3809

Gender variation in Dutch

A sociolinguistic study of Amsterdam speech

Dédé Brouwer

Gender variation in Dutch

Gender variation in Dutch

A sociolinguistic study of Amsterdam speech

een wetenschappelijke proeve op het gebied van de Letteren

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor aan
de Katholieke Universiteit te Nijmegen,
volgens besluit van het college van decanen in het
openbaar te verdedigen op
woensdag 21 juni 1989
te 15.30 uur

door

Demis Brouwer
geboren op 23 oktober 1947 te Amsterdam

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

Promotores: Prof. Dr. A.M. Hagen

Prof. Dr. P.C. Muysken (Universiteit van Amsterdam)

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

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
SAMENVATTING		125
CURRICULUM VITAE		129

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 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.

Introduction

1.1 LANGUAGE, SEX AND GENDER

This book deals with speech differences between women and men, focussing on pronunciation. Sociolinguistic research has frequently shown that women more often use standard variants and men more often non-standard variants at the phonetic- phonological level. Why is this so? That is the question I would like to try to answer in this study on language variation and language attitudes, carried out in Amsterdam. My first aim is to give a description of the sociolinguistic variation as accurately as possible, in which I will concentrate on the different living situations of women and men. In the second place, I will investigate the social evaluation of standard and non-standard varieties on the one hand, and the evaluation of female and male speakers on the other, in search of additional explanations for the gender-related linguistic variation found.

As regards language variation between women and men, it is quite common to distinguish between sex-exclusive or absolute speech differences and sex-preferential speech differences or differences of degree (cf. Bodine 1975, Brouwer, Gerritsen and De Haan 1979). Sex-exclusive speech differences are only likely to arise from differentiation within the language system. In many languages there are specific grammatical forms to refer to different genders. The covariation between sex and speech is then solely due to the causal dependence of speech on sex. In many Romance languages, for instance, the mere fact of whether a living being is classified as female or male predetermines the choice of gender form used.

On the other hand, sex differences with respect to language use are generally sex-preferential: one of the sexes uses a certain speech feature more often than does the other. Such speech differences can be expected to occur everywhere, since most if not all cultures and societies have different norms and values for women and men and a quite sharp division between their functions and positions, usually at the expense of women, needless to say. Unless the sex

differences in speech have become officially institutionalized, they are sex-preferential rather than sex-exclusive.

A direct causal relationship between sex and speech, as in the case of sex-exclusive variation conditioned by rules from the language system, would occur if, and only if, sex could be taken as one simple category, i.e. biological sex. Where sociological sex or gender is concerned, the relationship is inevitably much more complicated. Gender is not a "natural" fact, but takes shape in concrete, historically changing relationships' (Thorne, Kramarae and Henley eds. 1983: 16). There is hardly any scientific support for the view that there is a biological basis for different speech behaviour between women and men. Even when there is an anatomical difference such as between the vocal tracts of women and men - as a secondary sexual characteristic, during puberty the larynx of boys becomes larger and their vocal cords grow longer and thicker, resulting in lower formant frequencies - this biological factor cannot fully account for the difference in pitch between the voices of adult women and men. In both cases, the voice effects appear to be still cultivated, women speaking with higher-pitched and men with lower-pitched voices than might be expected on the grounds of the anatomical difference (Sachs, Lieberman and Erickson 1973). Besides, it is possible to identify children's sex on the basis of their voices, thus before this difference between their vocal tracts is present (Sachs 1975). However, researchers have continued to be intrigued by sex. For example, one part of a recent collection on language, gender and sex (Philips, Steele and Tanz eds. 1987: 263-295), summarizing recent work on sex differences in language and the brain, supports the conclusion from an earlier overview that there is no convincing evidence for sex differences in cognition (Fairweather 1976). In the present study, I shall use the terms 'sex', 'female' and 'male' to refer to the biological distinction and, if in any way possible, the terms 'gender', 'feminine' and 'masculine' to refer to the socio-culturally constructed categories based on sex.

In mainstream linguistics, as in other disciplines, relatively little scientific information has been gathered on women's speech. Only in anthropological linguistics have data been gathered on women's and men's speech in non-Western communities and in some branches of dialectology attention has also been paid to social factors including, incidentally, sex. This lack of studies of women's speech is due to both the linguistic paradigm current in this century and a masculine point of view. In European structuralism and, more recently, transformational generative grammar, language is studied as an autonomous phenomenon. The idealization in terms of a highly homogeneous linguistic structure leads to abstraction away from real speakers, cultures and societies. In

such a linguistic approach, data are usually gathered by introspection, so that linguists, for the most greater part men, claiming to study 'the' language, in fact described their own. On the rare occasions when women's language has been taken into account, by early twentieth century scholars, it has been dealt with as a deviation, in a separate chapter (Van Ginneken 1913, Jespersen 1922) or together with other 'abnormal types of speech' (Sapir 1915).

In the late Sixties the situation improved thanks to both the development of sociolinguistics, and a revival of the women's movement. Sociolinguistic theory is based on the assumption of heterogeneity of linguistic structure, claiming that systematic variation is inherent to language. This approach to language and speech within its cultural and social context cleared the way for the study of language variation, including that between women and men. At about the same time, from the other direction, the revival of the women's movement awakened general interest in women's affairs, including their speech, and produced a growing, though proportionately still small, number of women linguists.

Women's studies opened up new perspectives. They focus on analysis of both the subordinate position of women and the relation between the sexual division of labour and other developments in society (Bird, David, Malos et al. eds. 1979; Birke, Faulkner, Best et al. eds. 1980; Poldervaart et al. 1983). The underlying assumption is that the position of women is not so much determined by biological factors as by societal structures characterized by division of labour by sex and unequal balance of power between women and men. The opposition between domestic and public orientations, only in part caused by the nurturant capacities of women, provides a necessary framework for an examination of female and male roles in society. There is methodological multiformity in which both qualitative and quantitative approaches are used depending on the object of study. As a sociolinguist, I adopt the, in my opinion, most fruitful point of view, i.e. that it is not primarily the methodology which is feminist or not but the phrasing of the question (e.g. Bal 1981). Although traditional methods and designs are sometimes inadequate to answer feminist questions - corrections should be made and new methods and designs developed - it is the focus on the position of women, the underlying assumptions, hypotheses and interpretations which can meet feminist criteria rather than the method used.

The unequal roles and positions of women and men are reflected both in the language system of a speech community and in language as used to and by women and men. How girls and women are talked about, in which way they are addressed, which role in verbal interaction is allocated to them, and how they

speak can be traced back to sex-stereotypical norms and values and the division of labour by sex in society.

