European context 1: immigration

- Percentages for most countries of up to around 20% of population with an immigrant background; however, much higher percentages among children in larger cities.
- Strong presence of people from Italy (earlier) and Turkey (slightly later) immigrants in most NW European countries.
- Continuous immigration, with increasingly different national and ethnic backgrounds involved.

European context 2: reactions

- Sweden: Rinkeby Swedish, urban ghetto
- Danmark: Multi-ethnolects, multiple identities
- Germany: Kanakensprache, complex ethnicity
- France: Verlan etc., opposition
- UK: ethnic local varieties, Glaswasian etc., local identities
- Netherlands: Straattaal, street, youth

‘Hans und Gretel’ in ‘Kanakisch’ or ‘Kanak Sprak’

Murat und Aische gehen durch Ø Wald, auf Ø Suche nach korrekten Feuerholz.
Aische fragt Murat: "Hast Du Ø Kettensäge, Murat?"
Murat: "Normal! Ø Hab ich in meine Tasche, oder was!?"
Auf der Suche nach Ø korrekten Baum, verirren sie sich krass in de Wald.
Murat: "Ey scheisses, oder was!? Hast du Ø konkrete Plan, wo wir sind, oder was!?"
Aische: "Ne scheisses, aber ich riesche [Ø] Dönerbude!"
Murat: "Ja faaaaat!"
Aische: "Normal, da vorn an den Eck!"

Post-immigration stress syndrome

Once upon a time ...
all children had names like Hans and Gretel ...
all verbs were inflected ...
all cases marked.
Our language was uniform and complete.
Contamination

Viele, selbst deutsche Jugendliche bedienen sich heute einer Ausdrucksform, die umgangssprachlich wohl als "Kanakisch" bezeichnet wird. Nun geht es diesen Jugendlichen anscheinend nicht darum, gewisse Modewörter in den eigenen Sprachschatz zu übernehmen, sondern sie verändern ihren gesamten Ausdruck derart, dass es sich so anhört, als wäre nicht Deutsch, sondern eher Türkisch die Muttersprache.

Dabei entstehen übrigens bereits sehr weitreichende Probleme. Manche deutsche Jugendliche sind kaum noch in der Lage, diese Ausdrucksweise, die sie sich selbst angewöhnt haben, auch nur zeitweise ganz abzulegen. Es gibt Ausbildungsbetriebe, die sich mittlerweile weigern, solche jungen Leute einzustellen.

Distinction 1: Street language and ethnolect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stability</th>
<th>Ethnolect</th>
<th>Street language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>At most semi-conscious</td>
<td>Conscious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Inherent</td>
<td>Dynamic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features</td>
<td>Phonology, syntax</td>
<td>Lexicon, pragmatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain of use</td>
<td>Intergroup, in-group</td>
<td>In-group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distinction 2: Ethnolect narrow and Ethnolect broad

Ethnolect narrow:
Variety of a dominant (often national) language spoken by a specific (non-dominant) ethnic group

Ethnolect broad:
The varieties in the repertoire of a non-dominant ethnic group used in a larger context (includes heritage language, code-mixing, etc.)

Questions

post-colonial ethnolects versus pure immigration ethnolects?
multi-ethnolects versus mono-ethnolects?
Why do ethnolects emerge at all?
What forms do they take?

Ethnolects broad: Suriname community chat site Sranan-Dutch

Code-switching and approximation to the standard

Jamal na mi boi jere. Hij komt over als een jongen die hier niet lang is.
‘Jamal is my boy you hear. He comes across as a boy that is not here very long.’

[Schwa] deletion and paratactic patterns in L2 Dutch

Welk [ø] meid van hem heeft hij een vriendin dan
‘Which girl of his he has a girlfriend then?

[er] deletion in standard Dutch utterance
als ik [ø] een scheutje essence bij deed in de rum variant
‘if I put a bit of essence in, in the rum variant’
Perspectives 1

**L1 dimension: the local variety of the original language**

Haugen ‘The Norwegian Language in America’

‘American Finnish’

Italian in Toronto

‘Turkish in Germany, the Netherlands’

Koine in the ‘Hindi diaspora’

---

Perspectives 2

**L2 dimension: approximation to input from the target**

Labov (2008: 316-7) “Sociolinguistic studies in English speech communities in North America have found extensive linguistic variation conditioned by age, gender, social class and social networks. But ethnicity – Italian, Jewish, Irish, Polish, German family background has not appeared as a major factor.”

