

Gender Variation in Dutch

Topics in Sociolinguistics

This series in sociolinguistics aiming at the publication of works which take as their unifying theme the interplay between linguistic, social and cultural factors in human communication.

Items to be published will range widely from, for example, coverage of ways of speaking among diverse groups in a large geographical area, to a detailed study of a single feature of conversational narratives in American English. Contributions will include monographs, collections of papers, and previously unpublished dissertations.

Editors:

Nessa Wolfson

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, U.S.A.

Marinel Gerritsen

Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, Amsterdam, Holland

Other books in this series

1. Nessa Wolfson: *CHP The Conversational Historical Present in American English Narrative*
2. Anne Pauwels: *Immigrant Dialects and Language Maintenance in Australia*
3. Jonathan Holmquist: *Language Loyalty and Linguistic Variation*
4. Nancy Hornberger: *Bilingual Education and Language Maintenance*
5. Roeland van Hout/Uus Knops (eds.): *Language Attitudes in the Dutch Language Area*
6. Kas Deprez (ed.): *Language and Intergroup Relations in Flanders and in the Netherlands*
7. Dennis R. Preston: *Perceptual Dialectology*

Gender Variation in Dutch

**A Sociolinguistic Study of
Amsterdam Speech**

Dédé Brouwer



1989

FORIS PUBLICATIONS

Dordrecht - Holland/Providence R.I. - U.S.A.

Published by:

Foris Publications Holland
P.O. Box 509
3300 AM Dordrecht, The Netherlands

Distributor for the U.S.A. and Canada:

Foris Publications USA, Inc.
P.O. Box 5904
Providence R.I. 02903
U.S.A.

ISBN 90 6765 440 X

© 1989 Foris Publications - Dordrecht

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission from the copyright owner.

Printed in the Netherlands by ICG Printing, Dordrecht.

To the memory of my mother and father

Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| LIST OF FIGURES | x |
| LIST OF TABLES | xi |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | xiv |
| | |
| 1 INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 Language, sex and gender | 1 |
| 1.2 Women's and men's language use | 4 |
| 1.3 Women's and men's language attitudes | 9 |
| 1.4 The present study | 11 |
| | |
| 2 THE INVESTIGATION IN AMSTERDAM | 15 |
| 2.0 Introduction | 15 |
| 2.1 Sample | 15 |
| 2.1.1 Neighbourhood | 15 |
| 2.1.2 Informants | 17 |
| 2.2 Design and procedure | 21 |
| 2.2.1 Independent variables and hypotheses | 21 |
| 2.2.2 Interview | 23 |
| 2.3 Language use component | 24 |
| 2.3.1 Phonetic-phonological variation | 24 |
| 2.3.2 Six linguistic variables | 26 |
| 2.3.3 Transcription and scoring | 31 |
| 2.3.4 Informal and formal speech | 33 |

