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1. INTRODUCTION

Moroccans living in The Netherlands as foreign workers ("Gastarbeiter") tend to learn some Netherlandic during the first year or year and a half that they work in The Netherlands (1). Frequently their acquisition of Netherlandic comes to a halt after this time, however, at a level which is often far below that of adequate proficiency (2). Why do Moroccans only learn a bare minimum of Netherlandic? The research reported on here is directed to this question. We will focus on motivational and attitudinal factors here, rather than on social, situational, and interactional ones, although it will become clear that the distinction is an artificial and potentially dangerous one.

Specifically, the following questions will be asked:
(a) How is the Netherlandic linguistic competence of the Moroccan foreign workers best characterized?
(b) How can we study the attitudes of Moroccans towards The Netherlands, towards Dutch people, and towards the Netherlandic language?
(c) Is there a relationship between the Netherlandic linguistic competence of the Moroccans and their attitudes towards The Netherlands? If so, what is the nature of that relationship?

To answer these questions we carried out extensive interviews with 20 Moroccans living in Amsterdam. We will give a general overview of this research in section 2. In section 3 the Netherlandic linguistic competence of the Moroccans will be discussed, in section 4 the different motivational and attitudinal factors involved, and in 5 we will focus on the relationship between attitudes and proficiency in Netherlandic. We will approach
this relationship by looking in detail at narratives produced by the Moroccans in the interviews dealing with their experiences of discrimination by Dutch people.

2. THE RESEARCH PROJECT

The research was carried out in the autumn of 1978 in a seminar on foreign workers' language. 20 adult male Moroccans were interviewed for a period of 30 to 50 minutes. The interviews contained, besides unstructured conversation, three types of questions: general information questions, open-ended attitudinal questions, and questions about voices on a tape. We will first describe the interview situation and the subjects interviewed, before returning to a specific description of the content of the interviews and the processing of the transcriptions.

A total of 35 people were approached, of whom 21 were willing to be interviewed and showed up at the appointed time and place. The interviews were held (a) in subjects' homes; (b) in the house of one of the participants in the research project who lived in the same neighbourhood as many of the Moroccans; (c) in a neighbourhood centre. All four interviewers, who worked in teams of two, were female. It should be mentioned that the interviewers did not know Moroccan Arabic, which limited the language of conversation to Netherlandic, with occasional French words and expressions.

Before the interview started the purpose of the research and the structure of the questionnaire was explained. All questions in the structured part were first asked in their canonical form, and only then, if not understood, paraphrased and simplified.

Due to practical limitations we only interviewed men. It is very difficult to reach Moroccan women as they hardly leave their houses and remain isolated from Dutch society. The vast majority of them, in any case, would have known too little Netherlandic to understand the questions in the interview and to respond to them. We should mention that this same limitation holds for the fairly large group of Moroccan workers who are in The Netherlands illegally, have little contact with Dutch people, change jobs frequently, etc.

The subjects in this project were selected on the basis of their age and the length of their stay in The Netherlands (3). They were all between 17 and 30 years old, with an average of 23, and had been living in the capital, Amsterdam, for longer than two years. One had been in The Netherlands for as long as 11 years. Of the 20 Moroc-
cans, 17 had followed Netherlandic courses for some time, however briefly, and eight of them regularly. Six Moroccans were married, all these to Moroccan women, but only four of the women were living in Amsterdam along with their husbands. One of the foreign workers was living with a Dutch woman, and three had a girlfriend or fiancée in Morocco.

By far the majority of the subjects are engaged in unskilled labour. Four have followed or are following some kind of vocational training in The Netherlands. Ten had vocational training in Morocco. The others had only followed primary education. For 16 out of 20 Moroccans, the type of job they have here in The Netherlands is unrelated and inferior to the training and job they had in Morocco. The same holds for their home circumstances. Most of the subjects share an apartment, generally in a run-down 19th century neighbourhood, with relatives. Few live by themselves, renting a room from a Dutch family. None of the people in our sample live in a pension, a common but degrading living situation where the foreign worker only has a bed to himself in crowded quarters.

Generally speaking, the sample of the people interviewed is not so much representative of the whole group of Moroccan foreign workers living in the Netherlands, but rather of that portion of them who have been here for a while, have a fairly stable job, and have established some contacts, outside work, with Dutch people.

