- (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12.4: Significances [+*=significant, -*=not significant] between lowered and unlowered occurrences of three diphthongs by three speakers. Between parentheses are the actual average differences (index) between lowered and unlowered occurrences.

Two of the three speakers (JJ and HES) distinguish significantly between lowered and unlowered realisations. Speaker HES in particular has two distinct degrees of opening in two of her diphthongs. The difference between lowered and unlowered tokens of (ou) are not significant in any of the cases.

**Comparison with Polder Dutch**

The first element of some of our diphthong phonemes was qualified as ‘+low’, but this lowering tendency was subtle in the perception of the transcribers. In contemporary standardised Dutch, lowering tendencies can be observed that are perceptually considerably more prominent than those of our (more conservative) Standard Dutch speakers. Comparing such a progressive type of standardised Dutch with our conservative Standard Dutch data would put into perspective the degree of lowering by our speakers.

Round about the time when our measurements were performed, Edelman (2002) measured the first elements of (ei) in the speech of speakers who theoretically qualified as Polder Dutch speakers. This language variety (see Stroop 1998) has a strong lowering of the first element of the diphthongs as its main characteristic. Stroop claimed that this pronunciation can be considered the new type of Standard

---

$^3$ This was done on the basis of the index numbers. Using the values in hertz would have yielded identical results.
Dutch, as it is claimed to be spreading rapidly across certain influential speakers in
the Netherlands. Edelman looked for Polder Dutch speech in avant-garde circles
(which she found in a semi-intellectual cultural talk show). Only some of the women
in the group of her speakers obviously produced Polder Dutch. We had Edelman’s
data matrix at our disposal. Two issues obstructed a straightforward comparison
with our data. First of all, Edelman did not perform the elaborate corrections that we
did. In our measurements, the automatic and manual measurements were subjected
to an additional correction (see Section 5.10). Outliers in the data matrix were traced
and reconsidered, as these may have been the result of mismeasurements by Praat or
mispronunciations by the speakers. These would in that case be atypical, and
including these would make the averages less meaningful. On the basis of the
values, we checked the outstanding measurements, and these, too, were subjected to
manual measurements. In many cases, the speech signal was not good enough to
elicit a formant value, and the measurement was in that case deleted from the matrix.
Edelman did not perform this final correction. After studying Edelman’s formant
values, it occurred to us that strong outliers (according to SPSS) were numerous, and
the averages of the phonemes (five tokens, as opposed to our (up to) 20) per speaker
were based on these outliers as well. The second issue was the fact that we
determined for each phoneme token whether it was lowered. Edelman determined
for each speaker whether they were Polder Dutch speakers, without scoring the
individual vowel occurrences.

These two issues were dealt with by deleting the extreme outliers in Edelman’s
data matrix (we could not check the actual recordings) and calculating the averages
over the revised data. Furthermore, the averages in Figure 12.13 are not the lowered
and unlowered tokens but the averages for three types of speakers: speakers who
spoke strong Polder Dutch, speakers who spoke a moderate form of Polder Dutch,
and speakers who did not speak Polder Dutch. Our speakers were part of the latter
group. The results are in Figure 12.13. To put things into perspective, the values in
hertz have been added.

The women in the two researches who did not qualify as Polder Dutch speakers
(‘not Polder Dutch’) have similar degrees of openness (index numbers 60 and 62,
respectively). The women who qualified as Polder Dutch speakers had considerably
more open realisations, at the value of (index) 79 (‘moderate Polder Dutch’) and 83
(‘strong Polder Dutch’). The two types of Polder Dutch seem close to each other as
far as average degree of openness is concerned, yet the hertz values show that the
mutual differences are considerable. This is due to the high average degree of
openness of the speakers who spoke strong Polder Dutch. Their average (aa) at 50% was
911 Hz, whereas the (aa) at 50% was 879 Hz for the speakers who spoke the
milder form of Polder Dutch.
The average lowered first-element realisation of the diphthongs was 78 for our two women, and the unlowered occurrences were on average 59 (this is not visible in the table). This shows that the most open realisations in our corpus came close to the average of the openness of the first element of (ei) in the moderate version of Polder Dutch. This suggests that there is overlap in the openness of individual occurrences between speakers of Polder Dutch and our speakers.

12.6 CONCLUSION

After the perceptual description of Chapter 11, Chapter 12 presented the measurements of the vowels of our seven speakers (five male and two female newsreaders). These measurements were not only done to enable a comparison with the transcriptions but also to produce measurement data that future research could use as comparative material. With a comparison, not only the nature of Dutch vowels become clearer, but it also provides insights into the quality and usefulness of acoustic measurements on data such as ours.

To understand the spectral qualities of (variation in) Standard Dutch better, future research should include a larger corpus of speakers, preferably of television newsreaders. The possibilities of measuring the qualities of consonants may be explored too, especially to address the issue of perceived and actual voicing in fricatives. All in all, a combination of transcriptions and measurements has shown to be a successful method to describe the pronunciation qualities of phonemes.
FINALE
13. CONCLUSIONS

13.1 INTRODUCTION

This dissertation has defined Standard Dutch and described its pronunciation. The first of these themes approaches Standard Dutch as a social phenomenon rather than as a set of linguistic features. The second theme focuses on phonetic characteristics, namely the realisation of vowels and consonants. The starting point of the research was finding the agreement on what Standard Dutch speech is. This part in itself provided insights into the degree and nature of agreement on the linguistic norm in the Netherlands, and therefore the evaluation of speech is discussed as a separate theme in this chapter. The results also brought forward a fourth theme to discuss in the present chapter, namely the question of authority: who decide on the definition of Standard Dutch?

Chapter overview

Section 13.2 gives a characterisation of Standard Dutch. Respondent definitions of this language are used for this. First, an explanation is given of the two main ways Standard Dutch may be characterised, namely by taking as the point of departure either its intrinsic characteristics or its user characteristics. Intrinsic characteristics refer to the nature of the language itself, and this type of definition can be captured mostly by adjectives, for instance ‘correct’, ‘non-regional’, and ‘formal’. In some cases, intrinsic characteristics also included linguistic features. User characteristics refer to the people who typically speak this language variety; where they live, what they do, and so forth.

In Section 13.3, the pronunciation of Standard Dutch is dealt with. First, this section discusses pronunciation variation within Standard Dutch, and after that the descriptive results related to the consonants and vowels of Standard Dutch are presented. The final part of this section gives hints as to speech features other than segmental that may determine degree of standardness. The evaluation of speech, and particularly the effects of listener and respondent characteristics, is discussed in Section 13.4. A discussion on authority is in Section 13.5. This section also touches on the respective roles of laymen and experts in the present research. Section 13.6 concludes the chapter by hypothesising on the processes that establish and prolong a language norm. This final section predicts the future shape and position of Standard Dutch in the Netherlands.

13.2 STANDARD DUTCH: DEFINITION

Section 1.2 asked the question whether Standard Dutch exists. It certainly exists in the literature, and various writers have directly indicated that in some shape or form Standard Dutch is real. The amount of descriptive literature on this language variety speaks for itself. The willingness of respondents and listeners to answer questions on
Standard Dutch in our research confirms that it exists in Dutch society as well. Participants in the various researches generally did not question the existence of this language variety, and they were generally able to describe it. These descriptions even revealed considerable agreement, and this shows that Standard Dutch does not only exist but also that its shape has to some degree been established. Especially after recategorising characteristics put forward by respondents in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey (Section 6.3), it appeared that the named agreement is considerable. The characteristics mentioned oftentimes referred directly to actual speakers and audible qualities, which again confirms that an existing entity is described. The New-Zealand results in the International Survey indicate that this ability to describe the standard language depends on the actual existence. Standard New-Zealand English exists mainly in linguistic spheres and not so much in the minds of ordinary speakers, so it appears. Descriptions of New-Zealand English were as a result relatively irregular.

So, it seems that those writers who considered Standard Dutch too elusive and unrealistic to be considered a tangible reality (for instance Overdiep 1949:8-17, Kloeke 1951:43, Goossens 1974:12, De Vries 1980:224-225, 1987:128-129, Geerts 1987:165) are wrong. An explanation for the alleged elusiveness of Standard Dutch lies in the parallel existence of two distinct interpretations, as is argued in this section, rather than a single one. These two interpretations, however, are not mutually exclusive, so it will be argued.

After ordering the characteristics put forward by respondents, a two-way division appeared. Chapters 6 and 7 reflect this division between intrinsic (Chapter 6) and user characteristics (Chapter 7). Respondents themselves do not usually distinguish between these two types, using both interchangeably when asked to define Standard Dutch.

Intrinsic characteristics

The difficulty in describing the intrinsic characteristics of a language is that various types of such characteristics will arise from the research, as the results of the Sociolinguistic Survey show (Section 6.3). The comments by respondents can be ordered in various ways. In reporting on the intrinsic characteristics put forward by respondents, subtle distinctions can be maintained (for instance between responses such as ‘the language we all understand’ and ‘the language that we all have in common’). Most intrinsic characteristics that respondents mentioned, however, point towards more generic intrinsic characteristics (in this case, ‘lingua francaness’) and permit a broader characterisation. The results of the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey (Table 6.2) thus brought forward numerous characteristics, which showed that correctness, non-regionality, and lingua francaness are perceived to be the most distinctive intrinsic characteristics of Standard Dutch.

Some of the characteristics still referred to one and the same underlying idea and could be recategorised even further. One could, for instance, argue that the characteristics ‘non-regionality’ and ‘lingua francaness’ refer to similar notions, as both express the urge for mutual sameness (which could be named ‘generalness’).
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Looking at the wide variety of characteristics in this more generalistic manner (Table 6.3) showed that the respondents referred to generalness and culturedness as the most important intrinsic characteristics of Standard Dutch. This is mainly due to the fact that non-regionality (as part of generalness) and unnaturalness (as a part of culturedness) surfaced so often in the descriptions by respondents.

Generalness

Section 6.3 presented categories of intrinsic characteristics used by the respondents to describe Standard Dutch. The most dominant group of characteristics was called the ‘general’ category. Two main members of this category were the non-regionality and lingua franca characteristics. The generalness of the standard language most strongly surfaces in the results through references to non-regionality. In the Dutch literature (Section 6.3), non-regionality is put forward as a requirement of the standard language. Our respondents in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey (Table 6.1a and Table 6.1b) also applied this characteristic regularly. So, this is a popular view that is shared by Dutch professionals and laymen. It appears (Section 8.3, Table 8.1) that the Dutch put relatively much emphasis on non-regionality.

Section 2.4 indicated that in the 13th Century documents in the Low Countries were adjusted on the basis of the awareness of the existence of non-regional items. The wide variety of dialects in the Netherlands in the late Middle Ages made it useful to resort to such non-regional terminology in documents aimed at large audiences, if such terminology existed. After the Netherlands entered a period of unity and independence in the 16th Century (Section 2.5), this need for non-regionality remained. It can be assumed that today’s need for non-regionality is different from that in previous centuries. Also, non-regionality nowadays is most of all relevant in pronunciation, as written Dutch has standardised to a high degree (Section 2.1, 2.10, and 3.7).

Non-regionality is partly an effect and partly a point of focus, so it appears. It arises naturally as people move outside their local speech community and adjust their language so as to communicate effectively and neutrally with other people. It is only over time that striving for a non-regional accent has become an explicit point of interest in the Netherlands. In earlier times, the focus was more on characteristics other than pronunciation. Non-regionality was necessary in those cases where different language varieties met, whereas today this intelligibility function of non-regionality is disappearing. Today, speakers who are perfectly mutually understandable may strive towards non-regionality anyway, i.e. without any practical need. In this case, non-regionality becomes symbolic rather than practical.

An explanation for today’s outstanding focus on non-regionality in the Netherlands is that the geographical focus of Dutch speakers has broadened in recent centuries, and in recent decades in particular (Section 2.8). In earlier days, people’s scope of attention would almost exclusively be on the own village and the neighbouring ones. Making a neutral impression would not require a pronunciation that was neutral from a regional or national point of view. There seems to be the need in the Netherlands to adapt to the linguistic norms of the larger group and not
to stand out. The fact that poshness is hardly at all associated with Standard Dutch (Table 6.3) corroborates this suggestion. Apparently, poshness is a characteristic that serves to distinguish and is therefore not part of the standard language. It seems that amongst Standard Dutch speakers the aim is to produce clear language that is unmarked and inoffensive.

Parallel to the strict view, in which traces of regionality are not present in Standard Dutch, there is the view in which some traces are acceptable. When asked to indicate whether regional traces are audible in Standard Dutch, a considerable majority of the respondents in the Telephone Survey (Figure 6.4) indicated that this is the case. Only about a third believed that this is not so. The results of the same survey (Figure 6.4) showed that western features are more acceptable than other regional features. The results of the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey (Figure 7.1) showed that Haarlem, the Randstad, and the west are widely considered the places where Standard Dutch is spoken most. To a degree, therefore, regionality seems synonymous with a non-western accent (Section 6.3, Section 7.2), at least within such a lenient interpretation of Standard Dutch.

The results of the Speech Evaluation Experiment showed that evaluations of regional speech are less structured than those of non-regional speech (Section 9.4). The evaluation of highly standard speech evokes similar reactions across respondents and seems less dependent on where they come from, their age, sex, and level of education. Evaluations of obvious deviations from the standard language may be steered more strongly by such respondent characteristics. In future decades, western accents may either become associated increasingly with the standard language, or it may be that any kind of accent, including western, becomes less acceptable and that the importance of non-regionality grows.

Lingua francae is another characteristic of Standard Dutch that helps to make this language variety general. A lingua franca is a means of communication for those who do not necessarily have this language as their first or native language. The standard language is not a lingua franca in the traditional sense, as it is not usually the language used to achieve a basic form of communication but to understand each other better, to avoid confusion. The respondents in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey oftentimes in some descriptive form or other put forward the practical/communicative function of Standard Dutch (Section 6.3). This function of Standard Dutch is in the literature not usually emphasised as a core characteristic. Lingua francae is related to non-regionality in the sense that non-regionality makes language varieties more mutually comprehensible. The International Survey results (Section 8.3) suggested that lingua francae is the only characteristic that is internationally recognised as required in the standard language.

Intrinsic characteristics other than lingua francae are alive in the countries investigated outside the Netherlands, but their relative dominance varies. This shows that the lingua francae of the Dutch standard language is in line with broader sociolinguistic tendencies, whereas a characteristic such as the specific need for non-regionality seems typical of an old standard language like Dutch. The most important early proponent of the non-regionality characteristic was Jespersen (1925), a Dane. Danish is another established language.
**Chapter 13**

**Culturedness**

The results of the Speech Evaluation Experiment (Section 6.3) showed that standardness correlates positively with polishedness, and the results of the Sociolinguistic Description Survey (Table 6.2) showed that correctness is an important characteristic of the standard language in the Netherlands as well. Correctness was the most important general characteristic of Standard Dutch according to the respondents in the Sociolinguistic Survey (Section 6.3), and this suggests that truly standard Dutch is bound by rules and regulations. The term ‘culturedness’ was used to refer to such characteristics. Culturedness suggests that the standard language requires considerable effort, which may make it a less than natural language. Section 6.3 showed several other indications that Standard Dutch is to some degree subject to unnaturalness and suggested that this characteristic is embraced by its users and even by those who do not necessarily speak it. The suggested reasons for this were the conservative force and prescriptivism that Standard Dutch seems to be subject to, the fact that it is not always the mother tongue of speakers, the written tradition of the standard language, the formal communicative function of the standard language, and, finally, the articulated speech that is often heard in the media. It is safe to say that a relatively high degree of unnaturalness of the standard language is accepted; it even seems to enjoy a certain status. Naturalness is not a popular explicit point of debate. In fact, a loose and carefree style of speaking the standard language is likely to be viewed more critically than an exaggerated standard articulation.

**User characteristics**

User characteristics are the second kind of means to approach Standard Dutch. The results of the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey (Section 6.1) showed how these characteristics can be subdivided into by whom the language is typically used, when it was spoken in particular, and how many people speak it.

**Who**

It is not easy to describe a prototypical speaker of Standard Dutch in any detail, as the nature of the standard language itself does not allow such a narrow description. This language could never be exclusively typical of a highly specific group of speakers but will logically be the tongue of several groups of speakers. Therefore, only a set of hints can be given to describe typical Standard Dutch speakers.

The broadest subdivision possible, namely between men and women, is unsuccessful in the sense that both seem more or less equally likely to speak the standard language. Both men and women were put forward by the respondents in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey as famous speakers of Standard Dutch, and the two sexes were considered equally likely to speak it by the respondents in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey (Section 7.4). A light bias for women was found,
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but this was not the case across the countries studied in the International Survey (Section 8.3).

It was suggested (Section 6.3) that radio to a higher degree than television represents a theoretical norm, as radio is an older medium in which - logically and stereotypically - special attention is paid to speech and content. This possibility was not contradicted by the Dutch or international results, but it wasn’t confirmed either. In fact, the role allocated to television was perhaps even stronger. There was no majority of respondents in any country in the International Survey (Section 8.3) that strongly believed that either radio or television broadcast standard speech most. In all the countries investigated, the group of respondents who chose either medium was considerable, and so was the group who considered both to be equally likely to be broadcasting standard speech.

Newscasters in particular were associated with the standard language and to a lesser degree highly educated people as well (Section 7.4). (These two groups are not mutually exclusive, of course: newscasters may be presumed to be educated.) Many respondents put forward famous newscasters as prototypical Standard Dutch speakers (Figure 7.7, Table 7.2, and Figure 7.8). Although newscasters were found to be associated with the standard language across the countries investigated in the International Survey (Section 8.3), this group of speakers is not universally considered to represent the standard language. On the other hand, the only country where newscasters were not put forward by a majority of the respondents was New-Zealand, where the issue of standardness is confusing to respondents, due to a lack of an elaborate historical context. So, there are indications that in countries with an old standard language newscasters are linguistic role models. The respondents in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey (Section 7.4) were undecided between considering radio and television equally likely to broadcast standard speech or considering radio most likely, but the fact that famous television newscasters were put forward as example speakers suggests that perhaps television is more influential in the coming to existence of the linguistic norm.