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 2.4 | Language attitude component | 33 |
| 2.4.1 | Language variation and language evaluation | 33 |
| 2.4.2 | Four self-evaluation tests | 36 |
| 2.4.3 | Four subjective reaction tests | 39 |
| 3 | LINGUISTIC VARIATION | 43 |
| 3.0 | Introduction | 43 |
| 3.1 | Style shift and variation within styles | 44 |
| 3.1.1 | Mean scores in style shifting | 44 |
| 3.1.2 | Variation scores in style shifting | 47 |
| 3.2 | Language use by women and men | 49 |
| 3.2.1 | Gender and style | 49 |
| 3.2.2 | Two approaches to women's and men's style shifting | 53 |
| 3.3 | The standard/non-standard dimension | 56 |
| 3.3.1 | From variables to variety | 56 |
| 3.3.2 | Factor analysis of casual speech | 57 |
| 3.3.3 | A model for the linguistic variables | 59 |
| 4 | SOCIOLOGICAL FACTORS | 63 |
| 4.0 | Introduction | 63 |
| 4.1 | Language use by women and men revisited | 64 |
| 4.1.1 | Gender, children and woman's employment | 64 |
| 4.1.2 | Division of domestic tasks, social network, education and occupation | 68 |
| 4.1.3 | Analysis of covariance including education | 72 |
| 4.2 | Language use and social position: gender-related speech differences | 76 |
| 5 | LINGUISTIC ATTITUDES | 81 |
| 5.0 | Introduction | 81 |
| 5.1 | Self-evaluation of language use | 82 |
| 5.1.1 | Phonetic-phonological, morpho-syntactic and lexical tests | 82 |
| 5.1.2 | Amsterdam dialect test | 85 |
| 5.1.3 | Self-evaluations and language use | 87 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| <i>Contents</i> | ix |
| 5.2 Subjective reactions to standard and non-standard language use and to female and male speakers | 90 |
| 5.2.1 Social status | 90 |
| 5.2.2 Toughness | 93 |
| 5.2.3 Personality traits | 95 |
| 5.2.4 Femininity - masculinity | 99 |
| 5.3 Language use and social norms: gender-stereotyped attitudes | 101 |
| 6 CONCLUDING REMARKS | 103 |
| 6.1 Sociolinguistic differences between women and men | 103 |
| 6.2 Explanations and explanations | 105 |
| APPENDIX 1 Occupations of the informants | 109 |
| APPENDIX 2 Reading style text | 111 |
| APPENDIX 3 Word list | 112 |
| APPENDIX 4 Phonetic-phonological test | 113 |
| APPENDIX 5 Morpho-syntactic test | 114 |
| APPENDIX 6 Lexical test | 115 |
| APPENDIX 7 Amsterdam dialect test | 116 |
| REFERENCES | 117 |
| AUTHOR INDEX | 125 |

List of figures

| | | |
|------------|--|----|
| Figure 2.1 | Map of Amsterdam according to socio-economic status | 17 |
| Figure 2.2 | Configuration of factors underlying gender variation in language use | 22 |
| Figure 2.3 | The three components of the research and the interview structure | 23 |
| Figure 2.4 | Standard Dutch vowels | 27 |
| Figure 2.5 | Standard Dutch diphthongs | 28 |
| Figure 2.6 | Amsterdam vernacular diphthongs | 28 |
| Figure 2.7 | Amsterdam vernacular variants of (aa), (ee), (oo), (au) and (ei) | 30 |
| Figure 3.1 | The distribution of (aa), (ee), (oo), (au), (ei-height), (ei-monophthongization) and (z) by style | 46 |
| Figure 3.2 | Mean variance of (au) and (z) in three styles | 48 |
| Figure 3.3 | The distribution of (aa) by gender and style | 50 |
| Figure 3.4 | The distribution of (ee) by gender and style | 50 |
| Figure 3.5 | The distribution of (oo) by gender and style | 50 |
| Figure 3.6 | The distribution of (au) by gender and style | 50 |
| Figure 3.7 | The distribution of (ei-height) by gender and style | 51 |
| Figure 3.8 | The distribution of (ei-monophthongization) by gender and style | 51 |
| Figure 3.9 | The distribution of (z) by gender and style | 51 |
| Figure 4.1 | Mean cell scores for the standard/non-standard language use factor | 67 |
| Figure 4.2 | Mean cell scores for the standard/non-standard language use factor with education as covariate | 75 |
| Figure 4.3 | A model for the sociological variables and language use | 79 |
| Figure 5.1 | Social status scores for standard Dutch and Amsterdam dialect guises of two female and two male stimuli | 91 |
| Figure 5.2 | Toughness scores for standard Dutch and Amsterdam dialect guises of two female and two male stimuli | 93 |
| Figure 5.3 | Personality traits scores for standard Dutch and Amsterdam dialect guises of two female and two male stimuli | 97 |