Research into the language use about, i.e. to refer to, women (and men) is usually described as language sexism. Although it does not seem far-fetched to presume a relationship between how women are spoken about and how they end up speaking themselves, it is beyond the scope of the present study of language use by women and men to analyze linguistic sexism in detail. An excellent overview of publications on this subject can be found in two sections of an annotated bibliography compiled by Barrie Thorne, Cheris Kramarae and Nancy Henley (Thorne, Kramarae and Henley eds. 1983: 166-215).

Briefly, the linguistic phenomena studied point to an asymmetry and polarization between the sexes. There are, however, hardly any systematic descriptions since the semantic component is the Cinderella of current linguistics. The main topics are the invisibility and dependency of women in language corresponding to their very minor role in social life, sex-stereotyping of women and men and the semantic derogation of women. Contrary to the theoretical notion of unmarkedness commonly assumed, generics like 'he' and 'man' appear not to function thus in practice; neither women nor men usually imagine female beings to be included (e.g. Martyna 1978, Silveira 1980). The Mrs. or Miss distinction defines women primarily in relation to husband and family role. Women and men are pushed into sex-specific roles while individual variation is being ignored. Women are expected to be sweet, not too learned, and dependent, or else they are labelled battle-axes, blue-stockings and spinsters, or 'she has been left on the shelf'. Men, on the other hand, should be strong and determined and are allowed to be independent, witness terms like henpecked husband and bachelor, or 'he is free as a bird'. In addition, terms referring to women more often have or acquire a negative or sexual connotation than terms referring to men (Schulz 1975).

1.2 WOMEN'S AND MEN'S LANGUAGE USE

Research carried out to date into the language use of women and men roughly represents three stages and lines of approach relating to theory, method and interpretation, and linguistic levels. Firstly, I will briefly summarize introspective judgements and research results about women's and men's speech at the lexical and syntactic level. Secondly, after touching very lightly on the anthropological and dialectological findings, I will deal with the sociolinguistic findings at the phonetic-phonological level.

At the beginning of this century a Dutch and a Danish linguist each devoted a chapter of his handbook to 'the woman' (Van Ginneken 1913, Jespersen 1922), probably because neither was working within a rigid linguistic theory, and both lived during a period of emancipation. They present their intuitive statements about linguistic differences between women and men at the lexical and syntactic level. Women are supposed to have a limited vocabulary, saturated with sweet and chaste words, and use a simple sentence structure. They are supposed to be extremely talkative. Explanations put forward for these linguistic differences in the context of biological theories prevailing at the time suggested that women are more sensitive, chaste and simple by nature, and, of course, chatty.

In the early Seventies, coinciding with a revival of the women's liberation movement, two important articles on women's language aroused new interest in the subject (Key 1972, Lakoff 1973). The introspective judgements of these two - this time female - linguists have much in common with those made earlier, adding that women tend to use more linguistic forms indicating insecurity and politeness. However, the explanations have changed fundamentally in that biological assumptions are replaced by social ones. Girls are socialized to become 'ladies' or to behave modestly. Since men occupy the key positions in society and take the main decisions, women take up an uncertain and polite position in order to avoid situations of conflict. Should they become vigorous or rude, their femininity is questioned. It goes without saying that all linguistic data, whether male or female, based on introspection depend heavily on gender-stereotypical assumptions, in the same way that explanations given for the variation remain speculative.

Following these publications, there has been an avalanche of mostly small investigations to test the intuitive statements about vocabulary and sentence structure. The results demonstrate a far less consistent pattern than the common stereotypes would lead us to expect. In some cases sex differences in speech were not found, in many others they were related to age (e.g. Gerritsen 1980), situation and status (e.g. Dubois and Crouch 1975, Crosby and Nyquist 1977) or (sex of) addressee (e.g. Brouwer, Gerritsen and De Haan 1979, Brouwer 1982) rather than to sex of speaker. Although little research on the quantity of speech has been done, it is worth mentioning that not a single investigation supported the supposed talkativeness of women; on the contrary, men talked much, and much more and longer than women (Swacker 1975). Research into conversational interaction seems to support this finding. It offers a quite clear picture of the speech differences between women and men on a pragmatic level and of how the different speech strategies of women and men reflect their structurally unequal positions. Men dominate women in conversation by interrupting them and by ignoring topics which they raise, whereas women

show their supportiveness by doing the 'interactional shitwork' and by using 'positive' politeness strategies (e.g. Zimmerman and West 1975, Fishman 1983, Brown and Levinson 1978, Holmes 1987).

There are several comprehensive reviews of speech differentiation between women and men in non-Western communities as found by anthropological linguists (e.g. Bodine 1975, Van der Post 1978). Most speech differences concern pronunciation, but there are also examples of morphological and lexical variation. The differentiation can be based on sex of speaker, or on sex of addressee, or on both, and on sex spoken about. The presentation of the speech differences as being sex-exclusive is questioned in both reviews, given the relatively scanty data and the methodology used. One is often dependent on the evidence of male informants only. Besides, even if the speech differences reported were found to be sex-exclusive, this would definitely not imply absence of sex-preferential speech differences, since the latter are less salient in everyday usage and thus more easily overlooked.

Passing on to the dialectological findings, there is a critical review of sociolinguistic aspects in the history of dialectology (Hagen 1987) and an overview focussed on dialect differences between women and men (Gerritsen 1978). Two early studies of phonetic-phonological variation, with a surprisingly modern methodology, carried out in villages in Switzerland and France, point to the guiding part played by women in the process of language change (Gauchat 1905, Terracher 1914). Later sociolinguistic research confirmed that women appear to play an important role in linguistic innovations (Labov 1972b). What little further research concerning the factor of sex is available suggests a greater dialect usage by women in the country and by men in the cities (Mattheier 1980). Marinel Gerritsen views both quantity and quality of the dialectological results with some scepticism (Gerritsen 1985). The linguistic phenomena under investigation vary almost from study to study, which makes it hard to draw comparisons. Choice and number of informants are mostly haphazard; the methods used are hardly systematic.

It is the sociolinguistic approach which has produced the most consistent findings about language variation between women and men at the phonetic-phonological level. Regarding pronunciation, there is ample evidence that women use the standard variants more frequently and men the social (and regional) dialect variants. Correspondingly, women and men differ in their ideas and feelings about language varieties: women have a more positive attitude towards standard language, men towards non-standard or dialect. It also turned out that a shift towards more standard language forms takes place as the formality of the speech situation increases, and that women show a relatively

great and men a small style shift. In addition, the second-highest status group, the lower middle class, appeared to show the most extreme style shift, going beyond that of the highest status group. The linguistic data were mostly elicited during individual interviews which were tape-recorded.