Not all of the respondents in the countries that were investigated through the International Survey (Section 8.3) knew of individuals whose speech they considered representative of standard speech. New-Zealand did not have such exemplary speakers. So, again it seems that in countries where there is an old established standard language there are famous speakers whose speech is representative of standard speech. In countries where the standard language has never fully fledged, agreement on such famous speakers as a result does not exist.

As could be expected, the west of the Netherlands was associated strongly with Standard Dutch by the respondents in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey (Figure 7.1). The results of the Telephone Survey (Figure 6.4) showed that deviations from the standard language that have a western ring to them are considered more acceptable than features non-western. The Telephone Survey results (Figure 6.4) showed that western respondents feel this most strongly, so it is to some degree dependent on the regional origin of the respondent. As not all newscasters in the Netherlands are from the west of the country, and therefore do not necessarily have a western Dutch ring to their speech, the connection between the western Dutch
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cities and the standard language to a degree seems historical rather than practical. ‘Standardised speech that has its historical roots in the west’ rather than ‘today’s western speech’ may function as the language norm. Dutchmen are obviously aware of the historical ties between Standard Dutch and Dutch from the western cities.

The International Survey revealed that the capital city is often considered to be the place of origin of the standard language (Table 8.1). This, however, is always due to a specific reason, for instance because the capital city seats the most prestigious university. In the Netherlands, the capital city (Amsterdam) is not specifically associated with Standard Dutch. Urban areas are more often associated with the standard language than rural areas. When areas were named in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey (Figure 7.1) and the International Survey (Table 8.1), it seems that urban centres were referred to specifically. The results of the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey suggested that ‘the urban area in the west of the Netherlands’ and ‘the west’ are synonymous, as no rural areas or small towns were referred to specifically in those cases where a specific place was asked.

An expected but nevertheless striking result was the popularity of the city of Haarlem as the place where Standard Dutch is most likely to be spoken. It has been suggested that no compelling reasons can be invented to support this idea. The fact that this city has no widely recognisable city dialect - unlike other large western cities - is a possible reason why this response is still popular. No reasons have arisen to contradict this idea, and the relative obscurity and anonymity of Haarlem may thus have kept this notion alive.

*When*

The results of the Speech Evaluation Experiment showed that the evaluation of 1950s speech was significantly different from that of later decades. Speech from the 1950s was considered to be less standard (Figure 7.3 and Figure 7.4) when evaluated subconsciously (without the listener knowing how old the speech was). When 1950s speech was consciously evaluated (when respondents thought they knew the age) (Figure 7.3 and Figure 7.4), no significant differences appeared between the speech perceived to be from the 1950s and that from the other decades. The knowledge of the age of the speech has possibly caused higher standardness ratings for 1950s speech. It seems that while, generally, the speech from this era has a high, almost sentimental, status, the actual speech features from this period is subconsciously evaluated as less fit to function as a modern standard language.

This period was the early stage of widespread television broadcasting. It therefore may have set part of the norm. The exposure of Dutchmen to 1950s speech is limited today, and this speech could therefore never function as a norm. Old (pre-1960s) speech therefore seems to function as a theoretical norm to hold on to. There was no clear indication that speech from the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s was evaluated mutually differently. The evaluation of speech from these decades was unstructured. There were nevertheless indications of a small bias towards considering 1990s speech most standard (Table 7.1, Figure 7.3), and all in all it is clear that the modern
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standard language evolves with time and may remain ‘fresh’ for, say, two or three decades.

How many

One way of counting speakers of Standard Dutch is by asking respondents about their own ability to speak it. A majority of the respondents in the Telephone Survey believed in this ability. They even claimed to speak it regularly (Figure 7.15). In all the countries investigated in the International Survey (Section 8.3), more than 80% of the respondents considered themselves able to speak the standard language. However, after listening to the speech of half of respondents in the Telephone Survey (whose speech was recorded) it turned out that those who considered themselves speakers of Standard Dutch did not speak Standard Dutch to a significantly different degree than those who believed that they never spoke it (Section 7.3). Obviously, these respondents (Section 8.3) applied a broad interpretation of the standard language when it came to the ability to speak it. They can be assumed not to suggest being able to speak the standard language with no trace of a regional accent or other kind of variation. In the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey, as many as 86% of the respondents somehow characterised Standard Dutch by referring to its generalness (Table 6.2). This group of respondents referred to lingua franca, non-regionality, and other characteristics pointing to the accessibility of Standard Dutch to most speakers. This would again mean that the language has many speakers.

The literature (Section 2.8 and Section 3.3) suggests that besides this approach there is another dominant one, namely one that strongly limits the number of speakers and restricts variation. With the coming to existence of Standard Dutch, the idea developed that there was a version of the standard language that was homogenous and used only by the elite. The literature (Section 3.6) shows that today this idea of an exclusivist standard language is still alive. Table 6.2 reveals that a considerable number of respondents of the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey associated Standard Dutch with culturedness, which suggests that this language is accessible to a limited group of speakers only. At least a third, and in most cases half, of the respondents in the International Survey living in a country with an established standard language referred to the culturedness of the standard language (Table 8.2). It thus seems that established standard languages are ‘shadowed’ by a homogenous linguistic model, or at least the idea thereof.

So, the respondents appeared to be in two minds about Standard Dutch, adhering to both or one of these two views. The results of the Telephone Survey showed this most directly. The respondents (Section 7.6) were asked to indicate how many people speak Standard Dutch. Two responses stood out, namely ‘50% of the Dutch population’ and ‘between 0 and 5% of the Dutch population’. Although five percent of the population of the Netherlands is a large group of people, it is still a low percentage, and so they can be associated with an elite language. ‘Half of the Dutch population’ represents a broad view.
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These two approaches have been current since the middle of the 19th Century according to Kroon and Vallen (2004:6). Hagen and Vallen (1974) indicated that those who put the emphasis on homogeneity are strict and accept no variation, whereas those who consider heterogeneity to be a natural phenomenon embrace variation. Paardekooper (1969:30) believed that the lenient approach is a compromise used by those whose own language is in accordance with this and not the strict interpretation, but Kroon and Vallen (2004:6-7) believed that Paardekooper’s view has encountered little support. The strict view of active advocates of the homogeneous nature of the standard language is the one that has found its way into schoolbooks and language handbooks, and the data that have shown the heterogeneity of Dutch have failed to have much impact, so it seems. Hagen and Vallen (1975) indicated that this started to change in the 1970s.

Two types of standard languages

So, Standard Dutch seems subject to - what can be named - an ‘inclusive’ and an ‘exclusive’ interpretation. In the inclusive view, Standard Dutch binds speakers of Dutch. It is the language that many people know how to speak, and that most can and will achieve as a first or second language. This is a language with variation to the extent that it does not interfere with intelligibility. It is thus equal to ‘understandable Dutch’, the type of Dutch that avoids certain marked articulatory, lexical, and grammatical structures. It is spoken in situations where people with various backgrounds come together and need to communicate effectively and impartially (shops, schools, in the professional world, and so on). This inclusive type of Standard Dutch contains both regional and non-regional traces but no dialect features, most importantly those that impair comprehension. Non-standard Dutch in this inclusive view is Dutch that consistently shows features that are understandable to only a subset of speakers.

The exclusive distinguishes standard language speakers from others. It is the language of the happy few. It is the strictly homogenous language in which variation is limited and deviations highly conspicuous, including at the pronunciation level. Variation is allowed only within strict boundaries, providing it is not of the social type. The great majority of Dutchmen speak non-standard Dutch in this view or have non-standard features in their daily speech.

Looking at the international results (Table 8.1 and Table 8.2), it seems that the exclusivist standard language has as a prerequisite that it has had some centuries to develop. Considerable groups of respondents from the Netherlands, Flanders, Poland, and Japan somehow referred to the ‘culturedness’ of the standard language (Table 8.2). In New-Zealand society, on the other hand, there has been relatively little tradition with respect to a national standard language. As a possible consequence, the exclusivist (‘cultured’) aspect of the standard language was strikingly less present than in the four other societies dealt with in the International Survey. Correctness (part of culturedness) was not referred to at all by the New-Zealanders, while the respondents from the other countries named this characteristic regularly. Respondents from New-Zealand (Table 8.1) frequently equated ‘Standard
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New-Zealand English’ straightforwardly with ‘understandable and accessible New-Zealand English’, and one of the main intrinsic characteristics of the standard language in New-Zealand is its informal character, so the respondents indicated. Many New-Zealanders referred to Standard New-Zealand English with qualifications such as ‘slangy’, and all of this is reminiscent of generalness and heterogeneity, and thus of the inclusive view. The need for an invariable (exclusivist) norm in New-Zealand only indirectly surfaces, namely through the tendency of New-Zealand respondents to refer to British English, which is apparently their alternative to an exclusive standard language. Few New-Zealanders actually meet this norm or try to. This would suggest that the exclusive standard language is a remnant of the past that lingers persistently, rather than something that in modern-day society would come to existence. The exclusive standard language may act as a kind of guard for the language norm, to suppress change and quick adoptions to fashions.

If there are two standard languages, then the question is what their respective roles are and how they relate to each other. Both languages in their own way do not meet the stereotypical standard-language requirements. Although Exclusive Standard Dutch is highly homogenous, it is shared by few people, so that it is not standard in the sense of widely accepted and/or adopted. Inclusive Standard Dutch, on the other hand, is standard in the sense that many people speak it, but it is far from homogenous. Lingua francaness (typical of Inclusive Standard Dutch) and homogeneity (typical of Exclusive Standard Dutch) can be reconciled by regarding variation that causes no breach in communication as optional. Freedom of variation is thus naturally restricted by comprehension. Inclusive Standard Dutch, then, contains optional variation, which makes it non-homogenous, but the named variation is irrelevant as it is within certain bounds. This way, Inclusive Standard Dutch is the real standard language and simply has Exclusive Standard Dutch as one of its variants. Exclusive Standard Dutch is in this approach unnecessarily homogenous but not - on the basis of that homogeneity - more standard or less standard. The two types of Standard Dutch have in common the fact that they are maximally comprehensible.

Looking at the general definition of Standard Dutch (Table 6.2) and the literature on this topic (Section 6.3), we see that generalness surfaces as the main intrinsic characteristic of the standard language and exclusivity only to a lesser extent. This suggests that there is a stronger tendency to include variation than to exclude it, meaning that Inclusive Standard Dutch is the most widely embraced interpretation, whereas the strict view is mostly a convenient theoretical reference point.

13.3 STANDARD DUTCH: PRONUNCIATION

Pronunciation in particular plays a role in degree of standardness, so the respondents in the Telephone Survey indicated (Figure 6.5). Pronunciation is also one of the main topics discussed in the literature (Section 6.3) in relation to standardness. An explanation for this special interest in this aspect of language is that the Dutch
language has standardised to such an extent that pronunciation is the main remaining source of variation. As pronunciation is the more subtle of language features, it has become the main area of variation as well as the primary focus of attention in the standardness discussion. Grammatical, lexical, syntactic, and other types of variation are relatively minor, and producing completely standardised language in these fields has appeared to be feasible for most educated Dutchmen. As far as these aspects are concerned, they can achieve Exclusive Standard Dutch. In their pronunciation, however, achieving this type of Standard Dutch is more difficult, because the rules are strict.

The pronunciation variation discussed in the literature and here is in the realm of Exclusive Standard Dutch. For comprehension purposes, this variation is more or less irrelevant. The type of Dutch discussed here can be found in the so-called speech-making community¹ - i.e. the group of speakers whose speech is decisive in the coming to existence of the language norm. Within this domain of subtle variation, there is still debate on what is standard (or correct) pronunciation-wise. This again shows the need for an example pronunciation, one that may be referred to as an absolute and indubitable model. Those referring to this model nevertheless do not necessarily aspire to speak it.

Selection procedure

By taking into consideration theoretical issues and evaluations, speakers were selected whose speech can be considered highly standard. The theoretical standard language was found through assumptions (Section 1.6), the literature (Chapter 2 and 3), the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey (Table 7.2, Section 7.2, and Section 7.4), and the First Newsreader Survey (Table 7.3). A further selection was made through the Speech Evaluation Experiment (Figure 9.1 and Figure 9.2). The outcome were seven news presenters, whose speech was described both perceptually (Chapter 11) and acoustically (Chapter 12). It is safe to say that these speakers met the highest possible standardness norms, even within the Exclusive Standard Dutch sphere. The speakers in question received high standardness scores (Figure 9.1), but nevertheless not all listeners agreed on the high standardness of their speech (Table 9.2). Even when taking into consideration that some listeners and respondents for some reason or other failed to bring across a realistic evaluation and/or agree with the majority (Section 9.3), it is still clear that our speakers were not by everyone considered fit as Standard Dutch speakers, only a large majority. As our speakers were selected carefully, it may be assumed that agreement does not exist. Most likely, the agreement found regarding our speakers is the highest possible and gives an idea of the scope of variation within the language norm.

¹ Dutch term: spraakmakende gemeente.
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(v) and (z)

The literature of Section 10.3 showed how voiceless lax and to a lesser degree voiced lax and voiceless tense realisations of (v) and (z) are considered most typical of Standard Dutch. The voice in fricatives (v) and (z) is most usually viewed binarily; occurrences contain voice or they do not. Voice is perhaps better looked at in a more continuous manner, by viewing it from a perceptual point of view. While there is an absolute difference between voiced and voiceless, this difference is obscured perceptually. The lax articulation of voiceless fricatives creates a seemingly transitional realisation, one that is articulatorily close to (f) or (s) but perceptually still recognisable as the 'old' fricative (v) or (z). These transitional realisations are not clearly perceptually voiced or voiceless. Entering (v)'s and (z)'s in Praat and generating spectrograms revealed unambiguously whether there was voice but this finding says little about how people will perceive it.

Our transcription results (Section 11.3) show that both (v) and (z) are subject to devoicing but that (v) has a stronger tendency to devoice than (z). The realisations of these two phonemes do not coincide with (f) and (s). It can only be assumed that (v) and (z) will be stable in their realisation in the future, as a merger with (f) and (s) could cause ambiguity.

The transcription results also showed an overall preference for the fully voiced lax realisation for both fricatives, although in the case of (v) this tendency was less obvious than for (z). There was considerable intra- and interspeaker variation, especially for (v). Voice was not always obvious, but the representation in Praat showed that it was there often anyway. Strongly voiced realisations were exceptional.

(g)

The literature (Section 10.4) suggests that today there are various realisations of (g) in Standard Dutch: voiceless and voiced, and both velar and uvular. The most dominant one is the voiceless uvular realisation, and our transcription results (Section 11.4) confirm this. Over the years this phoneme has increasingly come to be pronounced in the back of the mouth. Our transcription results show that (g) is almost exclusively realised as a uvular fricative, and in many cases it is even produced with rasp. Realisations other than a uvular fricative (with or without rasp) occur accidentally across contexts and speakers.

(r)

For (r), the uvular and alveolar trills and taps are most common according to the literature (Section 10.5). The literature also indicates that approximant and reduced realisations of (r) occur in the coda and that this may even be a range of realisations.

The transcription results showed a striking variation in the production of (r) across speakers (Section 11.5). No less than 24 different realisations were found. Not surprisingly, the large majority of the variation was found in coda position,
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where the realisations were generally articulatorily weak and not always easy to qualify. Onset realisations were clear and easy to identify, and our data suggest that both front (alveolar) and back (uvular) realisations are acceptable in Standard Dutch. There is an acceptance of variation in this respect. This may be due to the fact that the frontness or backness of (r) is a speech habit that is hard to change in later life, and that neither (r) evokes strong connotations connected to a region within the Netherlands. For these reasons, this variation is likely to stay and remain largely unnoticed by lay Dutchmen. The distribution of coda realisations of (r) could not be predicted on the basis of the way onset occurrences were realised or vice versa.

For the various realisations of (r), writers tend to focus mainly on place of articulation, manner of articulation, and voice (Section 10.5). The transcriptions of coda (r) were affected by the degree of difficulty to determine the place and manner of articulation of the tokens and the presence of voice. Multiple reruns of the sound files were required to come to a plausible transcription for coda (r) realisation. These listening sessions yielded the impression that these three features are not in all cases the sole, or main, sources of contention for coda realisations but that the force of articulation of coda (r) is an important factor in the degree of standardness.

Articulatorily emphatic realisations of coda (r) were rare in our corpus, and at the same time the segmental variation within (r) was considerable. It may well be that forceful coda-(r) realisations constitute a deviation from the articulatory norm, irrespective of place and manner of articulation and of voice. It may, for instance be that for alveolar realisations the single tap is preferred over a salient trill. All of this would mean that to some degree the standard pronunciation of coda (r) is any place and manner of articulation (looking at the wide range of realisations in Table 11.5), as long as it contains little audible force of articulation. This would account for the amount of segmental variation in coda (r) that we found. It seems unrealistic to consider the variation in place and manner of articulation in coda (r) as equally relevant as that in onset (r).

The vowels

For the present research, transcriptions and acoustic measurements were performed on a set of vowels. The acoustic part of the phonetic description quantified vowels in Hertz, representing the open/close and front/back dimensions, and index numbers were used relative to the most open and most closed realisations. With such a representation, the vowel transcriptions could be put into perspective.