We will now turn to the interviews themselves, briefly described before. The sketch just given of the subjects as a group is based on the general information questions with which the formal part of the interview was started. On the basis of answers to these general questions, which could often be confirmed because of personal acquaintance with the subjects, we established a type of social index, following the same procedure as was used in the Heidelberg project (1978). Each person interviewed received an index-rating reflecting type of job held, accommodation, types of contacts with Dutch people, etc. A high rating indicates a decent job, much contact, etc.

The second set of questions dealt with attitudes towards The Netherlands, Dutch people, and the Netherlandic language. It included questions about whether the Moroccans considered they had a lot of Dutch friends, whether they thought that their children should learn the Arabic of the Koran, which differs considerably from the Moroccan vernacular Arabic dialect, what they thought about
Moroccan men marrying Dutch women, whether they had any plans to stay in The Netherlands or whether they were going to go back to Morocco. This last question is important because the idea that they will go back is prevalent among migrant workers and may be crucial to their ways of dealing with Dutch society, determining whether they will try to assimilate as much as possible or maintain a strong separate identity. Then there were other questions about preferences for Western- or Arabic-style music, what they would think of their daughter marrying a Dutchman, what reasons they had for learning or not learning Netherlandic and whether they considered it important to know Netherlandic well. There were questions about their children, whether they would mind if their children did not want to go back to Morocco, whether they thought that their children spoke their parents' language worse because of knowing Netherlandic well, and whether they thought that it was important for their children to know Netherlandic well. Two final questions concerned preferences for Dutch or Arabic food, and whether the Moroccan foreign workers thought they were treated badly because they came from Morocco. This final question resulted in a number of narratives of discrimination, to which we will return in detail in the final section of this paper.

The third component of the interview, time-wise somewhere halfway in the conversation, consisted of specific reactions by the subject to a tape of stimulus voices. There were eight voices and one preparatory one. The eight voices included two Dutch speakers, one of standard Netherlandic and one of non-standard Amsterdam dialect, three Moroccans speaking Netherlandic, rated by Dutch students as having a low, medium, and high level of proficiency in Netherlandic, and three Turkish foreign worker voices speaking Netherlandic, also rated as having a low, medium, and high level of proficiency in the Netherlandic language. These eight voices appeared in an arbitrary order on the stimulus tape. After each voice, the tape was halted, and a number of questions were asked about it. 'Where do you think the speaker is from?' 'Would you have respect for the speaker?' The notion 'respect' has been reported in the anthropological literature to be an important one in Mediterranean culture, but most of our subjects could not understand the question nor any of its paraphrases, and the answers were almost random, if any were given.
Other questions: 'How do you rate the Netherlandic of this speaker? (on a five-point scale)' 'Could this speaker be a friend of yours?' 'Do you think this speaker is rich?' 'Would you like to work together with this speaker?' 'Do you think your Netherlandic is worse/better than the speaker's? (on a five-point scale)' 'Would you like to have this speaker as a boss?' 'Does this speaker adhere to the rules of Ramadan when he is in The Netherlands? (i.e. is he a strict Muslim?)'

Then there was a question asking to guess the education of the speaker, offering five choices, and the final questions were whether the Moroccan subjects would have liked to have the speaker on the tape as his neighbour and whether they would start a conversation with him in the factory cafetaria.

Compounding these results, both from the open attitude questions and from the reactions to the stimulus tape, gave us two separate indices, the attitude index and the stimulans index. Both rate the subjects on a scale running from very positive towards Dutch culture, Dutch people, and the Netherlandic language, to tending towards strongly preserving Moroccan culture and having little interest in the Netherlandic language. In section 4 we will look at these two indices in more detail, trying to establish whether they really represent two different things.

On the basis of stretches of narrative taken from the last part of each interview, we established a composite syntactic index for each informant. It was based upon measures for the mean number of words per utterance, subject-verb agreement, subject pronoun deletion and determiner deletion. An average measure for these four was calculated and this resulted in a syntactic index. In addition, we found a rating index, which consisted of the ratings that 44 students, who did not participate in the research project, gave to taped fragments of the voices of the Moroccan foreign workers, on a 10-point scale. Finally, we established a self-rating-index on the basis of the subjects' evaluations of their own speech in comparison with the stimulus voices. In the next section we will return to the linguistic proficiency in Netherlandic of the Moroccans with more detail.