The greater part of research findings concern North American urban varieties of English in cities like New York or Detroit (e.g. Labov 1966, Shuy, Wolfram and Riley 1967, Wolfram 1969). However, a similar linguistic pattern was also found in Canada (Sankoff and Cedergren 1971), in cities in Britain such as Norwich and Glasgow (Trudgill 1972, Macaulay 1978), and for Australian English in Sydney (Horvath and Sankoff 1987).

Three examples of linguistic variables studied by William Labov in New York City illustrate the speech variation between women and men: the presence or absence of final and post-vocalic and pre-consonantal (r) in words like *car* or *target* and the height of the vowels (eh) and (oh) in words like *bad* or *ask* and *caught* or *dog*. Men used more stigmatized forms than women, while the apparent attraction of prestige forms for women was reflected by their steeper slope of style shifting. Looking at linguistic attitudes, men appeared to favour New York speech slightly while women appeared to be heavily against it (Labov 1966). Besides, the social class and style stratification of (r) is the most clear-cut example of extreme style shifting by the lower middle class (Labov 1972b: 124 ff.).

Explanations given for the linguistic variation between women and men are mainly speculative and partly contradictory, which is hardly surprising given the descriptive nature of most of the research. In many older studies, a direct causal link between sex and language use is assumed by claiming that language use is connected with sex-specific role-orientation. Two, partly conflicting, explanatory role-orientations are postulated. Firstly, it is suggested that women may speak more correctly than men because, since their role is generally assumed to be in charge of raising the children, they grow up with the feeling that they should set an example (Jespersen 1922, Labov 1972b). Secondly, the influence of employment on language use is proposed as an explanation. Since most women do not have paid work, they cannot acquire status through their occupation or earning power. It may be, therefore, that they have to be judged on how they 'appear' and that they try to derive their status from other signals of status, including speech (Trudgill 1972). This last explanation is contradicted by findings in West Germany; here, it is women in employment who adapt more to the standard norm, presumably because of their particularly insecure position on the labour market and the sharply defined sex-role expectations at work (Ammon 1973). This difference may be more apparent than real, however, since both the linguistic object of study and method used differ from those common in sociolinguistic research. The degree of standard

German and regional dialect usage was studied from recordings gathered earlier by dialect geographers.

In several more recent studies evidence is presented which indicates an indirect causal relationship between sex and speech through the intermediary concept of social network. A study of a black population in South Carolina showed the influence of the type of work on speech: women, who worked in white-collar occupations more frequently than men, consequently had a different social network from men, and moved faster toward (syntactic) standard prestige forms (Nichols 1978). Similarly, the results from an investigation in a bilingual, German-Hungarian community in eastern Austria pointed to the importance of social network, in this case its 'peasantness', and the linguistic attitudes and aspirations involved. Women, averse to becoming peasants or marrying them, used German more often than did men (Gal 1978). In the report of a study carried out in Belfast it was suggested that the degree of participation in a social network affects speech behaviour. The more people were enmeshed in a close-knit vernacular network, the more they expressed their group identity by conforming to the language norms prevailing in that group. Women, generally less embedded in such networks than men, adapted more to the standard pronunciation (Milroy 1980).

These studies show that any correlation between an isolated social variable such as gender and a linguistic variable is insufficient evidence for the thesis that differences between female and male speech are markers of sex.

In spite of the recurrent pattern found in the sociolinguistic variation between women and men, and the obviously central role of women in the transmission of language across generations, gender variation in language, let alone women's speech, has never become a focus of attention in sociolinguistic studies.

This is partly due to the difficulty of classifying women in terms of social groups or classes. When only male informants are involved, such other reasons are given as: 'to limit the amount of variables' (De Vries et al. 1974) or 'I wanted to interview people that I knew and that I could speak to at more or less the same level' (Van den Broeck 1977), while only a single study mentions the genuine difficulty of classifying women (Deprez and Geerts 1977). Owing to the one-sided concentration of sociologists on the world population's male half, stratification models fall short where women are concerned (Acker 1973, Oakley 1974, Brouwer and Gerritsen 1980). Profession is the most important index of stratification, in which the profession of housewife is regarded as unclassifiable. The family is the unit of stratification, so women are classified according to the socio-economic status of the husband. Apart from the exclusion of all people who do not live in families, including those who live

in social units other than the regular family, the present stratification model gives a distorted picture, since women do not always marry within their own social class. Dutch women often marry men from a higher social class, while, as early as 1964, an investigation in the United States showed that in cases where both the man and the woman had a job, that of the woman in 42% of cases carried higher status (Watson and Barth 1964).

Because of this mis-classification of women, it may be necessary to re-evaluate the sociolinguistic results on women's and men's speech. Sociolinguistic research usually shows a consistent covariation pattern between language and social class: the higher the social class, the more standard variants are used. If women in the United States marry beneath their social position, their more frequent use of standard variants is less significant; if English women, like Dutch women, marry above their social position, then the sex differentiation in speech would be greater than supposed. For an adequate description of the linguistic variation between women and men, it seems at least necessary to develop new criteria for stratification.

1.3 WOMEN'S AND MEN'S LANGUAGE ATTITUDES

In sociolinguistics William Labov was one of the first to pay attention to language attitudes, in his New York City research (Labov 1966). From the fact that speakers showed a style shift toward the standard as they became more alert to their own language production, he deduced that they held very specific norms with regard to language. He found that in most cases women showed the greater style shift to the standard as the formality of the speech situation increased, and concluded that they were more sensitive to prestige factors than men. When questioned about the New York City dialect women more consistently and sharply showed their distaste by calling it 'horrible', 'sloppy' and 'distorted'. Peter Trudgill found a similar pattern in the language of women and men in Norwich in Britain (Trudgill 1974). He assumed that men may attach a certain value to non-standard language because of the connotations of roughness and toughness, which are supposed to be desirable masculine attributes. When questioned directly, many men admitted that they would rather not speak the standard variety to avoid being seen as disloyal by their friends. But, above all, the results from a self-evaluation test confirmed his assumption of a covert norm for men. In most cases women reported using the standard variant, in fact over-reporting their actual speech, while men judged their own speech more accurately and often under-reported their actual speech (Trudgill 1972).