The phonetic results serve as objective data that may function as comparative material for future measurements of Standard Dutch vowels. As our speakers have been selected strictly, the results represent a kind of provisional contemporary yardstick for Standard Dutch vowels. New measurements, of equally carefully selected speakers, will improve the precision of this yardstick. The low number of speakers in our study is a certain weakness. A larger study would have revealed in a more convincing manner than our data what the variation is in Standard Dutch vowel realisations.
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Vowel measurements from the 1970s and 1990s were available (Section 12.1) as contrastive material. Unfortunately, the 1970s data were not fully comparable with ours. The contrastive speech data from the same period as ours (the 1990s: Adank, Van Hout & Smits 2004) was technically closer to ours and constituted highly standardised Dutch. They were teachers of Dutch from the west of the Netherlands. The measuring tool was more or less identical to ours.

(ee), (eu), and (oo)

Until recently, the literature (Section 10.6) painted a picture of a set of vowels that is in a process of change from monophthongs to semi-diphthongs. It seems, however, that this light diphthongisation has been relatively stable, perhaps even longer already than is often suggested. Today, the long midvowels are generally acknowledged as semi-diphthongal phonemes. Our transcriptions (Section 11.6) also revealed one basic kind of realisation for these three midvowels, namely a semi-diphthong.

Plotting the average F₁’s and F₂’s of the long midvowels (Figure 12.1), and normalising them through z-scores, yields a traditional vowel diagram (Figure 12.2), which confirms the effectiveness of our measurement technique. The results (Section 12.4) resemble Adank et al.’s (2004) measurements, which are on standardised Dutch as well. The measurements showed that our speakers diphthongised their midvowels less than Adank et al.’s speakers. This agrees with what one might expect, as Adank et al.’s speakers were more likely to have western accents and these accents tend to diphthongise more. The women measured by Adank et al. diphthongised less than their males, and they started their midvowels in a less open position. Our females’ midvowels were similar to Adank’s women’s diphthongs, and our men and women produced mutually similar midvowels. This means that Adank et al.’s western men diphthongised their midvowels relatively strongly, which is unexpected as men are not known to be forerunners in language change (Section 7.4).

(ei), (ui), and (ou)

The literature on the three Dutch diphthongs suggests that until relatively recently these three diphthongs were stable. In the last few decades, the lowering of the first element of diphthongs has started to appear in the literature (Section 10.7), but it is unclear whether this tendency also holds for Standard Dutch. The expected distinction between the degree of diphthongisation of semi-diphthongs and diphthongs is visible in our transcription results (Section 11.6). There seems no relationship between the tendency to lower the first element of diphthongs and the tendency to diphthongise (Section 11.6).

The measurements showed that Adank’ et al.’s men (Section 12.4) had more ‘modern’ diphthongs than ours, in the sense that their first elements were more open than our men’s diphthongs. As a consequence, Adank’s male speakers diphthongised more than ours. The same went for the women. None of the speakers
in our corpus produced strongly lowered first elements. Six of the seven speakers produced lightly lowered first elements (Section 11.6). Lowering in our corpus (Section 12.5) on average amounted to a ten-percent additional openness (on the open/close dimension), but the differences between speakers were considerable and ran from 7% to 31%. Diphthong phoneme (ui) seemed to diphthongise most and (ei) the least. Three speakers produced enough lowered and unlowered diphthongs to compare the difference between open and closed occurrences. The lowered and unlowered realisations of diphthong (ou) did not differ significantly for any of the three speakers.

To qualify ‘light diphthongisation’, we used comparative material by Edelman (2002), who measured the first elements of women who spoke Polder Dutch and lowered the first element of their diphthongs strongly. It turned out that Edelman’s women who spoke strong Polder Dutch on average produced diphthongs with first elements that were considerably lower than our speakers (lowered and unlowered realisations together).

Conclusion

It has become clear that few comprehensive rules can be given as to the acceptable degree of phonetic variation within Standard Dutch. It depends on the phoneme in question and on phonological position. Certain phonemes in certain positions are subject to variation. Phoneme (r), for instance, is subject to considerable variation in postvocalic position (which is not perceptually prominent), whereas the number of acceptable realisations in onset position is restricted to two basic ones. The phoneme (g), on the other hand, seems to have one basic realisation, irrespective of its place in the syllable.

The degree of realisational variation within certain Standard Dutch phonemes oftentimes looks to be exaggerated. Disagreement on certain variation has more or less disappeared, but the literature keeps questioning it. The light diphthongisation of midvowels, for instance, is often presented as a change in motion, whereas this phenomenon has been mentioned in the literature for many years already (Section 10.6). It may be that writers are copying each others’ observations and are themselves not accepting of such phenomena. Moreover, comments on variation concern a limited set of consonants only, and this hides the fact that for most phonemes agreement is as complete as can be.

After looking at the phonemes of Dutch from a segmental point of view, one suspects that features other than segmental ones determine degree of standardness also. It has already been indicated that force of articulation may be a factor. Non-segmental features that may be of influence on degree of standardness of speech are speech rate and pitch. There may be a standard pace and pitch. A slow and low speech style, for instance, may be considered more standard than a fast highly-pitched style. There may also be a standard intonation pattern (Gooskens 1997). It even seems likely that certain voice qualities are associated with the standard language. Creak, nasality, and breathiness may affect the degree of standardness, as
for instance. Future research into the pronunciation of Dutch should pay attention to
this.

A weakness of our speech data is that the speakers are all news presenters. Perhaps this is merely a selected type of Standard Dutch. Although it is by now obvious that our group of speakers is influential, it is not certain that the linguistic norm in the Netherlands is reflected in all its width in the speech of this highly limited group of speakers. Presumably, watching television and listening to the radio are not the sole factors in the establishment of norms. The role of the speech in formal education, the peer group, and the home is underexposed. If the standard language is most of all considered ‘correct’, then school language deserves more attention, for instance.

13.4 EVALUATION

The Speech Evaluation Experiment brought forward considerable agreement on the high degree of standardness of the speech of three speakers (Figure 9.1 and Figure 9.2). This agreement was based mainly on actual speech qualities rather than their position as newscasters. The results of this experiment (Figure 9.3, Table 9.1) showed that the agreement between listeners on the high degree of standardness of speakers is relative. There was a subgroup (6% of the total group of listeners) who did not react negatively to regional speech. This group of listeners was older and less educated. Besides the difficulty of the listener tasks, actual deviant attitudes may have been the cause of this. It is likely that absolute agreement on the standardness of speech generally does not exist but that instead a deviant subgroup will exist. This group may be as small as 6%. This may be true in the evaluation of highly standard speech like ours only.

Listener and respondent characteristics may explain evaluative behaviour to a degree. Men and women are known to speak differently and this may affect the way they view degree of standardness. The same suggestion is true for people from within the area that is the historical origin of the standard language and those not from this area. Age and level of education may also affect evaluation.

Sex

With some exceptions, women have in the past been found to be more likely to produce standard speech than men (Section 7.4). The two women and the five men whose vowels and consonants we transcribed did not have mutually distinct pronunciation patterns in any way (Section 11.3). There was no way in which the men and the women could be distinguished on the basis of speech habits, which may also be due to the group being too small for any tendencies to appear. Another reason may be the limited opportunity for variation within a group of people who have been subjected to such a strict selection; these people are evaluated as being close to each other accent-wise and male or female deviations may not fit in in that case.
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The way women and men are suggested to evaluate speech is contradictory (Section 9.2). On the one hand, there is the suggestion that men are evaluatively less strict and less aware of variation than women. Men, then, are more willing to give high standardness ratings to a wider range of speech. Women, in this view, punish deviations from the norm, as they are more sensitive to that norm. This enhanced sensitivity to speech style was found by several writers as well. The other view is one of women being evaluatively kind and rewarding a wide range of speech with a high standardness rating, while men strictly point out deviations from the norm that they observe. In our research, this would mean overall higher standardness ratings by women. In other words, the effects of sex are unpredictable.

So, productively women are stereotypically assumed to be somewhat more likely to speak the standard language than men and/or to a higher degree. We found some proof of this belief too. The Sociolinguistic Definition Survey results (Section 7.4) showed that in the Netherlands this thought exists to a small degree. Across the four additional countries investigated in the International Survey (Section 8.3), there was considerable agreement on men and women typically speaking the standard language to an equal extent. It was striking, however, how about a quarter of the respondents in each of the countries believed that either of the sexes was most likely to speak the standard language, and usually the women were favoured in this respect. The fact that a majority of the respondents across the countries considered both men and women to be equally likely to speak the standard language shows that this notion is weak only.

In line with the literature and previous research, our women and men evaluated speech in unpredictable ways. The women in the Speech Evaluation Experiment (Section 9.4) gave significantly higher ratings to the newsreader speech than the men did. This results points to an approach by women in which the use of Standard Dutch is supported. The male and female listeners in the Speech Evaluation Experiment gave similarly high standardness ratings to regional speech (Section 9.4).

In the evaluation of the degree of standardness of speech, it seems that speaker characteristics other than sex play a more important part. For instance, level of education and the question whether women are authoritative speakers (Section 9.2) may count more strongly than sex. As for instance, in the Speech Evaluation Experiment (Section 9.4), women from the authoritative area in the Netherlands (the west) gave particularly high standardness ratings to non-regional speech, significantly higher than female peripheral listeners. It may be hypothesised that highly educated women in the prime of their lives from the west of the Netherlands are strict in their views, while lowly educated women with no jobs and from outside this area are more accepting towards (or less concerned about, rather) variation.

Regional origin

Logically speaking, speakers from the area of the historical origin of Standard Dutch would speak a variety of Dutch that is closer to Standard Dutch than speakers who are not from this area (Section 9.2). The results of the Sociolinguistic Survey (Figure
7.1) indeed show that this notion lives, as speakers from the western cities are in particular associated with Standard Dutch. However, it was not possible to allocate our seven speakers to either of these groups, as some of them had grown up in places across the Netherlands. Perhaps this mobility during childhood was a factor in the tendency to speak the standard language. In that view, a third type of regional origin seems relevant, namely one where the speaker has moved around considerably during their childhood, to various parts of the country. This mobile group may be particularly susceptible to the standard language, maybe even more so than people from the area of the historical origin. Harmen Siezen - who was perhaps the most exemplary speaker of Standard Dutch in the 1990s - was a vicar’s son who had travelled around considerably during his youth. Perhaps this group of speakers should be looked at specifically in future research.

The history of Standard Dutch (Chapter 2 and 3) suggests that those from the area of the historical origin of a language may view language differently from those who are not from this area. However, previous research (Section 9.2) has suggested that when it comes to the standard language those from the authoritative area and those not from this area tend to evaluate similarly. Our data confirm this to a degree. The listeners in the Speech Evaluation Experiment from the authoritative area in the Netherlands (west) and those not from this area did not evaluate regional or non-regional (Section 9.4) speech differently. Some effects of regional origin of respondents were nevertheless found in our data. The western respondents in the Telephone Survey (Figure 6.3) were significantly less tolerant towards regional traces in Standard Dutch. In the same survey (Figure 6.4), westerners considered the presence of a western Dutch accent in Standard Dutch significantly more acceptable than non-westerners did. The western respondents in the Telephone Survey were in a higher number of cases convinced that they spoke Standard Dutch (Figure 7.15). Western women in the Speech Evaluation Experiment gave particularly high standardness ratings to non-regional speech, significantly higher than female peripheral listeners did (Section 9.4). It seems that regional origin most strongly plays a role in combination with other listener/respondent characteristics.

Level of education

What the effects would be of level of education on the evaluation of the standardness of speech is hard to predict, as literature on this topic is not widely available. People with lower educational levels are less likely to speak the standard language. In our research, the speech of lowly educated versus highly educated speakers was not described elaborately. Level of education generally did not play a significant role in the evaluation of regional or non-regional speech (Section 9.4) in the Speech Evaluation Experiment. There was, however, a subgroup of listeners who were not highly educated and did not distinguish strongly between regional and non-regional speech, giving both similar standardness ratings. This subgroup was too small to draw any conclusions.
from though (Section 9.3), and it is likely that the tasks were confusing to the respondents.

Age

It has been suggested that respondents would give the highest standardness ratings to speech from the period when they grew up (Section 9.4). Also, it was suggested that older listeners would be less critical towards language variation. These suggestions were not borne out in our results from the Speech Evaluation Experiment (Table 9.3). There was a subgroup of older listeners who did not distinguish strongly between regional and non-regional speech, giving both similarly high standardness ratings. This subgroup was too small to draw any conclusions from (Section 9.3). The younger listeners in the Speech Evaluation Experiment gave significantly lower standardness ratings to regional speech (Section 9.4), and this would suggest that the tolerance towards variation is decreasing. However, our data on the respondent variable age are not too convincing.

13.5 LINGUISTIC AUTHORITY

The present research has described a language variety that strongly relates to authority. No one language is subject to controversy and continuous debate regarding authority to the degree that the standard language is. To describe such a language, one needs to know who carry the authority to fix such a description. There are numerous sources of authority, and the question is whether a certain approach towards describing Standard Dutch can be defended as being the most acceptable. Examples of authoritative sources of linguistic norms are: linguists, grammar books, ordinary speakers, school, and the media. The question which of these is most appropriate as the point of departure in a description cannot be answered objectively. The literature and the results of the Telephone Survey (Section 6.2) suggest that linguists and ordinary Dutchmen approach the authority issue almost oppositely. Ordinary users seem to feel that rules are not negotiable or variable. A popular feeling in fact seems to be that rules are determined by nature and by experts and are beyond the reach of the ordinary user. While ordinary speakers thus tend to play down the role of actual language users, the literature shows that linguists are increasingly depending on living language as it is used in everyday life. The respondents in the Telephone Survey allocated most of the responsibility to linguists (Figure 6.1) and seemed to indicate that speaker behaviour needs to be taken into consideration by linguists while the government has a say as well. Linguists, on the other hand, say that they look to ordinary speakers’ speech habits, especially those with some authority (Section 6.2). So, both groups put most of the authority with the other.

It may be assumed that there is a synergy between ordinary speakers and experts in this process. The description of the norm that is based on the evaluations by ordinary language users and on the professional literature was considered the most realistic and was therefore taken in the present research.
Kloeke’s dilemma

Describing the standard language in the Netherlands and its pronunciation is an uncertain task. The descriptive part - as discussed in Section 13.2 - is straightforward, but it comes with an awareness of describing a theoretical rather than an actual linguistic norm. To some degree, respondents and experts may be expressing presupposed ideas. The fact that the city of Haarlem was chosen as the place where Standard Dutch is spoken in particular by the respondents in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey (Figure 7.1) shows that lay people in surveys and evaluation experiments to an extent tend to pass on assumptions and popular beliefs rather than communicate actual personal observations or experiences. Kloeke put this dilemma regarding authority into words in the early 1950s, and these words are on the first page of this dissertation. They translate as follows:

People are all too easily inclined to seek authority where experience dictates it to be. If need be, they are willing to admit that the authorities of old are lacking, but harshness is required to be able to arrive at the diagnosis that they are waning, and will ultimately decay and evaporate. For such is our relationship with authority that it is hardly imaginable without a certain degree of respect, appreciation, or if one so wishes, love. However, it is this very respect for authority that so often closes the eyes of those who have come under its spell to the symptoms of its weakening or decadence. The ruthless conclusion that "this is how it is" is unwittingly pushed aside by wishful thinking and becomes "this is how it should be." (Kloeke 1951:1)

Kloeke thus addressed the absolute nature of some authorities and the respect they enjoy, and he pointed out how this respect may silence criticism and hinder objective evaluation. It can be assumed that this does not only apply to ordinary speakers. Inevitably, in the choice of authoritatively source, researcher intuitions play a role as well; intuitions that are personal and to a degree unfounded and biased. Like any ordinary speaker, the researcher has preferences for certain sources and prejudices about their reliability and suitability. It is safe to say that researchers, too, are steered by the charisma of sources.

Bearing in mind Kloeke’s dilemma, the choice was made preliminarily to use the evaluations of ordinary people as the point of departure for the selection of speakers and the description of their speech, while remarks by linguists were used as comparative material. (The unrealistic alternative would have been to observe people in the wild, so to speak, in search of their spontaneous (in)direct evaluations of language.) To a degree, the results consist of things said about Standard Dutch by professionals and non-professionals. The challenge has been to distinguish continuously between results (evaluations, remarks, etc. by non-linguists and linguists’ claims) that constitute ‘how it is’ and those that represent intuitions on
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‘how it should be’. The non-professionals in our research mainly had ‘how it should be’ in mind, while the linguists - with various degrees of success - have attempted to point to ‘how it is’.

13.6 CONCLUSION

What has been found about authority so far in our research fails to explain the processes taking place in the continuous adjustment of the norm. Speakers are activated by a variety of factors in their adjustment to the norm and seem relatively unaware of these processes. According to Hellinga (1938:285), a complexity of factors that are hard to measure independently lies at the basis of the endeavour towards the civilised pronunciation, and these factors nevertheless reveal their influence by their absence in argumentation. Daan (1969:21) also wondered what some beliefs on language are based on. The origin of beliefs would help to discover how norms come to existence and spread.