Thus the first result of our research was a set of indices of the Moroccan foreign workers on several dimensions. Before going on to report on the relation between them, they are briefly summarized below:
The different indices

social index  - based on age, education, civil status, contacts, occupation, accommodation, situation, etc.
attitude index - based on answers to general questions on the feelings about the Netherlands, Dutch people and the Netherlandic language.
stimulus index - based on reactions to taped stimulus voices of speakers of different levels of proficiency and different nationalities.
syntactic index  - based on MLU, subject-verb agreement, subject-pronoun deletion and determiner deletion.
self-rating index - based on the informants' rating of their own linguistic level in comparison with the stimulus voices;
rating index - based on ratings by 44 students of the Moroccans' levels of proficiency as they appeared on tapes.

We found the following correlations (r) between these indices:

TABLE I: Correlation matrix of the different indexes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rating</th>
<th>stimulus</th>
<th>attitude</th>
<th>social</th>
<th>self-rating</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>syntactic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>stimulus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>social</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We will briefly summarize some of the results. The rating index correlated $r = .082$ with the syntactic index. This made us confident that the syntactic index that we have been using gives a fair representation of proficiency in the interviews of our subjects. On the other hand, the self-rating index did not correlate at all ($r = .08$) with the syntactic index and only slightly ($r = .036$) with the rating index. Whether these last results are due to the inadequacy of the interview procedure or to the difficulty the Moroccans had in judging their own proficiency, is unclear. We will return to this later.
A second set of results show a relation between social factors and proficiency in Netherlandic of the Moroccans \( r = .74 \). This result is similar to the one obtained in the Heidelberg project (1978). The result that attitudinal factors can also be related to the linguistic proficiency of foreign workers is new; we find reasonable correlations between the syntactic index and the attitude and stimulus indices \( r = .64 \) and \( r = .63 \), respectively. Other results include the correlation between the social and the attitude index \( r = .59 \).

So far we have avoided the term 'factor' or 'cause', in discussing these relations. The Heidelberg project assumes that linguistic proficiency is determined or considerably influenced by the social conditions in which the second language learner, here the foreign worker, finds himself. This assumption is borne out by the correlational data. Similarly, primarily Canadian research, to which we will return in section 4, has taken attitude to be an independent variable, influencing success in second language learning. In this article, we would like to take a more balanced position, wondering whether linguistic proficiency can also influence the living conditions and views of a foreign worker in industrial Western Europe.

3. THE NETHERLANDIC OF FOREIGN WORKERS

Some foreign workers in The Netherlands have a fluent command of Netherlandic while others can hardly utter a few words in a simple market situation. Thus we cannot generalize at all about the second language proficiency of this group (4). Here I will focus on the speech of one fluent speaker, who still produces many utterances which differ considerably from native Netherlandic, as an illustration of some of the more general features of foreign workers' Netherlandic. I will begin by presenting a glossed sample of narrative, and then I will describe some of the features of his Netherlandic referring back to the sample:

- **a. nou een keer hé**
  - now one time eh

- **b. ik was op Oosterpark hé en**
  - I was on East park eh and
c. en daar was een kennis van mij
   and there was an acquaintance of mine

d. een Nederlands meisje hé
   a Dutch girl eh

e. op die eh
   on that uh

f. zestien jaar, zeventien em, eh Balistraat hé
   sixteen year seventeen em uh Balistreet eh

g. en was zij een beetje gedronken hé
   and was she a bit drunk eh

h. en stond-ie zij te huilen daar op gras
   and stood-he she to cry there on grass:

i. en ben ik naar haar toe gegaan
   and have I to her to gone

j. was ook eh twee eh tweede politie daarbij
   was also uh two uh second police there too

k. nou en heb ik tegen haar gezegd
   now and have I to her said

l. "wat heb je in handen in XXXX?"
   what have you in hands in

m. en heb ze en de politieagent tegen mij gezegd
   and have she and the policeman to me said

n. "ga je weg of niet, eh, vieze Turk?"
   go you away or not uh dirty Turk

o. en ik heb tegen hem gezegd
   and I have to him said

p. "nou, wij zelfden, Turk of Nederlands"
   now, we same Turk or Dutch

   JA

q. zegt die andere
   says that other
"ja, geef je nog eh steeds een grote smoel voor me? yes give you uh still a big mouth for me

kom even hier, benne sodemieter" come just here are you crazy

en heb ze gelijk meeneem ow..wagen ge.. and have they right take with car ..en

OH, JA?

ja, en ze hebben mij gebracht naar de Ijtunnel yes and they have me brought to the Ijtunnel

naar, hoe heten die nou, Waterlooplein hé to how be called those now Waterlooplein eh