Attitudes towards women's and men's speech behaviour have also been

investigated from other, generally social psychological, perspectives. In Britain a great deal of research has been done on attitudes towards speakers of standard and non-standard varieties (cf. Giles and Powesland 1975). Several studies have shown that speech is an important factor in forming an impression of another person. Most of the data have been gathered by the 'matched-guise' technique, in which the same voices in different 'guises', representing the linguistic variants under investigation, are evaluated by listeners (cf. section 2.4.1 of the second chapter). The bulk of these studies include only male speakers as stimuli. Male speakers using a standard variety are often perceived as having more social competence (e.g. intelligence, ambition, self-confidence), while male speakers of a non-standard variety often score higher on the scale of social attractiveness (kindheartedness, sincerity). A similar pattern was found in the evaluation of female speakers using standard English (Received Pronunciation) and a Northern English dialect (Elyan et al. 1978). However, the female standard speaker was associated with both masculine characteristics (adventurous, independent, egotistic, aggressive) and with feminine ones, so the standard pronunciation of women carried with it the usual connotations of social competence and occupational status, while being associated with femininity as well. A follow-up study, including two female guises of RP and South Welsh accents, showed that female speakers, irrespective of accent, were seen as more feminine and male speakers were rated as more masculine and prestigious (Giles and Marsh 1979). In this study therefore the prestige connotations of speech were overshadowed by the mere sex of the speaker. Of course, it remains questionable whether this finding is linked to a different evaluation of social and regional dialects, but Carole Edelsky, investigating intonation patterns in the United States, found results which were rather similar (Edelsky 1979). Except for the fact that listeners associated both female and male voices with more stereotypical feminine attributes when the speakers used the straight rise contour, they also associated the female voices with feminine attributes regardless of the contour used.

Differences between the judgements of female and male listeners were hardly ever found.

To my knowledge, the few investigations mentioned above are alone in systematically using female speakers as stimuli. It is therefore time to determine more thoroughly the precise connotations of female speakers using standard and non-standard varieties.

Apart from these attitude data from tests, some information has been gathered by means of questionnaires about the ideas and feelings women and men have about their own language use and about that of women and men in general. The results from two questionnaires on the use of expletives showed that women

reported using swear words less than men, particularly the stronger ones, and that they used them more often when alone or with their children than in the presence of partner or friends (Oliver and Rubin 1975, Bailey and Timm 1976). Cheris Kramarae studied attitudes towards female and male speakers in the United States through a questionnaire based on fifty-one speech-related characteristics (Kramer 1977). She revealed a number of widespread beliefs and expectations with regard to the way women and men speak. The following traits were supposed to be representative of women's speech: enunciated, expressive (use of hands and face to express ideas), concerned for the listener, gentle, emotional, trivial, polite, 'smile a lot when talking', good grammar. On the other hand, men's speech was mainly described as demanding, boastful, dominating, loud, authoritarian, 'lounge and lean back while talking', aggressive and characterized by use of swear words and slang. The results from a comparable investigation in the Netherlands are in agreement with these findings: the traditional image of women being expressive, kind, and dependent and that of men being active, strong, and independent were confirmed by the scores of a group Dutch students (Boves, Fagel and Van Herpt 1982).

For the time being, three conclusions can be drawn. Women have a more positive attitude towards the standard variety, men towards non-standard or dialect. The standard variety is associated with social competence and femininity, dialect with social attractiveness and masculinity. Both women and men evaluate female and male speakers differently and have different expectations about women's and men's speech.

1.4 THE PRESENT STUDY

The present study extends the sociolinguistic findings concerning phonetic-phonological variation between women and men. The linguistic data have been gathered by elicitation during interviews, since this traditional sociolinguistic method suits analysis of subtle phonetic variation rather well. The aim is both to describe the linguistic variation between women and men accurately and to gain insight into the factors underlying gender-related variation in language in general. We have tried to combine the sociolinguistic approach with a feminist perspective by paying attention to the influence of the different orientations of women and men on their language use, while focussing on women, for a change. The social inequality between women and men - women spending most of their time in the private domain of the family, men in public life or the world outside - has been operationalized. In addition to sex of speaker, having children and employment by women have also been incorporated as primary

independent variables in the research design. As secondary independent variables, a more or less traditional way of living, the social network, education and occupational characteristics have been investigated.

In the test component of the research, the attitudes of women and men to language variation have been investigated together with attitudes to the language of female and male speakers. It was thought that some additional explanatory, and possibly predictive, power in respect of gender-related linguistic variation might result.

In short, the intention of this design was to employ the concept of gender to explain sex differentiation in language.

The book has the following structure.

Chapter 2 deals with sample, design and procedure of the Amsterdam study. In the first section, the neighbourhood under investigation and the selection of the informants are described. In the second section, I present the research design in which some of the differences in living circumstances between women and men have been taken into account, the hypotheses concerning language use and language attitudes, and the interview structure. The third and fourth sections contain descriptions of the language use and language attitude components.

In Chapter 3, the linguistic variation found for the six phonetic-phonological variables under study is discussed and analyzed more thoroughly. The first section goes into stylistic variation. Two approaches to the general phenomenon of style shifting are put forward, involving the shift between styles and the variation within a style. The second section deals with gender and style differentiation related to the - basic - hypothesis that women speak more standard Dutch and men more Amsterdam vernacular. Then, I discuss two methods for analyzing the difference in style shift between women and men. In order to determine the degree of difference in their style shift, it is first analyzed, as is common in sociolinguistic research, as an 'absolute' phenomenon. Next, I view the style shift as a 'relative' phenomenon, in which the possible degree of shifting is taken into account, i.e. compared with the actual amount of standard usage in the informal part of the interview. The third section deals with the covariation pattern of the six linguistic variables under study, resulting in a general measure for the degree of standard and non-standard usage.

Chapter 4 looks at the language variation between women and men in more detail, in search of factors underlying the speech differentiation other than sex. The standard/non-standard dimension revealed in the third chapter is used to test the hypotheses about the effects of having children and employment by women, specific educational and occupational characteristics, and a social

network index.

Chapter 5 presents the results from the language attitude tests. The attitudes of women and men toward the standard and non-standard variety are examined as well as their attitudes toward female and male speakers.

Finally, in Chapter 6, I summarize and briefly discuss the findings in the previous chapters.

The investigation in Amsterdam

2.0 INTRODUCTION

A number of reasons have been given for the speech differences existing between women and men. In order to test the hypotheses about speech variation, in a project carried out from 1980 to 1983, we have chosen a particular Amsterdam neighbourhood and have gathered linguistic data by interviewing a number of women and men living there. The choice of the neighbourhood and the selection of the informants are described in section 2.1. In section 2.2, I summarize the research design and hypotheses about language use and language attitudes and the method used to collect the data. Finally, sections 2.3 and 2.4 contain descriptions of the language use component and language attitude component of the research respectively.