The respondents in the Sociolinguistic Definition Survey were more or less unaware of the origins of their beliefs on the norm, but they did mention school and the home regularly (Section 6.2). References to school and home suggest that respondents felt that somewhat norms on what is standard are given by others, by authorities. Indeed, norms seem to be imposed to a degree, but there may be other factors as well. Giles and Trudgill cooperated with each other and a number of others in a series of articles on this topic in the 1970s. Giles, Bourhis, Trudgill, and Lewis (1974:405) concentrated mainly on the phonetic/phonological level and came up with the Imposed Norm Hypothesis and the Inherent Value Hypothesis. The Imposed Norm Hypothesis suggests that the standard language is considered more pleasing to listen to because it is the cultural norm. The Imposed Norm Hypothesis has been supported by empirical evidence (Giles et al. 1974, Giles Bourhis & Davies 1975) and is also in line with Kloee’s (1951) comment on authority (Section 13.5). The references to school and home are also in line with this (Section 6.2). The Inherent Value Hypothesis suggests that aesthetic qualities are what make standard languages more pleasing to the ear. This would also account for the choice of speakers to adopt the standard language. However, this hypothesis has met with little support (Giles et al. 1975) and was put forward by only a small group of respondents in the Sociolinguistic Description Survey (Table 6.1b). These respondents referred to certain qualitative features of Standard Dutch. Later, Trudgill and Giles (1978) added the Social Connotations Hypothesis, thus including the lifestyle and environmental setting of speakers as determinants of attitudes. Although this hypothesis has also been confirmed indirectly by our research (Chapter 7 showed that the nature of speakers is an important factor that respondents look at), it did not surface as an explicit factor that our respondents and experts put forward. It fails to explain the popularity of the standard language.

The day-to-day mechanics of the norm may be approached more practically than through such hypotheses. The community of speakers is by both laymen and experts considered a likely determiner of the language norm (Section 6.2). Presumably, not everyone has an equal say in the matter, and is has been suggested
that authoritative figures in particular directly influence the norm of individuals. Three main types of authoritative - or influential - figures in individual speakers’ lives have surfaced in our research. First of all, there are authoritative figures who directly and consciously influence the norm. These are mainly teachers and parents. They provide young speakers with both theoretical and practical input. Secondly, there are media speakers, with whom individuals do not communicate but who provide them with continuous daily exposure to speech that is considered the norm (trendy, standard, and so on). There are several indications of this (Section 7.4, Figure 7.7, Table 7.2, Figure 7.8). Besides school/parents and media, there are those who (mainly unintentionally and subconsciously) influence speakers. These are the speakers whose speech individuals expose themselves to on a daily basis and with whom they communicate regularly, i.e. the social environment (chosen (for instance friends) and not chosen (for instance classmates and colleagues)). This group provides opportunities to practice as well as general exposure, and they are therefore concrete and attainable models.

The question now is where these three sources of speech obtain their norms from, or rather their own (sample) speech. Parents and teachers pass on norms mainly from their parents and teachers. Teachers are educated at teachers colleges and generally professionally pass on norms, sometimes even stringent ones. Parents are mainly passing on what they consider to be correct, i.e. what teachers and their parents told them. The media provide input that in most cases meets the latest national norms and they get these norms from society, plus they themselves determine what the norm is. The day-to-day social environment of speakers is continuously present, playing with the language and the norm. They get much of their input from each other. Individual speakers in their language choices demonstrate the degree to which they adjust to the theoretical norm (mostly by teachers) and the practical norm (mostly by the social sphere and the media). Finally, individuals have preferences (the personal norm), which are guided by their personality.

Variation in degree of standardness in the speech of individuals may be explained by the fact that to some speakers the theoretical, social and personal norms coincide, whereas to others these three norms (or two of them) are distinct. The latter group deviates from the norm and contains speakers who take what is necessary from the theoretical norm to communicate and function effectively in daily life. The social norm is, furthermore - and by personal choice -, their main source of inspiration. On the other end of the standardness spectrum are those who personally aspire to meet the theoretical norm and whose social environment also motivates them to meet that norm.

The future shape of Standard Dutch

Standard Dutch is merely one of the many languages that function in Dutch society (Section 3.4). These languages influence each other, and they are steered by tendencies in society. Standard Dutch is a changing entity, but it is clear that it is here to stay in some form or other. Standard Dutch has proven to adjust to changes
in society quite willingly (Section 3.3 to Section 3.6), but it is uncertain to what extent changes are permanent. Examples of recent adaptations are the rapid spreading of vocalised (r)’s (Section 3.6 and Section 10.3), the lowering of the first element of diphthongs (Section 3.6), as well as the increasing Anglicisation of part of modern Dutch vocabulary (Section 3.5).

The question is whether Standard Dutch will in some way settle down or is stable as it is. Taking into consideration the increasing tendency for Dutch people to speak Standard Dutch, it seems most likely that variation in Inclusive Standard Dutch will progress. With the exclusive standard language as a reference point to fall back on, and to curb deviations and innovations, these new varieties will remain recognisable as being in the standardness sphere. Through the two definitions of Standard Dutch, the results paint a future picture of a traditional yet dynamic standard language. It is an image of an impartial - almost detached - language, unconditionally embraced by society, which reservedly adapts only to the most profound of societal tendencies, and which increasingly disassociates from its historical origins to become typical of speakers from across the country.
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APPENDIX 1
Speech Evaluation Experiment

LUISTEREXPERIMENT

Zo dadelijk krijgt u fragmenten te horen van spraak van nieuwslezers van de radio. Deze
fragmenten zijn allemaal 40 seconden lang. Tijdens het luisteren naar elk fragment beantwoordt
u een aantal vragen. Om te oefenen beginnen we met 5 proeffragmenten. Na deze
proeffragmenten volgen de 35 echte fragmenten. De hele bandopname duurt ongeveer een half
uur. Als de band naar uw mening te snel gaat, kunt u na elk fragment de band even stoppen en
de vragen beantwoorden.

Deze opnames zijn niet altijd even prettig om aan te horen. Ze zijn bijvoorbeeld technisch
gemanipuleerd om de intonatie eruit te halen. En ook is het zo dat, om de geluidskwaliteit niet
van invloed te laten zijn op uw oordeel, hier en daar ruis of kraak is toegevoegd of weggefilterd.
Na enkele fragmenten zult u echter merken dat de ongewone geluidskwaliteit went.
Aangeraden wordt om een hoofdtelefoon te gebruiken, zodat u de klanken ondanks de aparte
kwaliteit toch nauwkeurig kunt beoordelen.

Let alleen op de klanken, niet op de inhoud van wat gezegd wordt!

PERSOONLIJKE GEGEVENS

- geslacht: man/vrouw
- leeftijd: .... jaar
- geboortedatum/-provincie: .........

- Vertel waar u geboren bent en waar u achtereenvolgens gewoond heeft. Noem de
plaatsen en maak duidelijk van wanneer tot wanneer u daar gewoond heeft:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>plaats/provincie</th>
<th>van</th>
<th>tot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.................................</td>
<td>...........</td>
<td>...........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.................................</td>
<td>...........</td>
<td>...........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.................................</td>
<td>...........</td>
<td>...........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.................................</td>
<td>...........</td>
<td>...........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.................................</td>
<td>...........</td>
<td>...........</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Wat is uw beroep/studierichting (of wat was het vroeger)?:
........................................

- Wat is het hoogste opleidingsniveau dat u bereikt heeft?
  o lagere school-niveau
  o mavo/mulo/bo-niveau
  o havo/vwo/hbo/mbo-niveau
  o hbo-niveau
  o universitair niveau
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- Spreekt u ooit Standaardnederlands (ABN)? Geef 1 antwoord.
  o nee, nooit
  o bijna nooit
  o redelijk vaak
  o bijna altijd
  o ja, altijd
  o ik weet niet of ik Standaardnederlands spreek

- Het is aan te raden een hoofdtelefoon te gebruiken voor het luistergedeelte van het experiment. De band kan bijvoorbeeld op een walkman afgespeeld worden. Hoe gaat u de band beluisteren?
  o met hoofdtelefoon
  o zonder hoofdtelefoon

DE LUISTERFRAGMENTEN [same for Fragments 2-35]

PIEP

PROEFFRAGMENT 1

A. Hoe zou u deze spraak beoordelen op een schaal van 1 tot en met 10? Omcirkel op elk van onderstaande 8 schalen een cijfer van 1 t/m 10. Alle schalen dienen in te worden gevuld:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>niet Standaardnederlands</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</th>
<th>Standaardnederlands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>niet bekakt</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>bekakt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niet randstedelijk</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>randstedelijk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niet regionaal</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>regionaal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ouderwets</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formeleel</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>formeel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lelijk</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>mooi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slordig</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>verzorgd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. In welk jaar is deze opname gemaakt, denkt u? Deze opname is gemaakt in ongeveer 19...

C. Als u denkt de naam van deze spreker te weten, geef deze dan. Deze spreker heet: ............................................................................................................................

D. Als u nog opmerkingen hebt over dit fragment, geef die dan hier:

..................................................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................................................

PIEP PIEP PIEP

DANK U
APPENDIX 2
Sociolinguistic Definition Survey

ENQUÊTE

Dit is een vragenlijst over de standaardtaal in Nederland - het Standaardnederlands - die wordt afgenomen in het kader van een onderzoek aan de Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen. U kunt de vragen naar eigen inzicht beantwoorden: het antwoord is dus nooit goed of fout.

PERSOONLIJKE GEGEVENS

- geslacht: man/vrouw
- leeftijd: .... jaar
- geboorteplaats/-provincie: ________________________________

- Vertel waar u geboren bent en waar u achtereenvolgens gewoond heeft. Noem de plaatsen en maak duidelijk van wanneer tot wanneer u daar gewoond heeft:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>plaats/provincie</th>
<th>van</th>
<th>tot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Wat is uw beroep/studierichting (of wat was het vroeger)?:

- Wat is het hoogste opleidingsniveau dat u bereikt heeft?
  - o lagere school-niveau
  - o mavo/mulo/bo-niveau
  - o havo/vwo/hbo/mbo-niveau
  - o hbo-niveau
  - o universitair niveau

DE VRAGEN

1. Hoe zou u het Standaardnederlands (ABN) omschrijven?

   ..............................................................................................................................

   ..............................................................................................................................
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2. Waar wordt naar uw mening het Standaardnederlands vooral gesproken?
   Geef 1 antwoord.
   - in het noorden
   - in het oosten
   - in het zuiden
   - in het westen
   - in de Randstad
   - in Haarlem
   - in Den Haag
   - in Amsterdam
   - in Groningen
   - in Arnhem
   - in Den Bosch
   - in een andere plaats, namelijk in: .................................................................
   - overal in Nederland in gelijke mate
   - geen mening

3. Mensen met welk beroep of functie spreken vooral Standaardnederlands?
   Geef 1 antwoord.
   - acteurs
   - logopedisten
   - nieuwslezers
   - politici
   - de koningin
   - neerlandic/leraren Nederlands
   - leerkrachten in het algemeen
   - academici en andere hoogopgeleiden
   - mensen met een ander beroep, namelijk: .................................................................
   - alle beroepen/functies in gelijke mate
   - geen mening

4. Wordt het Standaardnederlands vooral door mannen of door vrouwen gesproken?
   Geef 1 antwoord.
   - door mannen
   - door vrouwen
   - door mannen en vrouwen in gelijke mate
   - geen mening

5. Wordt het Standaardnederlands het meest op de radio of op de televisie gesproken?
   Geef 1 antwoord.
   - het meest op de radio
   - het meest op de televisie
   - op de radio en de televisie in gelijke mate
   - geen mening
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   o nieuwslezers van de NOS
   o nieuwspresentatoren van actualiteitenprogramma’s van de publieke omroepen (b.v. VARA, KRO, NCRV)
   o nieuwspresentatoren van de commerciële omroepen (RTL, Veronica, SBS6, etc.)
   o nieuwspresentatoren van de NOS, de publieke en de commerciële omroepen in gelijke mate
   o geen mening

7. Als u een bekende spreker kent die naar uw mening erg goed Standaardnederlands spreekt, geef dan de naam van deze spreker en zijn/haar geslacht, en zeg waar deze spreker bekend van is:
   - Naam van de bekende Standaardnederlands spreker: ........................................ (m/v)
   - Deze spreker ken ik van: ........................................................................................................

8. Als u kijkt naar de antwoorden die u in vraag 2 t/m 7 gegeven hebt, welk antwoord vindt u dan het belangrijkste criterium om te bepalen waar of hoe het Standaardnederlands te vinden is? In andere woorden: welk antwoord bepaalt het beste wat Standaardnederlands is? Geef 1 antwoord.
   o mijn antwoord op vraag 2 (welke plaats)
   o mijn antwoord op vraag 3 (welke beroepen)
   o mijn antwoord op vraag 4 (mennen/vrouwen)
   o mijn antwoord op vraag 5 (radio/televisie)
   o mijn antwoord op vraag 6 (NOS/publieke / commerciële omroep)
   o mijn antwoord op vraag 7 (bekende persoon)
   o alle antwoorden in gelijke mate
   o geen mening

9. Kijk nog eens naar de antwoorden die u in vraag 2 t/m 7 gegeven hebt. Waar denkt u dat uw mening vandaan komt over waar, door wie, etc. het Standaardnederlands wordt gesproken?
   o Dat heb ik op school geleerd.
   o Dat heb ik van thuis meegekregen.
   o Dat heb ik ergens gelezen.
   o Dat denk ik omdat .......................................................... ..................................................
   o Ik weet niet waar ik die mening vandaan heb, ik heb die nou eenmaal.

DANK U
APPENDIX 3A
International Survey: Dutch version

ENQUÊTE

Dit is een vragenlijst over de standaardtaal in Nederland - het Standaardnederlands - die wordt afgenomen in het kader van een onderzoek aan de Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen. U kunt de vragen naar eigen inzicht beantwoorden: het antwoord is dus nooit goed of fout.

PERSOONLIJKE GEGEVENS

- geslacht: man/vrouw
- leeftijd: ... jaar
- geboortedatum/provincie: .................................................................
- Vertel waar u geboren bent en waar u achtereenvolgens gewoond heeft. Noem de plaatsen en maak duidelijk van wanneer tot wanneer u daar gewoond heeft:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>plaats/provincie</th>
<th>van</th>
<th>tot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Wat is uw beroep/studierichting (of wat was het vroeger)?:

- Wat is het hoogste opleidingsniveau dat u bereikt heeft?
  o lagere school-niveau
  o mavo/mulo/bo-niveau
  o havo/vwo/hbs/mbo-niveau
  o hbo-niveau
  o universitair niveau

- Spreekt u ooit Standaardnederlands (ABN)? Geef 1 antwoord.
  o nee, nooit
  o bijna nooit
  o redelijk vaak
  o bijna altijd
  o ja, altijd
  o ik weet niet of ik Standaardnederlands spreek
DE VRAGEN

1. Hoe zou u het Standaardnederlands (ABN) omschrijven?
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

2. Waar wordt naar uw mening het Standaardnederlands vooral gesproken?
   Geef 1 antwoord.
   o in het noorden
   o in het oosten
   o in het zuiden
   o in het westen
   o in de Randstad
   o in Haarlem
   o in Den Haag
   o in Amsterdam
   o in Groningen
   o in Arnhem
   o in Den Bosch
   o in een andere plaats, namelijk in: …………………………………………………………………………
   o overal in Nederland in gelijke mate
   o geen mening

3. Mensen met welk beroep of functie spreken vooral Standaardnederlands?
   Geef 1 antwoord.
   o acteurs
   o logopedisten
   o nieuwslezers
   o politici
   o de koningin
   o leerkrachten in het algemeen
   o academici en andere hoogopgeleiden
   o mensen met een ander beroep, namelijk: ………………………………………………………………
   o alle beroepen/functies in gelijke mate
   o geen mening

4. Wordt het Standaardnederlands vooral door mannen of door vrouwen gesproken?
   Geef 1 antwoord.
   o door mannen
   o door vrouwen
   o door mannen en vrouwen in gelijke mate
   o geen mening

5. Wordt het Standaardnederlands het meest op de radio of op de televisie gesproken?
   Geef 1 antwoord.
   o het meest op de radio
   o het meest op de televisie
   o op de radio en de televisie in gelijke mate
   o geen mening
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   o nieuwslezers van de NOS
   o nieuwspresentatoren van actualiteitenprogramma's van de publieke omroepen (b.v. VARA, KRO, NCRV)
   o nieuwspresentatoren van de commerciële omroepen (RTL, Veronica, SBS6, etc.)
   o nieuwspresentatoren van de NOS, de publieke en de commerciële omroepen in gelijke mate
   o geen mening

7. Als u een bekende spreker kent die naar uw mening erg goed Standaardnederlands spreekt, geef dan de naam van deze spreker en zijn/haar geslacht, en zeg waar deze spreker bekend van is:
   - Naam van de bekende Standaardnederlands spreker: ............................................................ (m/v)
   - Deze spreker ken ik van: ...........................................................................................................

8. Als u kijkt naar de antwoorden die u in vraag 2 t/m 7 gegeven hebt, welk antwoord vindt u dan het belangrijkste criterium om te bepalen waar of hoe het Standaardnederlands te vinden is? In andere woorden: welk antwoord bepaalt het beste wat Standaardnederlands is? Geef 1 antwoord.
   o mijn antwoord op vraag 2 (welke plaats)
   o mijn antwoord op vraag 3 (welke beroepen)
   o mijn antwoord op vraag 4 (mannen/vrouwen)
   o mijn antwoord op vraag 5 (radio/televisie)
   o mijn antwoord op vraag 6 (NOS/publieke / commerciële omroep)
   o mijn antwoord op vraag 7 (bekende persoon)
   o alle antwoorden in gelijke mate
   o geen mening

9. Kijk nog eens naar de antwoorden die u in vraag 2 t/m 7 gegeven hebt. Waar denkt u dat uw mening vandaan komt over waar, door wie, etc. het Standaardnederlands wordt gesproken?
   o Dat heb ik op school geleerd.
   o Dat heb ik van thuis meegekregen.
   o Dat heb ik ergens gelezen.
   o Dat denk ik omdat ...................................................................................................................
   o Ik weet niet waar ik die mening vandaan heb, ik heb die nou eenmaal.

DANK U
APPENDIX 3B
International Survey: Flemish version

ENQUÊTE

Dit is een vragenlijst over de standaardtaal in Vlaanderen - het Standaardnederlands - die wordt afgenomen in het kader van een onderzoek aan de Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen. U kunt de vragen naar eigen inzicht beantwoorden: het antwoord is dus nooit goed of fout.