JA

hij, zegt-ie, naar tegen die, eh, hem baas he says-he to to that uh him boss

"ik heb een illegaal meegenomen I have an illegal taken with

nou en ik was helemaal geen illegaal now and I was not at all an illegal

en heb ik een klap voor mij smoel ge.. gekrijgen and have I a smack on my face received van hem op eh.. from him on uh

OP HET BURO OOK NOG EEN KEER? IN THE STATION ONCE MORE?

nee, op 't binnen van de auto no on the inside of the car

ja, was hij ook, eh, nog steeds, eh, kwaad op mij, yes was he also uh still uh angry with me op de buro ook at the station also

maar ik vind eigenlijk niet erg hé but I find really not bad eh
dd. of maat ik heb mijn eigen papieren
because I have my own papers

JA

ee. en ik stond te lachen binnen van die wagen
and I stood laughing inside that car

ff. en heb ze tegen mij gezegd
and have she to me said

gg. "zit je nog steeds te lachen, sodemieter?"
sit you still laughing damm it

hh. en ik was gelijk een klap voor mij harses gegeven
and I was right a smack for my brains given

JEZUS

ii. nou, en ik was kwaad op hem
now and I was angry with him

jj. ik, ik heb tegen hem gezegd
I I have to him said

kk. "jij bent eigenlijk geen echte Nederlander"
you are really not a real Dutchman

ll. heb ze tegen mij gezegd
have they to me said

mm. "waarom ben ik helemaal geen echte Nederlands?"
why am I at all not a real Dutch

nn. ben jij dan echt Nederlanders?"
are you then real Dutchman

oo. nou, ik heb tegen hem gezegd
now I have to him said

pp. "ik ben helemaal geen echte Nederlands, maar ik ben mensen"
I am at all not a real Dutchman but I am people

MAAR IK?
BUT I
"ik ben mensen"
I am people

"Nederlands of ik, zijn zelfde"
Dutch or I are same

en dan hebben ze tegen mij gezegd
and then have they to me said

"hou je smoel, sodemieter op, of ik ga jou breken"
keep your trap piss off or I go you break

ik heb tegen hem gezegd
I have to him said

"breek efe mij"
break just me

now and then have I two hours in uh on prison
sat in Ijtunnel

We have reproduced the narrative in full here because of its intrinsic interest and because we will refer back to it frequently in the sections that follow.

The narrator is 21 years old, has been here for three years, and works as a driver of a small lorry. Of our 20 subjects, he ranked eighth on the syntactic index. Given the whole population of Moroccans in the Netherlands, the narrator's proficiency is above average. Still, his speech shows a number of features characteristic of the whole group. Consider the following features:

(a) Articles and other determiners are often lacking:
   b. ik was op ____ (het) Oosterpark (5)
   or wrongly used:
   bb. op de (het) buro

(b) Sometimes subject and verb do not agree in person and number
   t. en heb (hebben) ze gelijk meeneem
Note however, that the majority of the verbs in the text are correctly inflected.
Sometimes nouns and adjectives do not receive the proper endings:

pp. ik ben helemaal geen echte Nederlands (Nederlander)

In a few cases the copula is lacking:

p. wij (zijn) zelfden, Turk of Nederlands

Often, the wrong preposition is used:

aa. op 't binnen van (in) de auto
ww. op (in) gevangenis gezeten in Ijtunnel

The third person enclitic pronoun _ie_ is reinterpreted as a third person verbal marker:

h. en stond- _ie_ (Ø) zij daar te huilen

The passive is overgeneralized to indirect objects:

hh. en _ik_ was gelijk een klap voor mij harses _gegeven_
(ik kreeg...)

Verb fronting appears to be used to create emphasis more than is customary in Netherlandic:

j. was ook eh twee eh tweede politie daarbij

The syntactic index in our research was based on four measures for each subject, as was said before: mean number of words per utterance, subject deletion (which does not occur in the narrative presented), subject-verb agreement (here (b)), and determiner deletion (part of (a) here). The high correlation with the rating index, which is based on a general impression of the speech of each subject, indicates that these measures adequately reflect the proficiency of the Moroccans.

Nevertheless, the use of syntactic measures leaves one vaguely uneasy. Surely the narrative presented is different from native Dutch narratives in more ways than the ones listed above. I will try to consider three other ways of analyzing the narrative, in addition to just the syntactic analysis: (a) the use of idiomatic expressions; (b) the amount of stylistic variation; (c) the structuring of the narrative. Perhaps these types of analysis bring us closer to a complete image of the narrator's linguistic proficiency, which will allow us to study the relation between linguistic proficiency and attitudinal and motivational factors in more detail.