---

Perspectives 3

**L1/L2: convergence between L1 and L2**

- **a. DaR -I - house-1**
  - in Morocco
  - in Netherlands

- **b. D-DaR dyal-I D-house PS-1**
  - in Morocco
  - in Netherlands

- **c. weld t-tažer son D-merchant**
  - in Morocco
  - in Netherlands

- **d. l-weld dyal t-tažer D-son PS D-merchant**
  - in Morocco
  - in Netherlands

Moroccan Arabic (Boumans 2004)

---

Perspectives 4

**universal principles (UP): simplification and omission of unstressed functional elements in most ethnolects narrow**

- optionality of gender and number
- Less marking of copula and tense
- Loss of determiners and definiteness
- Tendency towards canonical word order

---

Perspectives 1-4

- **L1 : elements of the original community language**
- **L1/L2 : convergence between L1 and L2**
- **-L1/-L2 : universal principles (UP) of reduction and simplification**
- **L2 : approximation to input from the target**
Determining factors

- Power relations
- Time depth
- Barriers to language learning
- Ethnicity
- Numbers of speakers
- Competing forms (local variety of L1)
- Cross-ethnic identifications

‘Créolité hierarchy’ on the L2 dimension?

- Radical creoles
- Mesolectal creoles
- Semi-creoles
- Koinés
- Ethnolects
- Vernaculars
- Standard languages

Current project

Funded by Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO), grant to Pieter Muysken
Collaboration between Meertens Institute and Centre for Language Studies, Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen
2005-2011

Research question 1

Which aspects of language use (components of the grammar) characterize the ethnolects in question as distinct varieties?

- Naturalistic sociolinguistic corpus study in the Netherlands
- Structured elicitation task

Research question 2

To what extent are ethnolects based on interference from the original language (L1) of the ethnic group in question?

Two ethnic groups (Moroccan Dutch mostly with Berber, Turkish Dutch with Turkish as L1)

Research question 3

To which extent can we reduce features of ethnolects to properties resulting from processes of L2 acquisition?

Two age groups: 12 and 20
Comparison with Dutch as an L2 literature
**Research question 4**

To what extent are ethnolects based on local non-standard varieties?

Two cities with well-described urban dialects: Amsterdam and Nijmegen

**Research question 5**

Are ethnolects specific for an individual ethnic group, or do they reflect a more global non-native identity? Do features spread across ethnolects?

Comparison two ethnic groups

Interethnic conversations

**Research question 6**

Is there any evidence of spread of ethnic varieties to peers outside of the ethnic groups involved?

Two groups of Dutch boys, [+/-] with ethnic network

**Research question 7**

To what extent can speakers of an ethnolect shift to more standard varieties and to non-ethnic non-standard varieties.

Record people in various interaction settings

T – T   T – M   M – M   T – D
T – M   D1 – D1   D2 – D2

**Overall design**

Recordings, mostly in schools, of dyadic conversations. Researcher only lightly present. Games, informal topics

Elicited repetition task

Web survey with teachers

**Speaker design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th>Moroccan</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contacts in minority ethnic groups</td>
<td>light ethnic network</td>
<td>light ethnic network</td>
<td>light ethnic network (Du1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contacts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2x3</td>
<td>2x3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age of subjects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nijmegen</td>
<td>2x3</td>
<td>2x3</td>
<td>2x3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>2x3</td>
<td>2x3</td>
<td>2x3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Typology of ethnolectal features
+ L1 properties
+ filtered out by target norms
+ reached level of consciousness
  - local
  - salient
  - visible
+ part of L2 learning

Ethnolect =/= Interlanguage
Strong rigid SVO iso. V2/Vfin effects in first generation interlanguage for many speakers, independent of L1 background

Very limited SVO effects in second generation ethnolectal speech

Morphosyntax (Arien van Wijngaarden)
Object pronouns
Subject pronouns
Grammatical gender
Deictics
[R]-omission
No [R]-split

morpho-syntax 1: object pronoun omission
Waarom doe je [me] na?
‘Why do you imitate [me]?’
Ja ik weet [het].
‘Yes, I know [it].’

morpho-syntax 2: subject pronoun omission
Hoezo, wat wat voor spelletjes moeten [we] dan?
‘How so, what kind of games must [we] (play) then?’
Oh [het] is nog net geleden joh.
‘Oh, [it] just happened, you know.’