PERSOONLIJKE GEGEVENS

- geslacht: man/vrouw
- leeftijd: .... jaar
- Vertel waar u geboren bent en waar u achtervolgens gewoond heeft. Noem de plaatsen en maak duidelijk van wanneer tot wanneer u daar gewoond heeft:

  plaats/provincie  van  tot
  .................................................................  .................................  .................................
  .................................................................  .................................  .................................
  .................................................................  .................................  .................................

DE VRAGEN

1. Hoe zou u het Standaardnederlands (ABN) omschrijven?
   .................................................................
   .................................................................

2. Waar wordt naar uw mening het Standaardnederlands vooral gesproken?
   Geef 1 antwoord.
   o provincie West-Vlaanderen
   o provincie Oost-Vlaanderen
   o provincie Vlaams-Brabant
   o provincie Limburg
   o provincie Antwerpen
   o stad Antwerpen
   o Gent
   o Brugge
   o Brussel
   o in een andere plaats, namelijk in: .................................................................
   o overal in Vlaanderen in gelijke mate
   o geen mening
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3. Mensen met welk beroep of functie spreken vooral Standaardnederlands?
   Geef 1 antwoord.
   o acteurs
   o logopedisten
   o nieuwslezers
   o politici
   o de koning
   o neerlandici/laren Nederlands
   o leerkrachten in het algemeen
   o academici en andere hoogopgeleiden
   o mensen met een ander beroep, namelijk: ..........................................................
   o alle beroepen/functies in gelijke mate
   o geen mening

4. Wordt het Standaardnederlands vooral door mannen of door vrouwen gesproken?
   Geef 1 antwoord.
   o door mannen
   o door vrouwen
   o door mannen en vrouwen in gelijke mate
   o geen mening

5. Wordt het Standaardnederlands het meest op de radio of op de televisie gesproken?
   Geef 1 antwoord.
   o het meest op de radio
   o het meest op de televisie
   o op de radio en de televisie in gelijke mate
   o geen mening

6. Welke nieuwspresentatoren op TV benaderen volgens u het Standaardnederlands het
   meest? Geef 1 antwoord.
   o presentatoren van de VRT
   o nieuwspresentatoren van de VRT
   o presentatoren van VTM en VT4
   o nieuwspresentatoren van de VTM
   o presentatoren van VRT, VTM en VT4 in gelijke mate
   o geen mening

7. Als u een bekende spreker kent die naar uw mening erg goed Standaardnederlands
   spreekt, geef dan de naam van deze spreker en zijn/haar geslacht, en zeg waar deze
   spreker bekend van is:
   - Naam van de bekende Standaardnederlands spreker: ........................................ (m/v)
   - Deze spreker ken ik van: ..........................................................................................
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8. Als u kijkt naar de antwoorden die u in vraag 2 t/m 7 gegeven hebt, welk antwoord vindt u dan het belangrijkste criterium om te bepalen waar of hoe het Standaardnederlands te vinden is? In andere woorden: welk antwoord bepaalt het beste wat Standaardnederlands is? Geef 1 antwoord.

   o mijn antwoord op vraag 2 (welke plaats)
   o mijn antwoord op vraag 3 (welke beroepen)
   o mijn antwoord op vraag 4 (mannen/vrouwen)
   o mijn antwoord op vraag 5 (radio/televisie)
   o mijn antwoord op vraag 6 (RTV/publieke / commerciële omroep)
   o mijn antwoord op vraag 7 (bekende persoon)
   o alle antwoorden in gelijke mate
   o geen mening

9. Kijk nog eens naar de antwoorden die u in vraag 2 t/m 7 gegeven hebt. Waar denkt u dat uw mening vandaan komt over waar, door wie, etc. het Standaardnederlands wordt gesproken?

   o Dat heb ik op school geleerd.
   o Dat heb ik van thuis meegekregen.
   o Dat heb ik ergens gelezen.
   o Dat denk ik omdat ..............................................................
   o Ik weet niet waar ik die mening vandaan heb, ik heb die nou eenmaal.

DANK U
APPENDIX 3C
International Survey: New-Zealand version

SURVEY

This is a questionnaire on your intuitions on the standard language in New-Zealand, called 'Standard New-Zealand English'. It contains 9 questions. The results will serve in a comparison of the Dutch language situation with that of other countries; this survey was also done by students in Flanders, Poland, Japan and the Netherlands. Please note that only one answer is allowed in most questions; please choose the answer that applies most strongly.

PERSONAL DETAILS
- sex: .........................................................
- age: ........................................................
- province of birth: ........................................
- province(s) where you grew up: ........................
- ethnic origin: ............................................

THE QUESTIONS

1. How would you define Standard New-Zealand English in your own words?
   ........................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................

2. Where is Standard New-Zealand English spoken in particular?
   Please give one answer only.
   o the North Island
   o the South Island
   o the Auckland area
   o the Wellington area
   o Canterbury
   o Otago
   o Auckland city
   o Hamilton
   o Wellington city
   o Christchurch
   o Dunedin
   o another place, namely .................................................................
   o everywhere to the same degree
   o I don't know

3. Is Standard New-Zealand English spoken by women or men in particular?
   Please give one answer only.
   o men
   o women
   o men and women to the same degree
   o I don't know
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4. People with which profession speak Standard New-Zealand English in particular? Please give one answer only:
   - actors
   - speech therapists
   - newscasters
   - politicians
   - the Prime Minister
   - teachers of English
   - English language experts
   - teachers in general
   - highly educated people
   - people with another profession, namely .....................................................
   - all professions to the same degree
   - I don’t know

5. Is Standard New-Zealand English spoken on radio or television in particular? Please give one answer only:
   - radio
   - television
   - radio and television to the same degree
   - I don’t know

6. Which television presenters approximate Standard New-Zealand English most? Please give one answer only:
   - newscasters from TV1
   - all presenters from TV1
   - presenters from TV2
   - newscasters from TV3
   - all presenters from TV3
   - presenters from another channel, namely .....................................................
   - all television presenters to the same degree
   - I don’t know

7. Do you speak Standard New-Zealand English yourself? Please give one answer only:
   - no, never
   - almost never
   - reasonable often
   - almost always
   - yes, always
   - I don’t know if I speak Standard New-Zealand English

8. If there is a famous person who speaks Standard New-Zealand English particularly well in your opinion, please give the name of this person and indicate what (s)he is famous for (e.g. television celebrity, ‘acts in soap operas’, ‘newscaster’, or ‘politician’)
   - name of the famous person: ........................................... (m/f)
   - profession of this speaker, or reason why (s)he is famous: ..........................................................
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9. Where do you think you picked up the opinions on Standard New-Zealand English that you expressed above? Please give one answer only.
   
   o at school
   o at home
   o I read it somewhere
   o I picked them up somewhere else, namely ........................................
   o I don't know

THANK YOU
APPENDIX 3D
International Survey: Polish version

ANKIETA

To jest ankieta o standardowości językowej w Polsce, jest przeznaczona dla studentów w celu porównania jej z wynikami uzyskanymi w Holandii. Podobne badanie zostanie przeprowadzone we flamandzkojęzycznej części Belgii. Te trzy ankiety pozwolą na stworzenie diagностycznej części socjofonetycznych badań nad poziomem języka holenderskiego oraz nad "kryteriami standardowości językowej".

Ankieta jest anonimowa.

DANA OSOBISTE

- Jaki jest twój wiek?: .................................................................
- Podaj swoją płeć: .................................................................
- Z jakiej miejscowości pochodzisz?: ........................................
- W jakich miejscowościach mieszkałeś do 25-tego roku życia? (Podaj nazwy):
  ........................................................................................................
  ........................................................................................................

KWESTIONARIUSZ

1. Opisz standardową postać języka polskiego:
   ........................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................

2. Ludzie jakich zawodów posługują się standardową polskszczyzną?
   Daj tylko jedną odpowiedź:
   o aktor
   o logopeda
   o prezenter wiadomości w radiu/telewizji
   o polityk
   o prezydent
   o nauczyciel języka polskiego
   o specjalista od języka polskiego
   o nauczyciele generalnie
   o człowiek wykształcony
   o inny zawód (podaj nazwę)
   o nie mam zdania
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3. Czy standardową polszczyznę posługuj się szczególnie kobiety, czy też mężczyźni?
   Daj tylko jedną odpowiedź.
   o kobiety
   o mężczyźni
   o mężczyźni i kobiety w tym samym stopniu
   o nie mam zdania

4. Standardow odpowieść polszczyznę spotykasz przede wszystkim w radiu, czy w telewizji? Daj tylko jedną odpowiedź.
   o radio
   o telewizja
   o w obu przypadkach w tym samym stopniu
   o nie mam zdania

   o prezentor wiadomości telewizji publicznej
   o prezentor telewizji publicznej
   o prezentor TV1
   o prezentor TV2
   o prezentor wiadomości telewizji prywatnej
   o prezentor telewizji prywatnej
   o w obu przypadkach w takim samym stopniu
   o nie mam zdania

6. Gdzie według ciebie występuje najbardziej standardowa polszczyzna?
   Daj tylko jedną odpowiedź.
   o Warmia i Mazury
   o Pomorze
   o Wielkopolska
   o Śląsk
   o Mazowsze
   o Małopolska
   o Poznań
   o Wrocław
   o Gdańsk
   o Warszawa
   o Łódź
   o Kraków
   o inne miejsce (podaj nazwę): .................................................................
   o na całym obszarze Polski
   o nie mam zdania

7. Podaj nazwisko człowieka, który - według ciebie - posługuje się najbardziej standardową polszczyzną. Skąd znasz tę osobę?
   - imię i nazwisko: .................................................................
   - jest ona mi znana z: .................................................................
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   o w szkole
   o w domu
   o gdzieś o tym czytałem
   o w inny sposób (podaj nazwę): .................................................................
   o nie mam zdania

9. Czy mówisz standardową polszczyzną?
   o nie, nigdy
   o tak, ale niezbyt często
   o tak, regularnie
   o tak, prawie zawsze
   o tak, zawsze

DZIĘKUJĘ ZA WYPEŁNIENIE FORMULARZA
APPENDIX 3E
International Survey: Japanese version

アンケート

これは日本における概要だけのアンケートです。これは標準化という観点において導入されないアンケートの一部となるものです。このアンケートはオランダのスタジオ大学に類似の目的のために作成され、5つの国を対象としました。日本を含む国を一つとします。このアンケートは無回答です喜歡が、個人についていくつか質問させていただきますので、ご回答いただきますようお願い致します。

個人についての質問
- あなたの年齢は 　………………………………………………
- あなたの性別は 　………………………………………………
- あなたが興味・関心はどこですか 　………………………………

概要語についての質問
1. あなたが概要語どのように定義しますか
   ………………………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………

2. 概要語を話す職業の人どんな人たちですか、答えを一つだけ選んでください。
   ○ 信頼
   ○ 資産家
   ○ ラジオやテレビの司会者
   ○ 政治家
   ○ 個人
   ○ 家族
   ○ 日本語の専門家
   ○ 国務機関
   ○ 素晴らしい人
   ○ 他（何人）…………………………………………………………
   ○ すらない

3. 概要語話すのは特に男性ですか、それとも女性ですか、答えを一つだけ選んでください。
   ○ 女性
   ○ 男性
   ○ 別途、特定の男性もしくは女性
   ○ すらない
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4. 横浜港は特にラジオで話題ですか。それともテレビで話題ですか。答えを一つだけ選んでください。
   - ラジオ
   - テレビ
   - ラジオもテレビも同じくらい
   - わからない

5. 横浜港は特にどこで話題ですか。答えを一つだけ選んでください。
   - 東京
   - 京都
   - 関西
   - 広島
   - 長崎
   - その他 予想外の選択肢
   - わからない

6. - 横浜港ともに上位に話題のある名前の候補を挙げてください：
   - その候補でどんなことで有名ですか：

7. どこであなたは横浜港についての意見を聞くか、答えを一つだけ選んでください。
   - 学校
   - 自宅
   - どこで話していた
   - その他

8. あなたは横浜港を語りますか。答えを一つだけ選んでください。
   - 一番話さない
   - まれにしか話さない
   - 定期的に話す
   - よく話す
   - いつも話す
   - わからない

このアンケートにご協力いただきありがとうございました。
APPENDIX 4
First Newsreader Survey

ENQUÊTE

We willen nu graag weten wat u vindt van de uitspraak van bepaalde bekende nieuwslezers. Geef van de volgende twaalf nieuwslezers aan in welke mate zij volgens u Standaardnederlands spreken. Dit kunt u doen door een rapportcijfer voor hun Nederlands te geven. Als u de nieuwslezer niet kent of zijn/haar spreuk niet voor de geest kunt halen, maak dan het rundje voor “geen mening” zwart. U hoeft de schaal in dat geval dus niet in te vullen.

1. Marga van Praag 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  o onbekend/geen mening
2. Philip Freriks 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  o onbekend/geen mening
3. Sander Simons 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  o onbekend/geen mening
4. Pia Dijkstra 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  o onbekend/geen mening
5. Harmen Siezen 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  o onbekend/geen mening
6. Jeroen Pauw 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  o onbekend/geen mening
7. Jeroen Latijnhouwers 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  o onbekend/geen mening
8. Joop van Zijl 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  o onbekend/geen mening
9. Loretta Schrijver 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  o onbekend/geen mening
10. Noraly Beyer 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  o onbekend/geen mening
11. Rick Nieman 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  o onbekend/geen mening
12. Leo de Later 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  o onbekend/geen mening
13. Humberto Tan 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  o onbekend/geen mening
14. Jan de Hoop 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  o onbekend/geen mening
15. Gijs Wanders 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  o onbekend/geen mening
16. Debby Petter 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  o onbekend/geen mening
17. Margriet Vroomans 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  o onbekend/geen mening
18. Sacha de Boer 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  o onbekend/geen mening
19. Loretta Schrijver 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  o onbekend/geen mening
20. Henly Stoel 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  o onbekend/geen mening

DANK U
**APPENDIX 5**  
Second Newsreader Survey

---

**ENQUÊTE**

Geef aan in hoeverre onderstaande nieuwslezers Standaardnederlands (ook wel ABN genoemd) spreken door een cijfer te omcirkelen (1=helemaal geen Standaardnederlands; 10=perfect Standaardnederlands). Op de volgende pagina's staan foto's van alle nieuwslezers, voor het geval je niet zeker bent over een naam. Als je een spreker niet kent, of je hebt geen mening over zijn/haar Nederlands, geef dat dan aan in de rechterkolom. Vul ook je persoonlijke gegevens in.

- geslacht: v/m
- leeftijd: .... jaar
- opgegroeid in provincie: .................................................................

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nieuwslezer</th>
<th>Cijfers</th>
<th>Overige Gegevens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Antoin Peeters</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>o onbekend/geen mening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Roelof Hemmen</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>o onbekend/geen mening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hennie Stoel</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>o onbekend/geen mening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pia Dijkstra</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>o onbekend/geen mening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gerard Aminkhof</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>o onbekend/geen mening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Noraly Beyer</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>o onbekend/geen mening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sacha de Boer</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>o onbekend/geen mening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Philip Freriks</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>o onbekend/geen mening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Iwris Kelly</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>o onbekend/geen mening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Carolijn Lilypal</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>o onbekend/geen mening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Joop van Zijl</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>o onbekend/geen mening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Harmen Sienzen</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>o onbekend/geen mening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Jeroen Pauw</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>o onbekend/geen mening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Elseneke Havenga</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>o onbekend/geen mening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Jan de Hoop</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>o onbekend/geen mening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Femke Wolthus</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>o onbekend/geen mening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Loretta Schrijver</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>o onbekend/geen mening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Rick Nieman</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>o onbekend/geen mening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Suzanne Bosman</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>o onbekend/geen mening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Jeroen Latijnhouwers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>o onbekend/geen mening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Jeroen Overbeek</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>o onbekend/geen mening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Jeanet Schuurman</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>o onbekend/geen mening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Hans Smit</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>o onbekend/geen mening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Annette van Trigt</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>o onbekend/geen mening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Gijs Wanders</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>o onbekend/geen mening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Margreet Spijkers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>o onbekend/geen mening</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DANK U**
APPENDIX 6
Phoneme Evaluation Survey

ENQUÊTE
Dit is een vragenlijst die bedoeld is om uit te vinden wat volgens u de standaarduitspraak is van het Nederlands. Het gaat dus om de uitspraak van de taalvariant die vroeger vaak het Algemeen Beschaaft Nederlands (ABN) werd genoemd, maar die we tegenwoordig meestal als het Standaardnederlands betitelen. Het invullen van de vragenlijst duurt ongeveer 10 minutes.

PERSOONLIJKE GEGEVENS
1. geslacht:
   - o vrouw
   - o man
2. leeftijd: .......... jaar
3. In welke provincie(s) heeft u tot en met uw 25e gewoond?
   geboren te ............................... in 19....
   gewoond te ............................... van 19.... tot 19....
   gewoond te ............................... van 19.... tot 19....
   gewoond te ............................... van 19.... tot 19....
   gewoond te ............................... van 19.... tot 19....

4. Wat is het hoogste opleidingsniveau dat u heeft afgerond?
   - o lagere school
   - o lbo/mavo
   - o havo/vwo/mbo
   - o hbo
   - o universiteit
5. Wat is/was uw studierichting of beroep? ...........................................

UITSPRAAKVERSCHIJNSELEN
We willen graag weten wat u van bepaalde uitspraakverschijnselen vindt. Deze uitspraakverschijnselen zijn op de volgende pagina's beschreven. In totaal zijn het tien verschijnselen. Geef van deze uitspraakverschijnselen aan in welke mate ze een acceptabel onderdeel zijn van de Nederlandse standaardtaal. Lees eerst alle verschijnselen en vul ze dan aan voor een in, zodat u ze onderling vergelijkt. Als u geen mening heeft of het verschijnsel niet kent, vul dan “geen mening/ond beckend” in.
APPENDIX

Verschijnsel 1: Een EE wordt enigszins als EI uitgesproken:
KLEEDJE klinkt een beetje als KLEIDJE en BEET ALS BEIT.