2.1 SAMPLE

2.1.1 *The neighbourhood*

At the beginning of this century, around 1910, Amsterdam had almost 600.000 inhabitants. Since then the population has grown. The socialist movement won ground, especially among the growing group of workers who lived in poor housing and under bad working conditions, and in 1921 Amsterdam got its first socialist mayor. The neighbourhood under study was built around 1925, on the Western part of Amsterdam, as part of the new housing schemes developed by the socialist municipal council. After the second World War a great expansion of the city took place still further West, resulting in the garden suburbs of 'Slotermeer', 'Geuzenveld', 'Slotervaart', 'Osdorp' and 'Overtoomse Veld', so that now West Amsterdam has become almost part of the center.

There are more than 700.000 people living in Amsterdam and another 300.000 in the suburbs. The city has two universities with 22.000 registered students. In addition there are other centers for higher education and a total of

150.000 young people undergo education in the city. Amsterdam is an important city from the point of view of work: 7% of the Dutch working population (271.475 persons) work in Amsterdam, of whom 95.000 commute. With its 4.079 industries it is one of the largest industrial cities in the Netherlands and one of the most diverse in the world. Apart from an active money and exchange market, there is also a sizeable international capital market in the Amsterdam Stock Exchange. As a publicity center Amsterdam has many printers and publishers; as center of culture and entertainment many museums and theatres. It is the fourth most important tourist center in Europe after London, Paris and Rome and it welcomes hundreds of thousands of conference and exhibition visitors each year. Our neighbourhood, however, being mainly residential, is by-passed by most of these exciting activities.

Sociolinguistic findings in Great Britain and the United States (Trudgill 1974, Labov 1966) have shown that it is women from the upper working class and especially women of the lower middle class who are the most inclined to use standard language forms. For the sake of comparability an area was chosen in Amsterdam which was typically upper working and lower middle class. After consultation of population statistics with respect to a number of factors, the northern part of the Amsterdam New West quarter was chosen as neighbourhood of investigation, technically known as neighbourhood combinations ('buurtkombinaties') 64, 65, 66, 68 and 69; neighbourhood combinations 62 and 63 also belong to this quarter but have been omitted because of their ageing population.

The total area of Amsterdam covers about 210 square kilometers. On the map in Figure 2.1 the neighbourhood under investigation is marked and predominantly working or upper class areas of Amsterdam are indicated by horizontal and vertical hatching respectively (after Boon 1980: 12).

Figure 2.1 Map of Amsterdam according to socio-economic status

2.1.2 Informants

A relatively similar background for both female and male informants should enable better grasp on factors or variables which may indicate the social processes or mechanisms underlying language variation. It was decided therefore to take married couples as the unit of sampling rather than individual women and men. This decision was also based on our requirement for a sample

consisting of informants both with and without children (most people with children are married in the Netherlands). Apart from comparing the speech of the women with that of their husbands, the aim was to establish whether the speech of the women varied with the situation in which they lived. Two variables have been incorporated into the research design to test this. These were, as mentioned above, whether or not the couples had children and whether or not the women were employed. In order to keep the group of informants as homogeneous as possible, the age of the women and the occupational level of the men were taken into account in the selection. Since women would be more housebound with younger children, the chosen age range was 25 to 35. The range of socio-economic status or social class of the informants, also restricted to keep the necessary number of informants manageable, can be described as upper working and lower middle class, representing the occupational groups 2, 3 and 4 out of six groups (after Van Westerlaak, Kropman and Collaris 1975). Roughly, occupational group 2 concerns manual labour, group 3 white-collar workers and group 4 small traders. The husband's occupation must be taken as a selection criterion, both a) because only some of the women under study were employed and b) simply because of the lack of a proper register for employed married women in the Netherlands. Most men fell under occupational groups 2 and 3. As to group 2, they held occupations such as bench fitter, paperhanger, carpenter, plasterer, sprayer, mechanic, tiler, electrician or printer and as to group 3 occupations such as telegraphist, tramdriver, seller, attendant, bank clerk, or administrative worker. Informants from occupational group 4 comprise a few shopkeepers. A complete list of the occupations of the informants can be found in Appendix 1. Finally, all the informants chosen were born and bred in Amsterdam, so that most regional dialect variation would be excluded.

Table 2.1 on the next page gives some information about the population structure in New West compared to that of Amsterdam as a whole (Afdeling Bestuursinformatie der Gemeente Amsterdam 1979). As Table 2.1 shows, the inhabitants of New West meet the criteria of being from the area (83.1%) and being married (66.6%) rather well, while, in addition, the breadwinner is the male in 95.7% of the married couples.

So, whether the couple has children and whether the woman is employed, these were the stratifying factors in the research design. Crossing these two variables produces four cells: [-children, -woman's employment], [-children, +woman's employment], [+children, -woman's employment], [+children, +woman's employment]. It was planned to draw a stratified random sample, each stratum or cell containing 15 couples. This would add up to a total of 4 cells * 15 couples * 2 = 120 informants.

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)

	Amsterdam	New West
inhabitants	718.649	71.358
locally born	87.0%	88.3%
locally born 25-35	82.4%	83.1%
25-35	18.5%	15.2%
married	44.2%	48.9%
married 25-35	53.3%	66.6%
female heads of the family	1.5%	1.2%
male heads of the family	94.3%	97.0%
female heads of the family 25-35	2.2%	1.9%
male heads of the family 25-35	92.6%	95.7%

In order to achieve a more marked contrast between the four cells, children and woman's employment were more strictly defined. Having children was defined as possession of at least two children, and woman's employment as involving at least 15 hours a week. No employment meant no outside employment at all.

There were no sources available to offer reliable information about employment of married women who were not breadwinners, but there is, of course, a rather perfect registration of children in married couples. At the time of the investigation out of the 2729 married couples, where the woman was between 25 and 35 and living in New West, there were 774 couples without children and 1017 with two or more children (and 938 couples with one child).

Potential informants were sampled randomly from a list provided by the city housing authority, after which the additional selection criteria were applied. Through visits to or telephone calls with the candidate informants data were gathered about being locally born, the husband's actual occupation (to exclude all who did not fall into the category of upper working class and lower middle class and to exclude the unemployed), the number of children and whether the woman had outside employment.

Altogether, 659 couples were contacted, of whom 222 met the selection criteria. In Table 2.2 the distribution of these 222 couples over the strata of the research design is shown.