The use of idiomatic expressions provides crucial evidence for "native-like" linguistic proficiency and makes the story much more expressive. We will return to this latter point in section (5). Moroccans try to introduce idiomatic expressions into their speech because they realize their value in establishing relations with Dutch people. In the narrative presented we find the following types of idioms:
(a) **sodemieter** (derived from 'sodomite')

s. benne sodemieter (ben je besodemieterd) 'are you out of your mind'
gg. zit je nog steeds te lachen sodemieter 'are you still laughing, damn it'
tt. sodemieter op 'piss off'

The use of **sodemieter** in clause gg. is rather unusual. In native Netherlandic the exclamation **sodemieter** expresses surprise rather than 'damn it'.

(b) **smoel** 'trap'

r. geef je nog eh steeds een grote smoel voor me
   (heb je nog steeds een grote bek tegen me)
   'are you still opening your big trap against me'
z. en heb ik een klap voor mij smoel ge.. gekrijgen
   (ik kreeg een klap voor m'n smoel)
   'and I got smacked against my face'
tt. hou je smoel 'keep your mouth shut'

Again, the use of **smoel** sounds fine in clause z. and tt., but awkward in r..

(c) **breken** 'break'

tt. of ik ga jou breken (of ik zal je in tweeën breken)
   'or I'll break you'
vv. breek effe mij (breek me maar) 'just break me then'

This use of **breken** by itself is awkward.

On the whole we find in the narrative the frequent use of a reduced number of idiomatic expressions, sometimes correct and sometimes awkward. The same general phenomenon occurs when we look at the range of stylistic devices in the text. Here we will look at a range of different phenomena:

(a) **connective devices**

(1) **en** 'and' (17 times)
   g. en was zij een beetje gedronken hé
   o. en ik heb tegen hem gezegd
(2) **nou** 'now' (7 times)
   oo. nou, ik heb tegen hem gezegd
(3) **ja** 'yes' (2 times)
   r. ja geef je nog eh steeds een grote smoel voor me
(4) **toen** 'then' (once)

Notice that, again, there is no lack of connective devices, but a certain monotony in the devices used. For this analysis to be really meaningful, of course, it would be necessary to compare the narrative with similar Netherlandic texts.
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(b) **appellative devices**

hé 'eh', 'isn't it?' (7 times)
f. zestien jaar, zeventien em, eh Balistraat hé?

(c) **quotative devices**

heb... gezegd : 'have said...:' (9 times)
ff.en heb ze tegen mij gezegd
zegt 'says' (2 times)
q. zegt die andere

We do not find any direct quotes without an explicit introduction, and most of the times the cumbersome heb... gezegd construction. Never a direct past tense.

(d) **emphatic pronouns**

In Netherlandic we find a contrast in emphasis between stressed and unstressed pronouns : zij vs. ze 'she', jou vs. je 'you' (non-nominative), mij vs. me 'me', haar vs. d'r 'her'. In the narrative we find only stressed pronouns, where in native Netherlandic we would have expected unstressed ones :

i. en ben ik naar haar (d'r) toegegaan
bb.ja, was hij ook, eh, nog steeds eh, kwaad op mij (me)

(e) **word order**

Native Netherlandic declaratives have SVO order, and emphatic exclamatives sometimes VSO order.

The narrator uses VSO order (which incidentally is also frequent in Moroccan Arabic), particularly with third person subjects, apparently as a sort of connective device. In the whole text, we find the following pattern of SVO-VSO alternation (clauses in parentheses are remarks outside of the narrative) :

SVO b o w(y) (cc) (dd) ee hh ii jj kk oo
VSO cghijkm qtu z bb ff ll

SVO pp pp qq uu ww
VSO ss

Note that in long stretches of text the SVO or VSO pattern is maintained. The contrastive value is therefore somewhat diminished.

If we look at the overall stylistic capabilities of the narrator, we see that some devices are felicitous, but that their frequency in the text takes away some of their effect. It almost seems that the narrator is insecure of his proficiency and therefore sticks to a few devices. Alternatively, it may be that he really does not
know the alternatives. The latter may be the case for the
unstressed pronouns and for the direct past of the quota-
tive, zei 'said'.