- absoluut niet acceptabel in het Standaardnederlands
- niet echt acceptabel in het Standaardnederlands
- het mag eventueel in het Standaardnederlands
- het mag in het Standaardnederlands
- noodzakelijk onderdeel van het Standaardnederlands
- geen mening/ongevonden

Verschijnsel 2: Een OO wordt enigszins als OU uitgesproken:
ROZIN klinkt een beetje als ROUZEN en BOOT ALS BOUT.

- absoluut niet acceptabel in het Standaardnederlands
- niet echt acceptabel in het Standaardnederlands
- het mag eventueel in het Standaardnederlands
- het mag in het Standaardnederlands
- noodzakelijk onderdeel van het Standaardnederlands
- geen mening/ongevonden

Verschijnsel 3: Een EU wordt enigszins als UI uitgesproken:
SLEUTEL klinkt een beetje als SLUETEL en LEUK ALS LUUK.

- absoluut niet acceptabel in het Standaardnederlands
- niet echt acceptabel in het Standaardnederlands
- het mag eventueel in het Standaardnederlands
- het mag in het Standaardnederlands
- noodzakelijk onderdeel van het Standaardnederlands
- geen mening/ongevonden

Verschijnsel 4: Een UI wordt enigszins als AU uitgesproken:
BUITEN klinkt een beetje als BAUTEN en LUIK ALS LAUK.

- absoluut niet acceptabel in het Standaardnederlands
- niet echt acceptabel in het Standaardnederlands
- het mag eventueel in het Standaardnederlands
- het mag in het Standaardnederlands
- noodzakelijk onderdeel van het Standaardnederlands
- geen mening/ongevonden

Verschijnsel 5: Een OU wordt enigszins als AAU uitgesproken:
LOUTER klinkt een beetje als LAAUTER en KOUD ALS KAAUĐ.

- absoluut niet acceptabel in het Standaardnederlands
- niet echt acceptabel in het Standaardnederlands
- het mag eventueel in het Standaardnederlands
- het mag in het Standaardnederlands
- noodzakelijk onderdeel van het Standaardnederlands
- geen mening/ongevonden
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Verschijnsel 6: Een e wordt enigszins als aai uitgesproken:
KLEINE klinkt een beetje als KLAINE en GEIT als GAIT.

- absoluut niet acceptabel in het Standaardnederlands
- niet echt acceptabel in het Standaardnederlands
- het mag eventueel in het Standaardnederlands
- het mag in het Standaardnederlands
- noodzakelijk onderdeel van het Standaardnederlands
- geen mening/onderbouw

Verschijnsel 7: Een r klinkt enigszins "Goors", bijvoorbeeld zo als de r van de
kinderen van "Kinderen voor Kinderen" en van veel sprekers op de
commerciële TV-ondernemers.

- absoluut niet acceptabel in het Standaardnederlands
- niet echt acceptabel in het Standaardnederlands
- het mag eventueel in het Standaardnederlands
- het mag in het Standaardnederlands
- noodzakelijk onderdeel van het Standaardnederlands
- geen mening/onderbouw

Verschijnsel 8: Een g wordt enigszins als een "zachte g" uitgesproken:

- absoluut niet acceptabel in het Standaardnederlands
- niet echt acceptabel in het Standaardnederlands
- het mag eventueel in het Standaardnederlands
- het mag in het Standaardnederlands
- noodzakelijk onderdeel van het Standaardnederlands
- geen mening/onderbouw

Verschijnsel 9: Een v wordt enigszins als een f uitgesproken:
VOOR klinkt een beetje als FOOR en DIEVEN als DIFEN

- absoluut niet acceptabel in het Standaardnederlands
- niet echt acceptabel in het Standaardnederlands
- het mag eventueel in het Standaardnederlands
- het mag in het Standaardnederlands
- noodzakelijk onderdeel van het Standaardnederlands
- geen mening/onderbouw

Verschijnsel 10: Een z wordt enigszins als een s uitgesproken.
ZIEN klinkt een beetje als SIEEN en DEZE als DIESE

- absoluut niet acceptabel in het Standaardnederlands
- niet echt acceptabel in het Standaardnederlands
- het mag eventueel in het Standaardnederlands
- het mag in het Standaardnederlands
- noodzakelijk onderdeel van het Standaardnederlands
- geen mening/onderbouw

Als u uitspraakverschijnselen kent die u vaak op televisie hoort maar die geen Standaardneder-
lands zijn, beschrijf die dan hier:

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

DANK U
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Telephone Survey

1. Denkt u dat de positie van het Nederlands in Europa of in de wereld bedreigd wordt in verhouding tot andere talen?
   - nee
   - geen mening

2. Bent u bang voor invloeden van andere talen op het Nederlands?
   - nee, ik ben niet bang
   - ja (Zo ja, welke talen?)
   - Engels
   - Duits
   - Frans
   - andere taal, namelijk
   - geen mening

De volgende vragen gaan over het gebruik van het Standaardnederlands, ook wel ABN genoemd.

3. Als iemand Standaardnederlands (ABN) spreekt, kunt u dan horen waar hij of zij vandaan komt (uit welke stad of streek)?
   - dat kan
   - nee, dat kan niet
   - ander antwoord, namelijk
   - geen mening

4. Wat is het belangrijkste verschil dat u kunt bedenken tussen het Standaardnederlands en niet-standaard vormen van het Nederlands? (Eventueel uitleggen: niet-standaard is bijvoorbeeld Amsterdams of Brabants). Zit dat bijvoorbeeld in:
   - uitspraak (accent, klinkers en medeklinkers)?
   - woordenschat?
   - grammatica?
   - ander antwoord? Welke? .................................................................
   - geen mening

5. Hoeveel mensen in Nederland spreken volgens u echt Standaardnederlands?
   - niemand
   - 1 (concreet) persoon - wie? .................................................................
   - een paar mensen
   - veel mensen
   - iedereen
   - specifiek aantal, namelijk ..............................................................
   - geen mening
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6. Is dat een bepaalde categorie mensen (b.v. bepaalde beroepen, hoger opgeleiden, mensen van de radio/tv)?
   o alleen op sommige plekken (b.v. op kantoren, bij de gemeentebalie, bij de politie, etc.)
   o mensen van vele rangen en standen spreken Standaardnederlands, je komt ze dagelijks tegen
   o specifieke groep, namelijk .................................................................

7. Spreekt u zelf ABN?
   o ja, altijd
   o ja, soms / vaak
   o ik kan het wel, maar gebruik het niet of niet vaak
   o ik spreek het niet

8. Vindt u het belangrijk dat er een Standaardtaal is in ons land, of kunnen we ook zonder?
   o belangrijk
   o niet belangrijk
   o ander antwoord: ..................................................................................
   o geen mening

9. Wie moeten bepalen hoe die standaardtaal eruit ziet? Zijn dat
   o de sprekers zelf
   o overheid
   o taalkundigen
   o ander antwoord: ..................................................................................
   o geen mening

10. Mag het Standaardnederlands een Randstedelijk karakter hebben of moet het een meer algemeen karakter hebben? (Eventueel uitleggen: Nederlands zoals het in de Randstad gesproken wordt.)
    o ja
    o nee
    o geen mening

11. Vindt u dat op televisie alleen Standaardnederlands gesproken moet worden, of mogen ook regionale variëteiten gebruikt worden?
     o ja, alleen Standaardnederlands
     o hoofdzakelijk Standaardnederlands, slechts bij uitzondering mogen ook andere variëteiten gebruikt worden
     o afhankelijk van de situatie moeten naast het Standaardnederlands ook andere Nederlandse taalvariëteiten gebruikt kunnen worden, evt. regelmatig
     o alle variëteiten moeten in gelijke mate vertegenwoordigd zijn op tv
     o geen mening
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11. Vindt u dat op school alleen het Standaardnederlands gebruikt moet worden?
   - ja, alleen Standaardnederlands
   - nee, in sommige gevallen mogen regionale variëteiten gebruikt worden
   - ander antwoord: ………………………………………………………………………………………
   - geen mening

   - erg mooi
   - best mooi
   - gewoon
   - best lelijk
   - erg lelijk
   - iets anders, namelijk ………………………………………………………………………
   - geen mening

13. Moet in Nederland en Vlaanderen dezelfde taal gesproken worden?
   - ja
   - nee
   - ander antwoord: ………………………………………………………………………
   - geen mening/geen interesse

14. Ten slotte nog een paar algemene vragen:
   - Mag ik uw leeftijd weten?
   - Wat is uw hoogst genoten schoolopleiding?

DANK U
# APPENDIX 8

**Acoustic Measurements (Hz)**

### Duration Measurements (Milliseconds)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Duration (a)</th>
<th>Duration (b)</th>
<th>Duration (c)</th>
<th>Duration (d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>148.89</td>
<td>58.32</td>
<td>141.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>72.73</td>
<td>146.65</td>
<td>73.41</td>
<td>146.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>49.37</td>
<td>115.24</td>
<td>49.23</td>
<td>115.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAS</td>
<td>65.45</td>
<td>109.83</td>
<td>68.15</td>
<td>111.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>71.40</td>
<td>124.44</td>
<td>73.32</td>
<td>126.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>66.72</td>
<td>173.32</td>
<td>68.23</td>
<td>175.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>73.48</td>
<td>184.42</td>
<td>75.32</td>
<td>186.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Duration (e)</th>
<th>Duration (f)</th>
<th>Duration (g)</th>
<th>Duration (h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>123.87</td>
<td>286.82</td>
<td>120.32</td>
<td>282.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>115.01</td>
<td>263.96</td>
<td>113.41</td>
<td>261.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>94.92</td>
<td>179.82</td>
<td>93.23</td>
<td>177.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAS</td>
<td>113.71</td>
<td>262.97</td>
<td>113.41</td>
<td>256.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>124.02</td>
<td>264.61</td>
<td>120.32</td>
<td>265.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>119.21</td>
<td>259.39</td>
<td>116.41</td>
<td>256.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>107.87</td>
<td>256.65</td>
<td>108.23</td>
<td>257.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Duration (i)</th>
<th>Duration (j)</th>
<th>Duration (k)</th>
<th>Duration (l)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>55.13</td>
<td>142.27</td>
<td>54.31</td>
<td>141.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>67.01</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>66.31</td>
<td>150.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>61.36</td>
<td>186.89</td>
<td>61.23</td>
<td>186.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAS</td>
<td>68.54</td>
<td>289.91</td>
<td>68.41</td>
<td>289.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>60.93</td>
<td>140.00</td>
<td>60.32</td>
<td>140.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>78.16</td>
<td>191.18</td>
<td>78.32</td>
<td>191.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>78.15</td>
<td>203.33</td>
<td>78.32</td>
<td>203.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Duration (m)</th>
<th>Duration (n)</th>
<th>Duration (o)</th>
<th>Duration (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>68.28</td>
<td>222.52</td>
<td>68.31</td>
<td>222.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>66.60</td>
<td>149.11</td>
<td>66.32</td>
<td>149.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>59.18</td>
<td>155.06</td>
<td>59.23</td>
<td>155.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAS</td>
<td>61.19</td>
<td>179.59</td>
<td>61.32</td>
<td>179.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>76.95</td>
<td>220.80</td>
<td>77.32</td>
<td>220.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>58.17</td>
<td>107.77</td>
<td>58.32</td>
<td>107.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>73.58</td>
<td>265.61</td>
<td>74.32</td>
<td>265.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Duration (q)</th>
<th>Duration (r)</th>
<th>Duration (s)</th>
<th>Duration (t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>118.24</td>
<td>27.96</td>
<td>118.58</td>
<td>28.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>119.64</td>
<td>24.49</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>23.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>104.45</td>
<td>19.96</td>
<td>104.82</td>
<td>19.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAS</td>
<td>131.21</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td>131.82</td>
<td>14.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>116.80</td>
<td>29.37</td>
<td>116.34</td>
<td>29.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>129.63</td>
<td>18.98</td>
<td>129.91</td>
<td>19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>127.83</td>
<td>31.83</td>
<td>128.11</td>
<td>32.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>speaker</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>at 50%</th>
<th>st. dev.</th>
<th>speaker</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>at 50%</th>
<th>st. dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>22.74</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>33.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>28.11</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>25.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>16.09</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>24.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F₁</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>23.83</td>
<td>F₁</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>27.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>26.47</td>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>24.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>50.20</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>40.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>30.55</td>
<td>HES</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>30.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>72.87</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>88.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1132</td>
<td>80.69</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2082</td>
<td>81.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>73.93</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2143</td>
<td>121.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F₁</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>68.44</td>
<td>F₁</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2423</td>
<td>82.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1016</td>
<td>100.66</td>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2092</td>
<td>82.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>144.75</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2513</td>
<td>140.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>60.32</td>
<td>HES</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>60.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>178.53</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2688</td>
<td>198.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2488</td>
<td>124.84</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2566</td>
<td>96.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2359</td>
<td>223.57</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2495</td>
<td>117.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F₁</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2307</td>
<td>77.77</td>
<td>F₁</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2856</td>
<td>166.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2348</td>
<td>208.17</td>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2660</td>
<td>239.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2835</td>
<td>230.86</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2803</td>
<td>204.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2841</td>
<td>163.25</td>
<td>HES</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2897</td>
<td>150.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(aa) at 50%</th>
<th>(oe) at 50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>speaker</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F₁</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F₁</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F₁</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F₁</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### (ee) at 25% / 50% / 75%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>spkr</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>at 25%</th>
<th>st. dev.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>at 50%</th>
<th>st. dev.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>at 75%</th>
<th>st. dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JX</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24.65</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>26.98</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>26.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>21.58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>20.87</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>21.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>29.90</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>30.95</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>28.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>25.29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>25.29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>22.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>15.27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>16.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>33.24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>41.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>50.31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>54.39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>59.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>18.38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>27.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>32.66</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>34.70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>29.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>33.54</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>43.03</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>36.44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>53.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>44.82</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>43.10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>53.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (eu) at 25% / 50% / 75%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>spkr</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>at 25%</th>
<th>st. dev.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>at 50%</th>
<th>st. dev.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>at 75%</th>
<th>st. dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JX</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>44.13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>38.72</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>36.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>10.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>23.69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>24.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>19.08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>21.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>44.19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>52.36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>53.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>44.99</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>41.05</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>36.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>14.51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>18.53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>30.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>18.34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>19.01</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>30.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>31.26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>29.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>22.41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>25.17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>22.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>56.50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>71.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>52.41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>43.28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>46.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JX</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1398</td>
<td>62.35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>50.88</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>63.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>224.21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>141.33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>124.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>62.26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>55.26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1697</td>
<td>61.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1371</td>
<td>59.97</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1423</td>
<td>58.93</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>106.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1736</td>
<td>45.60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td>47.11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>54.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1706</td>
<td>66.44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>54.49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1554</td>
<td>43.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

350
# APPENDIX

## (oo) at 25% / 50% / 75%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sprk</th>
<th>n at 25%</th>
<th>st. dev.</th>
<th>n at 50%</th>
<th>st. dev.</th>
<th>n at 75%</th>
<th>st. dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F_0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F_0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2122</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2122</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2394</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2340</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2423</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2122</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2122</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2394</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2340</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2423</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2122</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2122</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2394</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2340</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2423</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>862</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## (ei) at 25% / 50% / 75%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sprk</th>
<th>n at 25%</th>
<th>st. dev.</th>
<th>n at 50%</th>
<th>st. dev.</th>
<th>n at 75%</th>
<th>st. dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F_0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1673</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1769</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1645</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1666</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1769</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2042</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2301</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2304</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2443</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2451</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2357</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2332</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZ</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2307</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2308</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2750</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2750</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2789</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2756</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2734</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX

### (ui) at 25% / 50% / 75%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>spkr</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>at 25%</th>
<th>st. dev.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>at 50%</th>
<th>st. dev.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>at 75%</th>
<th>st. dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>22.34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>24.90</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>26.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>17.38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21.96</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>22.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>19.21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>18.77</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>20.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F₁</td>
<td>HAS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>30.62</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>33.94</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F₁</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>14.45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>15.05</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>16.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>51.09</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>48.86</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>46.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>62.35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>56.41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>43.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (nu) at 25% / 50% / 75%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>spkr</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>at 25%</th>
<th>st. dev.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>at 50%</th>
<th>st. dev.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>at 75%</th>
<th>st. dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>16.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>25.10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>25.48</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>27.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>24.26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>22.40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>23.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F₁</td>
<td>HAS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>18.99</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F₁</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>25.54</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>45.19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>18.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>28.75</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>33.14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>48.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>33.09</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>36.45</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>43.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (uii) at 25% / 50% / 75%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>spkr</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>at 25%</th>
<th>st. dev.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>at 50%</th>
<th>st. dev.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>at 75%</th>
<th>st. dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>101.02</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>87.80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>87.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>52.64</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>37.74</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>38.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F₁</td>
<td>HAS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>69.29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>48.22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F₁</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>39.24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>49.01</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>37.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>65.42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>66.88</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>90.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>105.65</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>89.24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>119.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1128</td>
<td>46.58</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>37.07</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>61.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>83.73</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>45.43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1078</td>
<td>46.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>55.31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>48.23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>51.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F₁</td>
<td>HAS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>45.91</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td>45.81</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F₁</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>120.92</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>126.72</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>175.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1363</td>
<td>135.75</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1246</td>
<td>104.81</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>123.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>101.72</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>95.02</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>134.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (uiii) at 25% / 50% / 75%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>spkr</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>at 25%</th>
<th>st. dev.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>at 50%</th>
<th>st. dev.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>at 75%</th>
<th>st. dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2113</td>
<td>173.80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2077</td>
<td>180.61</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2105</td>
<td>190.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2361</td>
<td>84.01</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2366</td>
<td>97.72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2307</td>
<td>57.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2329</td>
<td>144.39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2373</td>
<td>115.09</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2418</td>
<td>165.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F₁</td>
<td>HAS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2171</td>
<td>130.83</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2181</td>
<td>125.41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F₁</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2165</td>
<td>148.01</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2194</td>
<td>98.30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2189</td>
<td>181.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2376</td>
<td>134.72</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2296</td>
<td>157.79</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2356</td>
<td>203.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2498</td>
<td>207.89</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2497</td>
<td>206.62</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2490</td>
<td>199.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Samenvatting (Dutch summary):

**HET STANDAARDNEDERLANDS IN NEDERLAND**

Een sociolinguïstische en fonetische beschrijving

Dit proefschrift geeft een definitie van de standaardtaal in Nederland en beschrijft de uitspraak van deze talenvariëteit. De weergave van dit onderzoek bestaat uit vier delen. Het eerste deel schetst de gedachtevorming achter het onderzoek en introduceert de Nederlandse standaardtaal, in de hoofdstukken 1, 2 en 3 (‘Achtergrond’). Het gebruikte spraakmateriaal alsmede de verschillende experimenten zijn beschreven in de hoofdstukken 4 en 5 (‘Methodologie’). De delen daarna beschrijven de Nederlandse standaardtaal en de uitspraak van deze talenvariëteit, respectievelijk in hoofdstuk 6 tot en met 9 (‘Het Standaardnederlands’) en 10 tot en met 12 (‘De uitspraak van het Standaardnederlands’).