Table 2.2 Distribution of the 222 couples conforming to the criteria

	- children		+ children		total	
- woman's employment	11	5.0%	122	55.0%	133	60.0%
+ woman's employment	39	17.6%	50	22.5%	89	40.0%
total	50	22.5%	172	77.5%	222	

Table 2.2 shows that couples with children where the woman is not employed are by far the most common, whereas couples without children where the woman is not employed are rather rare (55.0% versus 5.0% of the 222 couples conforming to the criteria). More than three-quarters have children, and in only one third of the couples does the woman have paid work. It is evident that this distribution is a reflection of the family structure in the neighbourhood under investigation.

Not surprisingly, we did not succeed in contacting 15 couples without children where the woman was not employed and further efforts had to be ended because of the time schedule of the project. The actual number of selected couples in this rare cell was even less because of refusals (in all, 75 of the 222 eligible couples declined to cooperate). A final random selection was made from those couples who were willing to cooperate. The ultimate result of our laborious search for couples and the selection procedure is given in Table 2.3. The fact that the most common subgroup - with children and woman not employed - has fourteen instead of fifteen couples, is the result of a faulty tape-recording.

Table 2.3 Distribution of the 48 selected couples

	- children	+ children	total
- woman's employment	4	14	18
+ woman's employment	15	15	30
total	19	29	48

Before describing the interview procedures, I shall summarize the design and hypotheses more systematically.

2.2 DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

2.2.1 *Independent variables and hypotheses*

Sociolinguistic research has shown that speech differences between the members of a speech community often correlate with social differences such as social class and gender (cf. section 1.2). We have tried to link social macro-categories like 'lower middle class' and 'woman' with specific explanations using the intermediary concept of the social network. The more people are enmeshed in a close-knit network, the more they will express the group identity by conforming to the language norms prevailing in that group. In the case of the lower middle class group under investigation this implies less standard language usage. Because of the rather sharp division of functions and positions between the sexes in society, women working in the private and men in public spheres, it can be expected that women have less social contacts and thus are less embedded in close-knit social networks than men and that they therefore tend to adapt to the norms of the standard.

The inequality between women and men in society has been incorporated in the design by introducing as primary independent variables, in addition to sex of speaker, children and woman's employment. As regards sex of speaker, children and woman's employment the following hypotheses concerning language use have been formulated.

- a. Women use more often the standard Dutch variants, men the Amsterdam dialect variants.
- b. Women show a greater, men a smaller style shift towards standard Dutch as the formality of the interview situation increases.
- c. Women with children use more often the standard pronunciation than women without children.
- d. Women without paid work use more often the standard pronunciation than women with paid work.

In formulating the basic hypotheses a. and b., we expected Dutch women to behave like their American and British counterparts. In the next two hypotheses - concerning children and employment by women - the assumption that the actual living circumstances of women and men condition their degree of participation in a social network has been taken into account.

Figure 2.2 gives a schematic representation of how the independent variables might be connected to the concept of social network (see the next page).

Figure 2.2 Configuration of factors underlying gender variation in language use

Next to the influence of group membership, the social identity of women and men will be determined by educational and occupational characteristics, and socialization or gender-specific attitudes. Education, occupational level and occupational type will be studied as secondary independent variables as well as socialization; interview data about the living situation of the informants, like division of domestic tasks, and the results from attitude tests will serve as an indication of a more or less gender-specific socialization.

In the case of a woman's employment, the effect of the particular type of occupation might counteract the principle effect of the employment itself, resulting in the hypothesis:

e. Women (and men) with paid work in which they come in contact with the standard use more often the standard pronunciation than women and men with paid work in which this is not the case.

Finally, a more or less positive attitude toward the standard variety may serve as an explanation for a greater or smaller use of standard Dutch, resulting in the hypothesis:

f. Women have a more positive attitude toward standard Dutch, men toward Amsterdam dialect.

The results which bear on the basic hypotheses about gender and style variation in language will be presented in section 3.2 of the third chapter, those concerning the next two hypotheses about the influence of children and woman's employment on language use in section 4.1 of the fourth chapter. The secondary variables of division of domestic tasks, social network features, education and occupation will also be dealt with in the fourth chapter. The results on the linguistic attitudes of the informants will be presented in the fifth chapter.

2.2.2 Interview

All informants were approached with a letter of introduction signed by the supervisor of the project, in which the aim of the survey was circumscribed as 'an investigation to gain some insight into how people live and work in this neighbourhood' and in which they were kindly requested to give an interview for this purpose. We were certainly a little worried about how people would react when they became aware of the real purpose of our visit, their language use. There were, however, no complaints of feelings misled. People who agreed to cooperate were visited at home and each partner of a couple was interviewed separately for an hour and a half by one of the two women interviewers, Rosalien Schenk-van Witsen, the co-researcher, and myself.

In accordance with the aim of this sociolinguistic investigation, both to describe gender differentiation in the pronunciation of Dutch and to gain insight into factors conditioning gender variation in language in general, the interview was designed to represent the three components of language use, language attitudes and background information. In the first part the linguistic data were gathered. We began by talking as informally as possible for about half an hour, after which the informants were asked to read a text and a word list containing the linguistic variables under study in order to elicit a style shift. During the last two parts information about language attitudes and life style was obtained by means of tests and questionnaires.

Figure 2.3 shows the research components and interview structure.

Figure 2.3 The three components of the research and the interview structure

While the language use component of the interview focusses on phonetic-phonological variation, the questions relating to language attitude also tested morpho-syntactic and lexical variation. These data about morpho-syntactic and lexical variables from the self-evaluation tests can be interpreted in two ways. Firstly, the test answers by the informants could be taken to reflect the linguistic forms they would use when paying a maximum of attention to their speech, following the stylistic continuum defined in terms of attention paid to speech (Labov 1972b: 208 ff). On the other hand, the test answers can also reflect the reported attitudes of the informants towards non-standard and coarse language. The results from the phonetic-phonological self-evaluation test can be compared with the actual language use of the informants in informal and formal speech. In this study, the test data about morpho-syntactic and lexical variation will only be analyzed in attitudinal perspective. It would have been possible to study the morpho-syntactic variables in casual speech and to compare their variation with the test results, but it remains to be seen whether a sufficient number of occurrences of the morpho-syntactic variables under study can be found in casual speech (cf. section 2.2.1) and for reasons of time, such a comparison was not attempted. Such an analysis of the lexical variables chosen would have been out of the question. Lexical choices, as regards expletives and sexually connotated words especially, are made much more consciously than those made in phonetic-phonological variation. The phenomenon of lexical variation is rather categorical: a certain word or expression is either used or it is not. In the case of phonetic-phonological variation, however, it is always a difference of degree: one's pronunciation inclines more or less towards standard Dutch. Needless to say, that the informants neither cursed nor used any obscene coarse language in front of us.