For the structural analysis of the narrative we have
made use of the wellknown article in Labov (1972), where
the following components are distinguished in a success-
ful narrative:

abstract - initial summary of the narrative
orientation - description of the setting
complicating action - the description of the events
proper
evaluation - reason for telling the story
coda - way of ending the narrative
result or resolution - conclusion of the events nar-
rated

Labov abstracts away here from specifics of individual
stories and from the interaction during the narration.
We can see that his model fits the narrative presented
above rather well. In terms of the clauses, it can be
analyzed as having the following parts:

abstract - absent, since the narrative follows as the
response to a question
orientation - a b
complicating action - c till vv
result and coda - ww
evaluation - cc, ee, ii, kk, pp, rr

We find a remarkably complete narrative, with a rich eva-
luative component interspersed through it.

This concludes my description of the Netherlandic pro-
ficiency of one foreign worker in The Netherlands. In the
final section of this article we will return again to the
discrimination narrative presented.

4. ATTITUDES

When we are talking about attitudinal factors being
related to the second language learning process, we ge-
nerally mean the attitude of second language learners
towards the linguistic community of the target language
speakers. In Canadian research (e.g. Gardner & Lambert,
1972), the principal distinction made is between instru-
mental motivation and integrative motivation. The first
derives from the need to learn a second language as an
instrument, for practical purposes such as jobs, training,
etc., and the second from the wish to learn a second lan-
guage because the learner has a positive attitude towards
the speakers of the second language. It was found that for
the subjects studied it was particularly a high integra­
tive motivation which could be related to success in se­
cond language learning. A high instrumental motivation
was less important by itself.

Here, we will take the conceptual framework of the
Canadian research cited as a basis, but will try to make
a few more distinctions. Clearly, there are a number of
different, although not wholly independent, components: 
ethnicity, attitude towards using the Netherlandic lan­
guage, attitudes towards Dutch society, norms for second
language proficiency, feelings of security and autonomy
within Dutch society. We will discuss these in turn.

First of all, ethnicity. There was a rather strong
relationship between the answers to the questions about
Moroccan ethnic identity and linguistic proficiency.
The stronger the Moroccans said they identified with Mo­
roccan and Islamic culture, the less their knowledge of
Netherlandic. This holds for the questions about music
and food, their children learning the Arabic of the Koran,
their intentions to go back to Morocco, mixed marriages.
Our findings confirm the results reported in Taylor et al.
(1977), where the link is made between a threatened ethnic
identity of a minority group, and its lack of success in
learning the language of the dominant majority.

A second component that we have to consider is attitu­
des towards speaking Netherlandic. There was a clear re­
relationship in our findings between 'integrative motiva­
tion' for learning Netherlandic and proficiency in that
language. There is more to this, however. How comfort­
able do the Moroccans feel speaking Netherlandic? How of­
ten do they feel frustrated by it? What do they feel they
have gained? There is often a big gap between a foreign
worker's factual knowledge of Netherlandic and his use
of it when speaking with Dutch people, because he is
afraid of being ridiculed. An example was given to me
by a Moroccan cleaner of the office building where we
are writing this. He told us he did not dare ask a Dutch
woman whether she understood him, with jij horen?
'you hear?', for fear of being understood as jij hoeren?
'you a whore?'. This fear derives from a very general
feeling of fear, to which we will return.

The third component is the foreign workers' attitu­
des towards Dutch society and culture. Do they apprecia­
te it? The question about Dutch friends was answered in
a very confused manner, because different subjects gave
different definitions of friendship.
For the rest, the questions in the attitude and stimulus tape sections of the interview produced results showing a relation between a positive attitude towards The Netherlands and a high level of proficiency ($r = .64$).

The fourth component has to do with linguistic norms. Do the Moroccans feel that there are norms for their own level of proficiency in Netherlandic? Some interesting evidence regarding this came out of the reactions to the stimulus tape. As was said before, there were eight voices on the tape, two Dutch voices, one standard and one non-standard, two voices of one Turk and one Moroccan speaking Netherlandic reasonably well, two voices of a Turk and a Moroccan speaking Netherlandic moderately well, and two non-fluent speakers. Consider Table II.

**TABLE II : Voices on the stimulus tape**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dutch standard</th>
<th>Dutch non-standard</th>
<th>Turk</th>
<th>Moroccan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 native</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 fluent</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 moderate</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 non-fluent</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We asked the 20 Moroccan subjects when we played the tape where they thought the speakers of the eight voice fragments came from. The results were of course based on a number of guesses about different nationalities. From these guesses we could reconstruct some idea of the images the Moroccans had about the linguistic capacities of different foreign groups in The Netherlands. This reconstruction is presented in Table III, which was calculated by rating the voices 1 to 4, as in Table II.