**ACHTERGROND**

Hoofdstuk 1 geeft de achtergronden weer van de keuze voor de Nederlandse standaardtaal en voor de uitspraak van deze talenvariëteit als onderzoeksthema’s. Betoogd wordt dat er in Nederland een sterk bewustzijn is van talenvariëteit en de daarmee samenhangende connotaties. De standaardtaal is gemaakt in de zin dat zij reacties oproept en dat Nederlanders zich doorgaans betrokken voelen bij deze talenvariëteit. De zoektocht naar de definitie van de Nederlandse standaardtaal in het voorliggende onderzoek had als uitgangspunt dat de professionele literatuur veel aanwijzingen tot zo’n definitie geeft, terwijl de mening van gewone talengebruikers onderblijft is gebleven. De taalbeleving van deze laatste groep is echter relevant. Een brede acceptatie door gewone sprekers is immers intrinsieke aan elke standaardtaal. De literatuur geeft veel aanwijzingen dat uitspraak bepalend is voor de mate van standaardizaalheid. Dit aspect van taal is het meest variabel binnen en tussen sprekers, daarnaast heerst er een sterke bewustzijn van de subtiliteiten van uitspraak.

Allerlei namen voor de talenvariëteit die onderzocht is, doen de ronde, zoals ‘Algemeen Beschaafl Nederlands’ en moderne, neutrale termen als ‘Algemeen Bruikbaar Nederlands’ en ‘Algemeen Nederlands’. De term die hier gebruikt wordt, is ‘Standaardnederlands’, wat een neutrale beschrijving is van het fenomeen dat onderzocht wordt en doelt op een normtaal, een taal die geaccepteerd is als zijnde typisch voor de taalgemeenschap als geheel. Deze term is ook eenvoudig te vertalen in ‘Standard Dutch’ en is internationaal vanzelfsprekend.

De eerste golf van observaties over de Nederlandse standaardtaal doet zich voor in de zestiende eeuw; de tweede in de negentiende. Persoonlijke inzichten van beroepsmatige taalgebruikers spelen hierin een hoofdrol; zij worden vooral gestuurd door de sterke talenvariëteit die ze in hun dagelijkse professionele leven tegenkomen. Levendige, op overtuigingskracht berustende beschrijvingen van hoe de Nederlandse taal gesproken dient te worden, zijn het gevolg. In de twintigste eeuw groeit het besef dat er naast de intuïties van experts en professionele gebruikers (schrijvers,
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docenten, uitgevers) sociolinguïstische instrumenten nodig zijn die de normen van
leken kunnen vastleggen. Tot de opkomst van de moderne media na de Tweede
Wereldoorlog lijkt de aanname in onderzoek naar de Nederlandse standaardtaal dat
de typisch standaardtalige uitspraakkenmerken bekend zijn bij een breed publiek.
Aannames - vaak erg traditioneel - voeren echter de boventoon; aannames die niet
uitgebreid getoetst worden. De voorliggende studie is het eerste uitgebreide
onderzoek naar lekenopvattingen over het Standnaardenlands en beoogt zo een
startpunt te zijn voor verder onderzoek naar taalnormen in Nederland. Een eventuele
toepassing van de gegevens is een leerboek voor buitenlanders die Nederlands
studeren. Vooral studenten buiten het Nederlandse taalgebied die Nederlands willen
leren, zijn gebaat bij een beschrijving van taalnormen en de mate en aard van
acceptatie van bepaalde uitspraakkenmerken.
Hoofdstuk 2 schetst de geschiedenis van het Standnaardenlands. Parallel aan
de toestandkoming van de Nederlandse taal in haar vele vormen, ontstaan normen
omtrent correclheid en het gevoel dat onderlinge talige tegemoetkoming eenheid
schep, wederzijdse verstaanbaarheid en begrip. Deze taalstandaardisatie is in dit
hoofdstuk beschreven aan de hand van de stadia zoals beschreven door Haugen
(1966): selectie van de taal die als basis dient voor standaardiseren, codificatie van
de taalnormen in grammatica’s en andere beschrijvende (en voorschrijvende)
werken, uitbreiding van de functies van de standaardtaal en ten slotte de acceptatie
van de standaardtaal.
De Middelnaardense periode (1100-1500) wordt door velen gezien als de
echte start van de geregistreerde Nederlandse taal. In deze periode ligt de basis van
het standaardiseringsproces. rondom de dertiende eeuw verschijnen de eerste
documenten in de volkstalen zoals toentertijd gesproken. Brabants en Vlaamse
variëteiten zijn hierin het best vertegenwoordigd. Brussel, Brugge en Antwerpen
lijken onderhevig te zijn aan een zekere taalstandaardisering door de wederzijdse
handel die plaatsvindt, waarbij kooplieden met elkaar dienen te communiceren.
Door het vele overschrijven van teksten ontstaan geschreven die door de dialecten
van de kopierende schrijvers beïnvloed zijn.
Vanaf de vijfde eeuw draagt de drukpers bij tot het naar elkaar toegroeien van
verschillende geschreven taalvariëteiten. De talen van Antwerpen en
Amsterdam zijn het meest dominant hierin. Hoewel de selectie plaatsvindt van een
aantal dialecten als basis van de standaardtaal, en ook de eerste kleinschalige
codificatie zichtbaar wordt, is er aan het einde van de Middelnaardense periode
nog geen sprake van enige wijdverbreide standaardisatie. De val van Antwerpen in
1585 verstoort de natuurlijke ontwikkeling voor het hele gebied richting een
gezamenlijke standaardtaal. Antwerpen komt in handen van de Spanjaarden en het
noorden scheidt zich af van het hedendaagse Vlaanderen. De standaardisering in het
zuiden zal voor enkele eeuwen tot een minimum worden beperkt, terwijl de
beschreven en gesproken eenheid in het zelfbewuste noorden een vlucht neemt.
De zeventiende eeuw brengt de Statenvertaling van de Bijbel, koloniale
expansie en bekende Nederlandse schrijvers als Van den Vondel en Hooft. De
Republiek der Verenigde Nederlanden wordt gesticht en het Nederlands als taal
wordt speerpunt in het eenheidsstreven van de jonge natie. Ondernemers, drukkers,
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uitgevers en wetenschappers hebben belang bij een einheidstaal en dragen hieraan bij. De provincies buiten het westen blijven buitengesloten van enige invloed op de einheidstaal.


Vanaf het begin van de twintigste eeuw komt de standaardisering van de gesproken standaardtaal andermaal in een stroomversnelling. De taal van de ontwikkelde klasse in de Hollandse steden krijgt een steeds eenduidigere vorm. Het onderwijs wordt steeds toegankelijker en daarmee groeit het besef van de standaardtaal. De opkomst van radio (jaren ’20) en televisie (jaren ’50) draagt bij aan de snelle verspreiding van de klanken van de standaardtaal.

Het Nederlands wordt grammaticaal en spellingtechnisch vastgelegd in respectievelijk de Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst en de Woordenlijst der Nederlandse Taal. Van Dale’s Groot Woordenboek en het Woordenboek der Nederlandische Taal vormen verder een vergevorderde beschrijving van de Nederlandse woordenschat. Samen met de massamedia hebben deze werken de uiteindelijke verspreiding van het Nederlands en de standaardtaal in hoge mate volbracht. Het Nederlands is in een vergevorderd stadium van standaardisering en functioneel kan worden gesproken van volledige standaardisatie, daar communicatieve problemen die een gevolg zijn van variatie in de standaardtaal te verwaarlozen zijn.

Hoofdstuk 3 bekijkt hoe na eeuwen van standaardisering een situatie is ontstaan waarin verschillende talen in het Nederlandse taalgebied naast elkaar bestaan - soms vreedaan, soms moeizaam - en ontwikkelingen actief zijn die standaardisering versterken dan wel ondergraven. De meest dominante taal in het Nederlandse taalgebied is het Nederlands. De naam ‘Nederlands’ is pas sinds de twintigste eeuw de meest gebruikelijke manier om te verwijzen naar de Germaanse taal die historisch gezien het sterkst verbonden is met Nederland. Andere benamingen (bijvoorbeeld
DUTCH SUMMARY

‘Diets’, ‘Duysch’ en ‘Nederduits’) zijn in onbruik geraakt. Het bestaan van deze benamingen heeft echter geleid tot internationale inconsistentie bij het verwijzen naar het Nederlands, een inconsistentie die soms tot verwarring leidt over de verhouding tussen de talen in Nederland, Vlaanderen en Duitsland. De term ‘Hollands’ wordt tegenwoordig gebruikt om zowel naar de taal van het hele gebied te verwijzen als naar de taal die typisch is voor het westelijke deel. ‘Algemeen Beschafid Nederlands’ is onder taalkundigen in onbruik maar blijft de term die veel Nederlanders gebruiken om de Nederlandse standaardtaal te benoemen. Onder taalkundigen is de term ‘Standaardnederlands’ de meest gebruikte, waarbij zij onderscheid maken tussen de variëteit die in Nederland wordt gesproken (‘noordelijk Standaardnederlands’) en die in Vlaanderen gebruikt wordt (‘zuidelijk Standaardnederlands’).

De media worden gezien als de belangrijkste factor in de toestandkoming van een nieuw taalnormenstelsel waar het uitspraak betreft. De Gooise ‘r’ en het Poldernederlands geven een impressie van hoe het nieuwe Nederlands zal klinken, maar de verwachting is dat veranderingen langzaam zullen plaatsvinden. Al met al lijkt er in Nederland een sterke behoefte te zijn aan een eenduidige norm. De voordelen van een eenheidstaal in Nederland zijn het ontstaan van saamhorigheid en wederzijds begrip. Deze taal draagt echter ook bij aan een verminderde tolerantie ten opzichte van afwijkingen van de norm.

METHODOLOGIE


In hoofdstuk 5 wordt een methodologische beschrijving gegeven van de empirische onderzoeken die verricht zijn ter beantwoording van de onderzoeks- vraag, namelijk een luisterexperiment, zes enquêtes en twee fonetische beschrijvingen. Literatuurstudie is een belangrijk onderdeel van het huidige onderzoek. Hoofdstuk 10 bestaat bijvoorbeeld vrijwel uitsluitend uit literatuuronderzoek. Dit type onderzoek dient echter vooral ter ondersteuning van bovenstaand empirische onderzoek.

Het meest omvangrijke experiment was het Spraakevaluatie-experiment, waarin 114 luisteraars als belangrijkste taak hadden de spraak van de 30 sprekers uit het eerste corpus te kwalificeren op basis van de volgende kenmerken: Standaardnederlandsheid, bekaktheid, westelijkheid, regionaalheid, modernheid,
formeelheid, mooiheid en verzorgtheid. Sprekerselectie was een ander belangrijk doel van dit experiment. De luisteraars kwamen uit verschillende delen van Nederland en konden in verschillende leeftijdsgroepen worden ingedeeld. Het waren mannen en vrouwen.


In de Perceptieve Beschrijving werden tien geselecteerde fonemen in specifieke contexten onderworpen aan een consensustranscriptie. De spraak was afkomstig van de vier sprekers uit het tweede corpus, aangevuld met drie sprekers uit het eerste. In de Akoestische Beschrijving werd elk van de geselecteerde klinkers akoestisch gemeten. De toonhoogte en de drie eerste formanten (F1, F2 en F3) zijn gemeten. De perifere klinkers (ie), (oe), (a) en (aa) dienden als referentiepunten. De basis van de beschrijving waren F1 en F2.

HET STANDAARDNEDERLANDS

In Hoofdstuk 6 begint de beschrijving van de kenmerken van het Standaardnederlands. Dit hoofdstuk behandelt ‘intrinsieke kenmerken’ van deze taalvariëteit, ofwel kenmerken van de taal en niet van de sprekers. Het uitgangspunt is dat leken belangrijke bepalers zijn van de definitie van het Standaardnederlands en hun evaluaties hebben we dan ook gelegd naast die van experts. Zowel leken als deze experts zijn, zo blijkt, van mening dat beide groepen een belangrijke stem hebben in deze definitie.
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Vooral correctheid, niet-regionaliteit en ‘lingua-francaheid’ worden door leken sterk met het Standaardnederlands geassocieerd. Lingua-francaheid verwijst naar de communicatieve functie van het Standaardnederlands, waarbij het dient als taal waarin de wederzijdse verstaanbaarheid optimaal is. Op een algemener niveau zijn er twee kenmerken van het Standaardnederlands die elkaars tegenpolen lijken te zijn: algemeenheid (kenmerkend voor het hele land, de taal van iedereen, emotioneel neutraal) en gecultiveerdheid (een cultuurproduct, een aangeleerde taal, een elitetaal). Deze twee beschrijvingen lijken naast elkaar te bestaan en het is eerder regel dan uitzondering dat individuele luisteraars en respondenten in ons onderzoek gelijktijdig aanspraak maken op beide typen. Naast deze twee categorieën kenmerken komt het adjetief ‘mooi’ naar voren. Uitspraak wordt door respondenten als de meest kritische kwaliteit gezien voor de mate van standaardtaligheid, terwijl woordkeus en grammatica in mindere mate als bepalend worden beschouwd. We kunnen concluderen dat Nederlanders geneigd zijn het Standaardnederlands mooi te vinden en die mening in het bijzonder baseren op uitspraak.

Onnatuurlijkheid komt als veelgenoemd kenmerk uit verschillende van de experimenten. Opvallend daarbij is dat dit kenmerk niet alleen gedoogd wordt als zijdne onvermijdelijk maar zelfs omarmd wordt als voorwaarde. Geopperde oorzaken van de onnatuurlijkheid van de standaardtaal zijn: de conservatieve krachten waardoor deze taalvariëteit omringd is, de bewustheid waarmee wordt omgegaan met deze taal, de prescriptieve krachten die het aanturen, het feit dat het een aangeleerde taal is voor velen, de geschreven traditie van de standaardtaal en ten slotte het feit dat de media deze taal bewust verspreiden.

Hoofdstuk 7 beschrijft de ‘gebruikerskenmerken’ van het Standaardnederlands en beantwoordt daarmee de vraag wie typisch deze taal bezigen. Bewoners uit Haarlem en de westelijke steden worden in het bijzonder naar voren geschoven als typische sprekers. Hoofdstuk 7 betoogt dat de keus voor Haarlem voortkomt uit een hardnekkige mythe en dat er geen goede redenen zijn aan te wijzen waarom in deze stad het Standaardnederlands het meest wordt gesproken of op de meest zuivere manier. De onbekendheid van het accent zoals dat in Haarlem wordt gesproken kan een reden zijn waardoor deze mythe - die in de negentiende eeuw mogelijk ontstond na een opmerking van de schrijver Winkler (1871) over “die eigenaardige haarlemsche tongval” - zich voort kon zetten. De keuze voor de westelijke steden stemt overeen met wat historisch gezien verwacht kan worden. Deze keuze geeft aan dat er nog steeds een sterk bewustzijn is van de oorsprong van het Standaardnederlands.

Onduidelijkheid bestaat over de vraag in welke periode het Standaardnederlands vooral gesproken werd of wordt. Onze resultaten wijzen op een theoretische norm, van voor de jaren ‘60, maar geven ook aan dat moderne spraak toch het meest accepabel is. Spraak van voor de jaren ‘60 heeft een bijna sentimentele uitstraling maar wordt niet gezien als een talige norm waarnaar de huidige spreker zich moet richten.

Zowel mannen als vrouwen worden gezien als representatieve sprekers van het Standaardnederlands, sprekers of de publieke omroepen worden als meer Standaardnederlandssprekend beoordeeld dan die van commerciële omroepen. De
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NOS-nieuwslezers scoren hierin hoog, vooral het 8-uurjournaal van deze omroep heeft een exceptionele status in dit opzicht.