In the following two sections I will describe the language use component and language attitude component of the interview in more detail.

2.3 LANGUAGE USE COMPONENT

2.3.1 *Phonetic-phonological variation*

The language use component focusses on pronunciation, for the following reasons. Firstly, the findings can be compared to the consistent linguistic pattern between women and men found in the United States and Britain (e.g. Labov 1966, Trudgill 1974). Secondly, phonetic-phonological variants are easier to study than lexical and syntactic variants in respect of frequency and potential occurrence, and in respect of absence of referential meaning. A great

number of phonetic-phonological variants occur in a short record of spontaneous speech. The occurrence of a variant and the total number of occurrences of that variable can simply be compared since phonetic variants have no referential meaning (e.g. Lavandera 1978). Thirdly, social judgements about phonetic-phonological variants are much more clearly marked than, for example, judgements on syntactic variants (Jansen 1980). Fourth, these variables allow scaling on a linear axis.

Little has been written about the Amsterdam dialect, in spite of its special position among other Dutch urban dialects; it has relatively high prestige, in the same way as, for example, London Cockney (Kloke 1934, Daan 1949, Faddegon 1951, Daan 1954, Vangassen 1965). Apart from going into the differing dialects in Amsterdam in the past, main topics in these writings are lexical differentiation, i.e. Amsterdam 'Bargoens' (Endt and Frerichs 1972), and phonetic-phonological differentiation such as diphthongization of (ee) and (oo) in Amsterdam vernacular, monophthongization of (ei) and (ui), devoicing of (v) and (z), and palatalization of (a). H.F. Schatz gives a more detailed overview of studies about urban dialects in the Netherlands and the development of Amsterdam dialect (Schatz 1986: 17-35).

Only three studies using tape recordings have been reported. J. Mittelmeijer taped the speech of small groups of schoolchildren from various parts of Amsterdam and investigated the sound system as to rounding of (aa), diphthongization of (ee) and (oo), monophthongization of (au), (ui) and (ei), palatalization of (a), (e), (o), (i), (u) and (s), and devoicing of (g), (v) and (z) (Mittelmeijer 1959). Inevitably, his observations remain rather unsystematic in this pre-sociolinguistic approach. In a pilot study by Annette van der Post and myself (Brouwer and Van der Post 1976) ten girls and ten boys from a lower middle class and an upper class secondary school were interviewed. An analysis of three phonetic-phonological variables, rounding of (aa), monophthongization of (ei) and devoicing of (z), did show a slightly greater standard usage by girls compared to boys in the lower middle class group only. There was, however, always a remarkable distance in standard usage between the upper class pupils and lower middle class pupils, such that use of the Amsterdam dialect was characterized by social markers rather than gender markers in this study. Finally, H.F. Schatz used 40 out of 136 recordings of a corpus of Amsterdam speech (Schatz 1986) which had been collected for the purpose of calculating word frequencies in spoken Dutch (Heikens 1978, De Jong ed. 1979). She studied five phonetic-phonological variables, rounding and nasalization of (aa), diphthongization of (ee), palatalization of (l) and (s), and velarization and flap of (r), in the speech of twenty women and twenty men, aged 20-25 and 50-55, from low and high socio-economic status. The greatest use of non-standard

variants was found in men, the younger age group and the low status group.

Table 2.4 summarizes the linguistic variables, including those from the present study, about which sociolinguistic results have been obtained as regards the use of Amsterdam dialect by women and men.

Table 2.4 Overview of phonetic-phonological and social variables from three sociolinguistic studies on Amsterdam dialect

phonetic-phonological variables

	(aa)	(ee)	(oo)	(au)	(ei)	(s)	(l)	(r)	(z)
study	BP				BP				BP
	S	S				S	S	S	
	BS	BS	BS	BS	BS				BS

social variables

study	BP		S				BS	
age	12-15		20-25		50-55		25-40	
socio-economic status	low	high	low	high	low	high	lower	middle
female	5	5	5	5	5	5	48	
male	5	5	5	5	5	5	48	
total	20						40	
							96	

BP	Brouwer and Van der Post (1976)
S	Schatz (1986)
BS	Brouwer and Schenk-van Witsen (1983) / the present study

The rather few linguistic phenomena studied and the low total number of informants involved (9 phonetic-phonological variables and 156 informants over three studies) clearly show how little is yet known about the sociolinguistic structure of Amsterdam vernacular (Table 2.4).

2.3.2 *Six linguistic variables*

The choice of the phonetic-phonological variables in the present study was based on both the above literature and on our own knowledge of the Amsterdam dialect. Three vowels, two diphthongs and one consonant were chosen: (aa) in words like *balen* (to be fed up) and *gaan* (to go), (ee) in *eten* (to eat) and *veel* (much), (oo) in *kopen* (to buy) and *boot* (boat), (au) in *kauwen* (to chew) and *zout* (salt), (ei) in *ijs* (ice) and *gein* (fun) and (z) in *gezanik*

(nagging) and *zon* (sun). The original intention to study also the diphthong (ui) in words like *buiten* (outside) and *huis* (house) could not be sustained (cf. below).

Figure 2.4 gives a representation of the Dutch vowel space through phonetic-phonological features (after Booij 1981: 19). The representation is in accordance with the Standard Dutch pronunciation - 'Algemeen Beschaafd Nederlands' or 'ABN' (General Cultured Dutch) - which is generally considered to be the prestige variety, used in school, media and official contexts.

Figure 2.4 Standard Dutch vowels

The diphthongs in Dutch consist of a relatively low vowel, the pronunciation of which is followed by a rapid movement in the direction of the corresponding high vowel. The composition of these sounds can be represented as in the diagram in Figure 2.5 on the next page (after Trommelen & Zonneveld 1979: 17).

Figure 2.5 Standard Dutch diphthongs

Roughly, the composition of the three Dutch diphthongs in Amsterdam vernacular could be reflected as in the following diagram in Figure 2.6.

Figure 2.6 Amsterdam vernacular diphthongs

The six phonetic-phonological variables chosen as dependent variables are characterized by the following distinctive features in standard Dutch and dimensions of variation in Amsterdam vernacular which were taken into account in this study.