**TABLE III : Rating of the different nationalities based on the estimated provenance of the stimulus voices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam local</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutchman</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern part of Holland</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port./Span./Fr./Ital.</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yougoslav</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptian/Gypsy</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Englishman/German</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indon./Surinam/Asian/Pakist./Hindust.</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turk</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fact that Amsterdam locals get a 4 in Table III means that only Dutch voices (4 in Table II) were ever guessed to be Amsterdam locals. That the Dutch people as a whole get 3.75 means that sometimes, though rarely, a Turkish or a Moroccan speaker was guessed to be Dutch, etc., bringing down the average. High up we find the Dutch, then we find people from the Romance Mediterranean area, then a varied number of intermediary groups, then a category for Moroccan, and finally we find a Turkish category. We see that the Moroccan informants thought that the Turks speak Netherlandic worst of all.

These guesses or estimations were not necessarily in correspondence with the actual tape: the good Turkish speaker was often assumed to be a Moroccan, the bad Moroccan speaker, a Turk. They rather reflect some kind of norm for level of proficiency in Netherlandic. Table III shows that the Moroccans rate themselves quite low on the Netherlandic fluency scale. This low rating may be a barrier to their progress in the acquisition of Netherlandic as a second language. It would be interesting to investigate this type of scale further: in what sense do the limited expectations of Turkish and Moroccan speakers of their own fluency effectively limit them?

A final component of attitudes has to do with the Moroccans' feelings of security and autonomy. How independent do they feel? Do they feel they are being treated justly here? To these attitudes was directed the question about experiences of discrimination. We will examine the results in detail in the final section of this article.

5. EXPERIENCES OF DISCRIMINATION

In this final section of the article we will try to bring together the various lines of thinking presented so far. Before directly discussing the central question of how precisely attitudes and linguistic proficiency are related, we will discuss the discrimination experiences narrated in the interviews in some detail.

What did the 20 Moroccans answer to the question: "Have you been treated badly in The Netherlands because you are a Moroccan?"? First of all, twelve answered yes, eight answered no. The people saying they had experienced discrimination generally had a lower command of Netherlandic than the people who said they had not. Quite probably these answers reflected subjective views and ways of dealing with the interview situation as much or more than objective experiences. The question is how exactly?
The suggestion that the people who said no wanted to keep the information within their own group is problematic. Note that it has often been observed that older Moroccans tend to keep problematic information (disagreements, problems, complaints) inside their own group, while the younger generation tends to be more outspoken. In this case, however, the group saying yes was older, on the average, (26.6 years) than the group saying no (21 years). More plausible is, we think, that at least two things are involved: a tendency to want to come across positively in the interview, and a tendency to minimize the experience because the subject has overcome it in some sense.

It is interesting to see in which ways people managed to deny discrimination. Consider the following statements (freely translated):

- 'Well, that is just the way it is, not only here, but also in other countries.'
- 'Some people do it. Some don't. It's normal.'
- 'Well, it happens, but I think it is good. I just say that because that's why I stay here, because I like it here.'
- 'I don't have the feeling of being discriminated against, or experiencing anything. Never. I just live here like a Dutch person. I have rights everywhere I go.'
- 'No. We're just like Dutch people.'

Faced with the necessary evil (given the poverty of the towns and villages the Moroccans came from) of living in The Netherlands, people try to come to grips with it. The narrative presented in section 3 shows one way of coming to grips with it. The narrator in some way came out of the conflict with the police as a victor, he felt. First he caught the policeman by surprise by claiming the latter was not a real Dutchman either, then he confirmed that Dutch people and foreigners were the same people. Also the narrator comes out as a victor in the interview, since he is able to captivate the attention of the interviewer by presenting the story in a certain coherent way, and by being able to evaluate the experience while relating it. This capacity is not shared by all the Moroccans interviewed, as can be seen from examining the answers of the people who said yes to the discrimination question.