Hoewel er uiteenlopende antwoorden worden gegeven op de vraag betreffende het aantal sprekers van het Standaardnederlands, domineren antwoorden die verwijzen naar een klein percentage van de Nederlanders. Daarnaast is er een groep respondenten die de standaardtaal als typisch beschouwt voor de helft van de bevolking. Dit resultaat doet denken aan de enge en brede interpretatie die in de hoofdstukken aan de orde komen. De brede interpretatie gaat er vanuit dat de standaardtaal van alle mensen is; de enge ziet deze taal als typisch voor de elite. Beredeneerd kan echter worden dat een elitetaal intrinsiek niet standaard is. De twee benaderingen kunnen verenigd worden door de elitevariant te beschouwen als onderscheid van de gemeenschapsvariëteit.

De resultaten in Hoofdstuk 8 plaatsen de Nederlandse bevindingen in een internationaal perspectief. De onderzochte landen vertegenwoordigen een diverse groep standaardtalen in de wereld. De Nederlandse taalsituatie en die van Vlaanderen zijn sterk met elkaar verbonden. De Poolse situatie is interessant omdat dit land ongerekende buitenlandse bedreigingen heeft gekend. Japan daarentegen juist weer niet, en Nieuw-Zeeland vertegenwoordigt de landen die een relatief jonge standaardtaal hebben.

Alleen de lingua franca-functie wordt door de respondenten van alle landen aan de standaardtaal toegekend. Dit lijkt het meest primaire kenmerk van de standaardtaal; zij bindt sprekers en vormt de gemeenschappelijke communicatie. Dit kenmerk vertegenwoordigt blijkbaar de allereerste behoeftes die de standaardtaal bevredigt. In de Nederlandse geschiedenis was dit inderdaad ook de primaire motivatie om een standaardtaal na te streven. Deze motivatie is gebleven, gezien het feit dat dit opgaat voor een jonge standaardtaal als die in Nieuw-Zeeland.

De Japanners associëren het Standaardjapans sterk met de media en de Polen hechten sterke waarde aan correctheid als kenmerk van het Standaardpools. Een ander opvallend resultaat is de nadruk waarmee Nieuw-Zeelanders hun standaardtaal als ‘slangy’ beschrijven. De meest opmerkelijke bevinding is echter dat de Nederlanders sterker dan elk van de onderzochte volken de nadruk leggen op niet-regionaliteit. Bekend is dat er in Nederland bij velen een taboe ligt op het hebben van een regionaal accent. Meer dan één op de drie Nederlandse respondenten geeft inderdaad aan dat niet-regionaliteit een kenmerk is van de standaardtaal, terwijl slechts één op de tien Vlaamse respondenten dit kenmerk aandraagt. Voor de andere landen is dit percentage nog lager.

De taal van de hoofdstad heeft voor respondenten uit Polen en Japan een voorbeeldfunctie maar de Nieuw-Zeelandse resultaten, en tot op bepaalde hoogte ook de Vlaamse, maken duidelijk dat de taalnorm niet noodzakelijkerwijs in een stedelijk gebied hoeft te liggen. Nieuwslezers zijn duidelijk internationale voorbeelden als het om de standaardtaal gaat. Ook de beroemde rolmodellen die de respondenten aandroegen, werken vaak voor radio of televisie. Wel verschilt dit sterk per land. In Polen, bijvoorbeeld, worden docenten als sterke rolmodellen aangemerkt. In alle onderzochte landen worden mannen en vrouwen gemiddeld als evenzogoede standaardtaalsprekers beschouwd.
DUTCH SUMMARY

Hoofdstuk 9 benadert de standaardtaal vanuit een andere hoek, door te kijken naar de mate en aard van overeenstemming tussen luisteraars over geëvalueerde spraak. Gekeken wordt naar de kenmerken van deze luisteraars met in het achterhoofd de vraag of de verschillen in mate van overeenstemming zoals in eerdere hoofdstukken gevonden, te verklaren zijn op basis van deze kenmerken. De luisteraars zijn bijvoorbeeld relatief hoog opgeleid, hetgeen de resultaten beïnvloed kan hebben. Naast een beschrijvende functie heeft dit luisterexperiment ook een selecterende functie. De sprekers die volgens luisteraars het meest het Standaardnederlands benaderen, worden in een later stadium zelf onderworpen aan een fonetische beschrijving.

Drie sprekers komen naar voren in het experiment. Niet alleen behalen zij de hoogste Standaardnederlandsscore, ook is de overeenstemming over deze sprekers tussen luisteraars het hoogst. Deze sprekers zijn John Jaspers, Noud Smelt en Tom Herlaar. Noud Smelt was radiopresentator in de jaren ’70, de opnames van de andere twee komen uit de jaren ’90. De overeenstemming over deze sprekers is niet absoluut. Twee luisteraargroepen kunnen worden onderscheiden: één van wie de beoordelingen parallel lopen aan het gemiddelde en de andere die significant afwijkt van deze gemiddelde tendens. Het verschil tussen beide groepen ligt vooral in de beoordeling van regionale fragmenten (die in feite afleiders vormen in het experiment): de deviantie groep geeft significant hogere Standaardnederlandsscores aan regionale spraak. Deze groep is significant ouder en lager opgeleid dan de reguliere groep.

Er is geen effect voor leeftijd maar wel een voor decennium waarin de beoordeelde spraak is opgenomen, alsmede een significante interactie tussen leeftijd van de luisteraar en beoordeeld decennium. Regionale oorsprong en opleidingsniveau leiden niet tot significante verschillen in de beoordelingen. Wel is er een hoofdeffect voor sekse; de vrouwelijke luisteraars geven significant hogere Standaardnederlandsscores aan de spraak dan de mannen. Daarnaast geven hoogopgeleide vrouwen uit het westen van Nederland significant hogere Standaardnederlandsscores dan laagopgeleide vrouwen van buiten het westen. Deze zijn dus vooral verantwoordelijk voor de gevonden sekseverschillen. Deze groep bestaat typisch uit voortrekkers en voelt zich klaarblijkelijk in staat om hoge scores te geven. Het lijkt erop dat het zelfvertrouwen bij deze groep dusdanig is dat ze meent in een positie te zijn om hoge scores te geven, om ‘goed’ Nederlands te belonen.

DE UITSPRAAK VAN HET STANDAARDNEDERLANDS

Hoofdstuk 10 geeft een overzicht van fonetische beschrijvingen vanaf het begin van de negentiende eeuw. In deze eeuw neemt het aantal beschrijvingen van de klanken van de eenheidstaal toe, de uitgebreidheid en betrouwbaarheid van deze beschrijvingen verbeteren.

In de literatuur komt een vaste set van klanken steeds terug, wat op hun omstredenheid en variabiliteit duidt. De klanken zijn: de fricatieve (ɣ), (z) en (g), de (r), de lange middenvocalen (ee), (oo) en (eu) en de tweeklanken (ei), (ui) en
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(ou). Voor elk van deze basisklanken is bekeken wat de recente geschiedenis over hun realisatie vermeldt: hoeveel variatie er is en hoe omstreden die variatie is. Het doel is te komen tot voorspellingen over de uitkomsten van de perceptuele en akoestische beschrijvingen.

De fricatieve (v) en (z) worden in de negentiende en in de eerste helft van de twintigste eeuw vooral omschreven als stemhebbend en ongespannen. In de tweede helft van de twintigste eeuw wordt steeds vaker melding gemaakt van stemverlies, waarbij (v) op (z) voorloopt. Een verdere verstemlozing is een mogelijke toekomst voor deze klanken, hoewel het bewustzijn van de verstemlozing een remmende werking heeft, zodat het onderscheid met (f) en (s) gehandhaafd blijft. Voor de fricatief (g) kan historisch een onderscheid worden gemaakt tussen de stemhebbende en de stemloze variant. Dit onderscheid lijkt te zijn verdwenen in de standaardtaal en vanaf de tweede helft van de negentiende eeuw lijken stemloze realisaties de overhand te nemen en realisaties achter in de mond lijken steeds meer acceptatie te ondervinden. In de tweede helft van de twintigste eeuw neemt het verder achter in de mond uitspreken van (g) toe en daarmee de verschaping. Dat de stemhebbende varianten zullen verdwijnen uit de standaardtaal lijkt onvermijdelijk.

De alveolaire realisatie van de (r) is in de negentiende eeuw de norm, of in ieder geval wordt in die tijd aangenomen dat dit de enige standaardtalige realisatie kan zijn. Of hier sprake is van een eenduidige norm, een gebrek aan besef van andere realisaties of de aanname dat afwijkende voorkomens slechts een bijverschijnsel van lopende spraak zijn, is niet duidelijk. Onwaarschijnlijk is echter wel dat de levende norm dusdanig afgebakend is in genoemde periode. Vermeldingen van uvulaire realisaties worden in de loop van de twintigste eeuw steeds talrijker en in de laatste decennia van de twintigste eeuw komen daar approximante voorkomens bij als mogelijke standaardtalige vormen. Het besef is gegroeid dat een onderscheid dient te worden gemaakt tussen onset- en coda-realisaties. Te verwachten is dat deze twee posities ook in de spraak van onze sprekers bepalend zijn.

De lange middenvocallen (ee), (eu) en (oo) hebben relatief weinig verandering ondergaan sinds het begin van de negentiende eeuw. In die tijd worden monofonge realisaties nog vermeld, naast de licht-difonge, maar sindsdien lijken de laatste de overhand te hebben en deze situatie lijkt stabiel. Er is een kans dat toekomstige realisaties een versterkte verglijding zullen vertonen, maar de historische stabiliteit van deze klinkers suggereert dat dit nog lang op zich zal laten wachten. De Standaardnederlandse difongen zijn sinds het begin van de negentiende eeuw stabiel, maar sinds de laatste decennia van de twintigste eeuw wordt steeds vaker gesuggereerd dat het eerste element van deze fonemen aan het verlagen is. Dit wordt wel toegeschreven aan een selecte, progressieve groep sprekers; de vraag is in hoeverre zij van blijvende invloed zijn op de breedgedragen standaardtaal, die vooral een behoudend karakter heeft. De toekomst zou een verdere verlaging van het eerste element van difongen kunnen brengen.

Hoofdstuk 11 geeft de resultaten van de (consensus-)transcriptie van de klinkers en medeklinkers zoals die geselecteerd zijn. De fricatieve (v) en (z) van de geselecteerde zeven sprekers zijn in de meeste gevallen gerealiseerd als stemhebbend en ongespannen, maar het verschil tussen sprekers is groot. De (v)
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vertoon, in overeenstemming met de tendens beschreven in de literatuur, een sterkere verstemlozing dan (z). De stem in de voorkomens van deze twee fonemen is in geen van de gevallen sterk maar is wel eenduidig waarneembaar. Het Standaardnederlands lijk een sterke verscherping (verstemlozing in combinatie met een meer gespannen realisatie) tegen te houden voor deze twee fricatieve. De fricatief (g) wordt aan de andere kant overtuigend uvular en stemloos uitgesproken. Slechts een enkele velare of stemhebbende realisatie komt voor in de spraak van onze sprekers. De drie contexten die zijn gedefinieerd hebben geen eenduidig effect op de realisaties. De tendens richting een eenduidige (g) in meerdere posities is sterk.

Het gedrag van (r) in vier fonetisch/fonologische omgevingen is beluisterd, maar uiteindelijk bleek een opdeling in twee contexten het meest inzichtelijk: de onset en de coda. Onsettokens in het Standaardnederlands zijn perceptueel saillant door hun relatief krachtige realisatie. De twee voorkomens (velair en uvular) zijn opvallend even acceptabel in die posities. Er zijn in die gedachte ‘voorsprekers’ en ‘achtersprekers’ van het Standaardnederlands, dus sprekers die onset-(r) voorraan of achteraan in de mond uitspreken. Of het de een of de andere (r) is, heeft schijnbaar geen invloed op de mate van standaardtaligheid. Dit is opmerkelijk, daar ze elkaars tegenpoelen zijn waar het plaats van articulatie betreft. In codapositie is er sprake van perceptueel moeilijk waar te nemen realisaties, met weinig consistentie binnen de uitspraakgewoontes van individuele sprekers. De voorwaarde voor het Standaardnederlands lijk zelfs dat coda-(r) met weinig kracht gerealiseerd wordt. Dit heeft als gevolg dat onset-(r) slecht te kwalificeren is en vanuit segmenteel oogpunt zelfs relatief onvoorspelbaar is. Saillante realisaties in de coda lijken voor (r) onacceptabel.

De lange middenvocalen (ee), (eu) en (oo) zijn in vrijwel alle getranscribeerde gevallen semi-diflong. De diflongen (ei), (ui) en (ou) zijn evenzo stabiel als de semi-diflongen, met de toevoeging dat er in veel gevallen verlaging van het eerste element waar te nemen is. Geen van deze verlagingen is sterk en ze zijn onduidelijk verdeeld over de drie diflongen en de zeven sprekers.

Een meer algemene typering van het uitspraakgedrag van de sprekers maakt duidelijk dat ze niet eenduidig kiezen voor moderne dan wel behoudende realisaties van fonemen. Met andere woorden: voor het ene foneem kan een spreker neigen naar de traditionele (volgens de literatuur) variant en voor het andere foneem kan hij of zij een modern te noemen uitspraakgewoonte hebben.

Hoofdstuk 12 geeft een beschrijving van akoestische metingen van de besteudeerde klinkers. De enige metingen met wie de onze vergelijkbaar zijn, komen uit de jaren ‘90. Metingen uit de jaren ‘70 blijken ongeschikt als vergelijkingsmateriaal, onder andere door verschillen in meettechnieken en onduidelijkheid over de selectiecriteria van de sprekers.

De weergave in ruwe Hertzwaarden (op het 50% duurmoment) van de gemiddelde formantwaarden (F1/F2) van (t) (20 tokens van) elke klinker van elke spreker levert een eerste impressie van een traditioneel klinkerdiagram op. De genormaliseerde waarden (via z-scores) bieden verder een opvallend scherp beeld van de verdeling van klinkers in de klinkerruimte. De middenvocalen liggen in het
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horizontale midden, duidelijk verdeeld over voor (de (ee)), midden (de (eu)) en achter (de (oo)). De drie diftongen liggen los, maar dichter bij elkaar en op een meer open positie.

Diftongering is bekeken door de klinkers te meten op 25% en 75% van hun duur. De resultaten bieden een onduidelijk beeld. Verschillende overeenkomsten en verschillen tussen onze klinkers en de jaren '90-klinkers waarmee we onze klinkers vergelijken, komen boven drijven, maar geen duidelijke tendensen. Geen van de drie middenvocalen of drie diftongen onderscheidt zich systematisch van de andere. De middenvocalen diftongeren minder dan de diftongen, zoals verwacht. Op basis van mate van diftongering zijn deze twee groepen bijna absoluut te onderscheiden. Onze mannelijke en vrouwelijke sprekers vertonen een vergelijkbare mate van diftongering.

De transcripties leveren verlaagde eerste elementen op van diftongen en de metingen kunnen verduidelijken of deze verlaging sterk is of niet. De F1 van verlaagde voorkomens van de drie diftongen is op het 25%-punt gemiddeld 10 of 11 Hertz lager dan voor niet-verlaagde tokens, maar de verschillen tussen individuele voorkomens is groot. Slechts drie van de sprekers maken een significant onderscheid tussen verlaagde en niet-verlaagde voorkomens. Voor (ou) is er niet één spreker, bij wie het verschil tussen verlaagde en niet-verlaagde voorkomens significant is. Dit alles suggereert dat de verschillen tussen verlaagd en niet-verlaagd subtiel zijn, ondanks dat ze hoorbaar zijn. Vervolgens vergelijken we het eerste element van diftong (ei) van onze sprekers met dat van deze diftong in het zogenaamde Poldernederlands. Deze variëteit van het Nederlands heeft als karakteristiek kenmerk de verlaging van het eerste element van diftongen. De vergelijking met deze variëteit maakt andermaal duidelijk dat de verlaging in de spraak van onze sprekers licht is en niet in de buurt komt van progressievere realisaties.

CONCLUSIE

Het Standaardnederlands bestaat overduidelijk, zo besluit Hoofdstuk 13. De uitgebreidheid van de beschrijvingen van deze taalvariëteit door leken en experts en de overeenstemming die hierover bestaat, spreken voor zich. De uitspraak kent diversiteit maar de nadruk die in de afgelopen eeuwen is gelegd op variatie en op onduidelijkheid over wat goed of fout is, verhult dat de overeenstemming over segmentale uitspraakmerken overheerst. Het lijkt erop dat niet-segmentale uitspraakmerken meer aandacht verdienen als factor in de mate van standaard-taligheid van variëteiten.

Gezag speelt in de evaluatie van taal een rol, zo laten verschillende resultaten zien - alhoewel vaak impliciet. Dit gezag is dagelijks aanwezig in vele vormen. Variatie in de mate waarin individuen de Nederlandse standaardtaal in het dagelijks leven benaderen, kan voor een groot gedeelte verklaard worden uit de mate waarin de sociale, persoonlijke en theoretische norm samenvallen. Aan het ene eind van het spectrum is er de spreker die koste wat kost de norm wil benaderen - ongeacht met wie hij of zij spreekt en in welke situatie -, hetgeen vaak leidt tot een strikt en bewust taalgebruik waarin variatie onderdrukt wordt. Aan de andere kant is er de
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spreker die zich wel bewust is van het bestaan van de theoretische norm maar wiens sociale en professionele omgeving geen druk uitoefent deze te benaderen en die daar persoonlijk ook niet naar streeft.

De taal die beschreven is in voorliggende studie onderscheidt zich van elke andere taalvariëteit in Nederland. Zij wordt omgeven door een sfeer van neutraliteit en zelfs een zekere afstandelijkheid. Dit is de enige taalvariëteit die verworven is tot communicatiemiddel dat bewust wordt aangewend door grote groepen Nederlanders, ook door hen die haar niet als moedertaal hebben meegekregen. Bovenal wordt geen andere variëteit in Nederland zo kritisch bekeken en tegelijkertijd onvoorwaardelijk omarmd als het Standaardnederlands.
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