morpho-syntax 3: grammatical gender

die meisje [st.Du. dat meisje]
‘that girl’
moie spel [st.Du. mooie spel]
‘beautiful playing’

Overuse of the non-neuter article de over het
Overuse of the generic inflected adjective rather than the non-inflected article limited to neuter indefinite contexts
**Quantitative results 1**

Almost no variation in article use in non-neuter contexts

Turkish & Moroccan background significantly more neuter > non-neuter than Dutch background

No significant locality effect

Interlocutor effect only for Moroccan background speakers

**Quantitative results 2: deictics**

Grammatical gender effect with deictics much stronger than with articles

<<overgeneralization of die>>

For all groups significant age differences

In deictic use significant interlocutor effect in Moroccan background group

**morpho-syntax 5: [R] (incl. [er])locative pronoun omission**

*Ja maar hij zegt [er] niks over.*

‘Yes but he does says nothing [there] about.’

*Hij heeft [er] negen gedaan. Ik heb er acht gedaan.*

‘He did [there] nine. I have done there eight.’

**morpho-syntax 6: [R] locative pronoun split**

* R omission
  *Ja maar hij zegt niks over.*

* Non-R
  *Ja maar zegt niks over het* (only 10 cases)

* R-non split
  *Ja maar hij zegt niks er over.*

* R-split
  *Ja maar hij zegt er niks over.*

‘Yes but he says nothing about it.’

**Quantitative results**

* D > T > M  R-realization
* D > T > M  R-split
  much stronger significance if locative and presentational R are taken out
* D > M > T  interlocutor R-split (weak)
Phonology (Linda van Meel)

Sharp and voiced /z/
realization of /r/, also in relation to preceding central vowels
word-final [t] deletion
- in final clusters (general)
- lexicalized in wat ‘what’, dot ‘that’, niet ‘not’ (Nijmegen)
palatal vs velar /y/
/sx/ for /sx/, also across word boundaries
aspiration of voiceless plosives
realization of diphongs

phonology 2: sibilants /s/ and /z/

Voice: regional and age effects

Sharpness: ethnicity * ethnicity interlocutor

Sharpness (1)

Mean sharpness of voiced /z/ by Turkish and Moroccan speakers

Sharpness (2)

Mean sharpness of voiced /z/ by (a) Turkish speakers and (b) Moroccan speakers.

Voicing

Mean voicing indexes for 12-year-olds and 20-year-olds for Amsterdam and Nijmegen

Overall results

Within ‘ethnolect narrow’ larger differences
between M and D groups than between T and
D groups
T often intermediate position
Interlocutor effects for M groups
But:
T recordings contain T/D CS, M recordings no CS
‘ethnolect broad’ for T group contains CS
Newspaper 1

Street culture undermines the school culture. Street culture leads to absenteeism, delayed language development, and aggressive behavior. Schools should ban street culture. Hence no iPod in the classroom. The problem with street language is that it brings down the language level of many children. School assignments and job application letters are full of mistakes. “Language use is truly dramatic”, says [an education researcher who has been working in the schools.]

Newspaper 2

Integrating you do with street language. “We all speak Standard Dutch. Not a new language. We just miss creativity and certain words in Dutch. We simply complete the language.” Street language shows that there has been integration already. It says that young people from different cultures learn from each other.

Regional / ethnic (with Julian Rott)

Dönerdeutsch Türkentaal
Türkendeutsch Surinaams Nederlands
Yugo-Deutsch Melaju Sini
/Jugo-Tüütsch Mokrotaal
Balkandeutsch Indisch Nederlands

Pejorative

Ghettosprache Smurfentaal
Ghettoslang
Pidgindeutsch
Kanakendeutsch
Kanakisch

Colonial

Kanakendeutsch Indisch Nederlands
Kanakisch Surinaams Nederlands
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>‘street’/ ‘urban’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiphop Slang</td>
<td>Stadtteilsprache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeugdtaal</td>
<td>Straattaal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansprache</td>
<td>Kiezdeutsch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jugendsprache</td>
<td>Bijlmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juventulekt</td>
<td>Wakaman taal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verkavelings-vlaams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cités</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immigrant</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gastarbeiterdeutsch</td>
<td>Gemischtsprechen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mischsprache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hybridolekt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Ethnolekt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broader context?</th>
<th>Bedankt!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnolects part of a more general trend towards broader range of varieties used in the public domain?</td>
<td>Čok teşekkürür</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shukran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baie dankie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vielen Dank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Merci beaucoup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hopi danki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muchas gracias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>