As to the type of discrimination mentioned, this varied considerably. Four people found that leave from their boss to go to Morocco and visit their family was very unfairly arranged: Dutch workers have three or
four weeks every year, but the Moroccans are denied six to eight weeks every two years. Four (younger) people complained about not being admitted into clubs and discotheques. Three Moroccans complained about the attitude towards them of Dutch women, three about the police, three about general patterns of discrimination. Other things mentioned are cafés, taxi drivers, etc. Of the 12 people who admitted to having experienced discrimination, seven told a story about it (two told two stories). When we compare these stories on three dimensions: the use of connectives, the use of appelatives, and overall structure, we get the following picture (table IV).
**TABLE IV: Schematic representation of the main properties of the discrimination narratives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>SYNT. INDEX</th>
<th>LENGTH NARRAT.</th>
<th>EN</th>
<th>NOU</th>
<th>JA</th>
<th>TOEN</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>TOTAL₁/LENGTH</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>KYK ES</th>
<th>WEETJEWEL</th>
<th>TOTAL₂/LENGTH</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Comp. action</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Coda</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBJECT = rank among the 20 subjects according to syntactic index

SYNT. INDEX = syntactic index, here indicated in z-scores, representing distance from the mean

LENGTH NARRAT. = number of lines in discrimination narrative

EN = ‘and’

NOU = ‘now’

JA = ‘yes’

TOEN = ‘then’

OTHER = other connectives

TOTAL₁/LENGTH = total number of connectives divided by length of narrative

HE = ‘eh ? ’

KIJK ES = ‘look here’

WEETJEWEL = ‘you know’

TOTAL₂/LENGTH = total number of appelatives divided by length of narrative
While there is some relationship between the syntactic index and the narrative capacities of the subjects, the rank order correlation is by no means perfect. There are some intermediate speakers with considerable narrative skills even in Netherlandic.

Consider the material in Table IV in more detail. While connectives such as en 'and' are successfully used by all speakers, appelatives, and particularly the colloquial hè 'eh', occur only with the better speakers who produced discrimination narratives. Weetjewel 'you know', and kijk es 'look', occur with the less advanced speakers and are less flexible devices. When we look at the analysis of the stories in terms of narrative structure, we find that the basic cycle Orientation/Complicating action/Result occurs in all narratives, but that Evaluation is only present in the more fluent narratives.

I would like to suggest that the evaluative component, i.e. the ability of the narrator to voice his or her opinion of the event narrated, is crucial. What kind of evaluative devices are used? Ranked in the same way as in Table IV we find for the speakers remarks such as:

1 - niet fijn
   not nice
   - nou dat vond ik toen een goed idee
      now that found I then a good idea

8 - (cc) maar ik vind eigenlijk niet erg hè
    but I find really not bad eh
    - nou en toen was ik erg kwaad op hem
       now and then was I very angry with him

10 - nee allemaal niks nee helemaal niks, nee gelooft mij niet
     no all nothing no completely nothing no believes me not

12- kijk es ik vind dat het heel slechter wordt
    look I find that it very worse becomes

The other narratives just present the chain of events, without presenting a view on them. Within a functional model, we could say that the more advanced speakers have acquired the evaluative function, and, as we saw above, the conative or appelative function, while for less ad-
vanced learners of Netherlandic as a second language only the referential function is available.

If we consider what is involved in being able to produce a narrative such as the one presented in 3, we must conclude that the relation between attitudes towards The Netherlands and Netherlandic second language proficiency is by no means simple. On the one hand, a positive attitude may favour successful acquisition, on the other hand, successful acquisition, and hence the capacity to express oneself and thus cope with difficult experiences such as that of discrimination, may influence attitudes profoundly.
NOTES

(1) The research reported on here was carried out in a seminar at the Instituut voor Algemene Taalwetenschap, Universiteit van Amsterdam, in the autumn of 1978. A complete description in Netherlandic of the project is Werkgroep Taal Buitenlandse Werknemers (1980). I am particularly grateful to A.R. Vermeer who helped prepare the material in section 2., which was presented at the Bristol Conference on Language and Social Psychology in 1979, by A.R. Vermeer in conjunction with the present author.

(2) There is no consensus on what constitutes 'adequate proficiency'. We take it to mean: sufficient knowledge of Netherlandic to be able to deal with the demands of the work situation, of bureaucracy, of daily life, and to defend one's rights.

(3) In 1976 there were 40,000 Moroccans legally residing in The Netherlands, out of a total population of foreign workers of 190,000. The other major group is Turkish.

(4) To give just an idea of the range of variation involved just for our 20 speakers, we find between 11% and 80% deletion of determiners, between 0 and 38% incorrect subject-verb agreement, between 0 and 50% missing subjects.

(5) Here and in the following examples the 'correct' or more usual native Netherlandic alternative is given in parentheses.
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