List of tables

| | | |
|------------|---|----|
| Table 2.1 | Numbers of inhabitants and percentages of locally born, 25-35 years old, married couples and married female and male heads of the family in Amsterdam and New West (1979) | 19 |
| Table 2.2 | Distribution of the 222 couples conforming to the criteria | 20 |
| Table 2.3 | Distribution of the 48 selected couples | 20 |
| Table 2.4 | Overview of phonetic-phonological and social variables from three sociolinguistic studies on Amsterdam dialect | 26 |
| Table 2.5 | Phonetic-phonological variables and rating scales | 32 |
| Table 3.1 | Absolute frequencies and percentages of (aa)-variants in three styles | 45 |
| Table 3.2 | Mean scores for the seven linguistic variables in three styles and the F ratios of the differences between the three styles | 46 |
| Table 3.3 | Mean variation scores for the seven linguistic variables in three styles and the F ratios of the differences between the three styles | 48 |
| Table 3.4 | F ratios of the differences in mean scores between women and men for the seven linguistic variables in three styles | 52 |
| Table 3.5 | Mean scores of women for the seven linguistic variables in three styles and the F ratios of the differences between the three styles | 53 |
| Table 3.6 | Mean scores of men for the seven linguistic variables in three styles and the F ratios of the differences between the three styles | 53 |
| Table 3.7 | Absolute scores for style shift of women and men and the F ratios of the style shift differences between women and men | 54 |
| Table 3.8 | Correlations between absolute style shift and mean scores in casual speech | 55 |
| Table 3.9 | Relative scores for style shift of women and men and the F ratios of the style shift differences between women and men | 55 |
| Table 3.10 | Correlation coefficients of the linguistic variables in casual speech | 57 |

| | | |
|------------|--|----|
| Table 3.11 | Factor loadings of the linguistic variables for a unifactorial solution | 58 |
| Table 3.12 | Initial statistics on the first six factors regarding the seven linguistic variables in three styles | 59 |
| Table 3.13 | Factor matrix of the linguistic variables, varimax rotation | 60 |
| Table 3.14 | Factor matrix of the linguistic variables, quartimax rotation | 61 |
| Table 4.1 | Correlation between the language use of partners | 65 |
| Table 4.2 | Analysis of variance of the standard/non-standard language use factor: gender, children and woman's employment | 66 |
| Table 4.3 | Frequency distribution of division of domestic tasks, social contacts, educational level, occupational level and occupational type | 69 |
| Table 4.4 | Mean scores of division of domestic tasks, social contacts, educational level, occupational level and occupational type | 70 |
| Table 4.5 | Correlations between educational level, occupational level and occupational type | 71 |
| Table 4.6 | Correlations between educational level, occupational level, occupational type and the standard/non-standard language use factor | 71 |
| Table 4.7 | Educational level within the different subgroups | 73 |
| Table 4.8 | Analysis of variance of the standard/non-standard language use factor: gender, children, woman's employment with educational level as covariate | 74 |
| Table 4.9 | Percentages of employed women up to 35 years old by education and children up to 6 years old in the Netherlands (1979) | 77 |
| Table 5.1 | Percentages non-standard and coarse language in phonetic-phonological, morpho-syntactic and lexical self-evaluation tests and the F ratios of the differences in the test scores between women and men | 83 |
| Table 5.2 | Lexical test: frequency distribution of ten expletives in five situations | 84 |
| Table 5.3 | Correlations between the phonetic-phonological, morpho-syntactic and lexical test scores | 85 |
| Table 5.4 | Mean scores for Amsterdam dialect test and the F ratios of the differences in the mean scores between women and men | 86 |
| Table 5.5 | Correlations between self-evaluation scores and language use scores | 88 |

| | | |
|------------|---|-----|
| Table 5.6 | Correlations between self-evaluation scores for the phonetic-phonological test and language use scores for the seven linguistic variables in three styles | 90 |
| Table 5.7 | Mean subjective reaction scores for social status | 91 |
| Table 5.8 | Social status: effects of standard Dutch and Amsterdam dialect guises and of two female and two male stimuli | 92 |
| Table 5.9 | Mean subjective reaction scores for toughness | 93 |
| Table 5.10 | Toughness: effects of standard Dutch and Amsterdam dialect guises and of two female and two male stimuli | 94 |
| Table 5.11 | Mean subjective reaction scores for personality traits | 96 |
| Table 5.12 | Personality traits: effects of standard Dutch and Amsterdam dialect guises and of two female and two male stimuli | 98 |
| Table 5.13 | Judgements by 96 informants of standard Dutch and Amsterdam dialect guises of female and male stimuli with real and phonetically manipulated voices and of female stimulus with androgynous voice | 100 |
| Table 5.14 | Fourfold table of changes in the female and male assignments to standard and dialect guises of female stimulus with androgynous voice and female stimulus with phonetically manipulated voice | 101 |

Acknowledgements

This study is the final outcome of a sociolinguistic project entitled 'Sex differences in language use and language attitude', supported by the Foundation for Linguistic Research, which is funded by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO), from August 1980 to August 1983 ('Sekseverschillen in taalgebruik en taalattitude', grant number 17-25-04).

The project was carried out at the Institute for General Linguistics of the University of Amsterdam, under the stimulating direction of Pieter Muysken. The co-researcher in the project, Rosalien Schenk-van Witsen, is the first whom I hereby thank for her contribution. In addition, I would like to thank the members of the supervising committee of the project, Renate Bartsch, Jo Daan, Arjen Florijn, Marinel Gerritsen, Henk Heikens and Roeland van Hout, for their significant contributions, and the staff of the Institute for General Linguistics, particularly René Appel, Gerard Hubers, Margreet van Ierland and Kwee Tjoe-Liong for their support.

A grant from the Research Support Project of the Ministry of Education and Sciences through the P.J. Meertens Institute of the Royal Dutch Academy of Sciences made it possible to publish this book in its present form. Apart from the financial support, I would like to thank the staff of the P.J. Meertens Institute for their hospitality; the expertise and help of Huib Hogerheijde in particular in converting the text for a laser printer facilitated my work.

I would further like to thank the following persons and institutions for their help.

- First of all, the Amsterdam women and men who were willing to participate in the investigation and thus made this study possible.
- The City Housing Authority of Amsterdam provided a list of names and addresses of couples living in New West.
- The Computer Department of the Faculty of Arts, especially Tine van Nierop-Muller, Joos Skolnik and Gert van der Steen, gave assistance in the computer processing of the data.
- Jadranka Gvozdanović, Frank Jansen, Norval Smith and Mieke Trommelen participated in the analysis with regard to the reliability of the scoring of the

linguistic variables in order to determine the rating scales to be used.

- Viola ten Have, Huib Hogerheijde, Miep Lukman, Marja Meeder and Ron Prins agreed to have their voices tape-recorded in standard and non-standard guises as stimulus material.

- Lou Boves and Emiel Kappner carried out phonetic manipulations of some stimulus tape-recordings.

- Alcedo Coenen and Louis Saalmink transcribed the recorded conversations conscientiously and put them on disk with unfailing humour, despite the laborious and sometimes monotonous nature of the task.

I am grateful to Dorian de Haan and Marinel Gerritsen for their careful reading of the text and their useful suggestions. Furthermore, without mentioning everyone by name, I have gained much from the support and comments of colleagues from here and abroad, especially at conferences in Lund, Mexico City, Bristol and Tromsø and during a working visit to Philadelphia.

I am indebted to Murray Pearson and particularly John Rudge for polishing my English. Finally, I would like to express my special gratitude to Roeland van Hout for his methodological advice and enjoyable cooperation, and his generously given support. Above all, I would like to thank my friends for their tolerance of my preoccupation while writing this book and for their kind help and understanding.