[a]: [+low], [-back], [-round]

The variable (aa) has in Amsterdam vernacular the features [+back] and [+round], whereas the standard pronunciation is characterized by the features [-back] and [-round].

[e]: [+mid], [-back], [-round] and [o]: [+mid], [+back], [+round]

The long vowels (ee) and (oo) are strongly diphthongized in non-standard Amsterdam pronunciation. The first element of the diphthong can also be lower compared to the standard Dutch vowel.

[ou]: [+mid], [-mid], [+back], [+round]

The first element of the diphthong (au) may be fronted and unrounded in Amsterdam vernacular, becoming a long stretched α ; there is also a variant, although rare, in which this diphthong, in lowering, becomes a monophthong.

The composition of standard and Amsterdam vernacular (au) may be described as follows:

standard Dutch		Amsterdam vernacular	
α	$\longrightarrow$ u	α	$\longrightarrow$ α
$\begin{bmatrix} +\text{low} \\ +\text{back} \\ -\text{round} \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} -\text{low} \\ +\text{back} \\ +\text{round} \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} +\text{low} \\ +\text{back} \\ -\text{round} \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} +\text{low} \\ +\text{mid} \\ +\text{round} \end{bmatrix}$

[ei]: [+mid], [-mid], [-back], [-round]

In case of (ei) two articulatory dimensions can be distinguished: the (ei) varies in height and in degree of monophthongization. Amsterdam vernacular is marked by both lowering of the first element of the diphthong and by monophthongization.

The composition of standard and Amsterdam vernacular (ei) is roughly:

standard Dutch

$\epsilon \longrightarrow$	i / e
$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{- high} \\ \text{- back} \\ \text{- round} \\ \text{- low} \end{array} \right]$	$\left[\begin{array}{l} \pm \text{high} \\ \text{- back} \\ \text{- round} \\ \text{- low} \end{array} \right]$

Amsterdam vernacular

$\alpha / \text{æ} \longrightarrow$	i / e
$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{- high} \\ \text{+back} \\ \text{- round} \end{array} \right]$	$\left[\begin{array}{l} \pm \text{high} \\ \text{- back} \\ \text{- round} \\ \text{- low} \end{array} \right]$

As can also be seen in Table 2.5 in section 2.3.3, it was decided to score the two dimensions of the linguistic variable (ei) - lowering and monophthongization - separately, giving variables (ei-height) and (ei-monophthongization). Although nine variants were at first distinguished, the reliability analysis ended up with six variants because of difficulties and disagreement in scoring and because of further statistical considerations.

[z]: [+voice], [-tense]

The voiced alveolar fricative (z) is devoiced and tensed in Amsterdam vernacular and has, in its most extreme vernacular form, a palatalized variant.

Figure 2.7 gives a vowel space picture of Amsterdam vernacular variants of the vowels and diphthongs under study.

Figure 2.7 Amsterdam vernacular variants of (aa), (ee), (oo), (au) and (ei)

Because of both the complex nature of the variable (ui) and its low frequency, it was decided to omit this linguistic variable from further analyses. The diphthong (ui) is characterized by monophthongization and unrounding in Amsterdam vernacular. Both the height of the starting point and the degree of diphthongization can vary, and, in addition, the diphthongization can follow two directions, towards either an unrounded front vowel position, glide-element /i/, or a rounded back vowel, /u/.

Compared to composition of (ui) in standard Dutch, the Amsterdam vernacular realizations may be said to have the following distinctive features:

standard Dutch		Amsterdam vernacular		
œ —→ ü		œ —→ i / j and/or u / w		
[- high - back +round]	[+high - back +round]	[- high - back +round]	[+high - back - round]	[+high +back +round]

In scoring this diphthong (ui) the ear appeared to be a far from 'superb instrument for judging which of several possibilities are realized' (Labov 1972b: 202). This is probably due to the three-dimensional character of the variation. In the reliability analysis, it was the rule rather than the exception for seven scorers to use the whole range of a 4-point scale in judging the same realization of (ui). In addition, the linguistic variable (ui) has a very low frequency of occurrence in spoken Dutch compared to some other linguistic variables, and also, not unexpectedly, occurring in a limited number of words. It was common to find hardly ten occurrences of (ui) in the transcriptions where the word *uit* (out) was the most frequent.

2.3.3 Transcription and scoring

From the informal part of each interview, a fragment was transcribed long enough to contain a number of fifty occurrences of each of the linguistic variables under study. The fragment was always an unbroken part of casual speech beginning as soon as the conversation was getting well underway, usually after pouring the beverage suited to the time of the day.

The transcriptions were spelled phonemically which means that the utterances were rewritten as far as possible according to corresponding Dutch phonemes. The spelling instructions were identical to those used in a

sociolinguistic investigation in Nijmegen (Van Hout 1982b; uniform data processing of Dutch linguistic corpora serves general accessibility and utility). Following the spelling instructions all speech fragments have been transcribed and put on disk by two assistants, both advanced students in the Faculty of Arts. A great advantage of computer processing of the transcriptions is that all kinds of lists of the variables to be studied are easily available.

Using the transcriptions and lists of words containing the phonetic-phonological variables, an analysis with regard to the reliability of the scoring took place. The aim was both to establish the rating scales of the linguistic variables and to train the ears of Rosalien Schenk-Witsen and myself in order to bring them into line for scoring. Apart from the two of us and the supervisor, two female and two male linguists, all experts on phonetics or on the Amsterdam dialect, also participated.

Table 2.5 shows the resulting variants distinguished and the rating scales used. The scores range from low (= standard variant) to high (= non-standard variant).

Table 2.5 Phonetic-phonological variables and rating scales

1 - 5: standard variant - non-standard variant							
	(aa)	(ee)	(oo)	(au)	(ei-height)	(ei-monophthongization)	(z)
1.	a.	e.	o.	əu	ei / ɛ. ^(ə)	ei / æi / ai	z
2.	ɑ.	e. ⁱ	o. ^u	ɑu	æi / æ. ^(ə)	ɛ. ^(ə) / æ. ^(ə) / a. ^(ə)	ʒ
3.	ɑ. ^ə	ei	ou	au	ai / a. ^(ə)	—	s
4.	ɔ.	ei	ɑu	ɑ:	—	—	ʒ
5.	—	æi	—	—	—	—	—

In the scoring of the linguistic variables (aa), (ee), (oo) and (z), some restrictions were taken into account depending on linguistic environment. When the long vowel (aa) is unstressed and is followed by a syllable which is stressed, it is easily reduced or pronounced as a schwa, as in a word like *banaan*, [bənan] (banana). Words in which this could have been the case have been left out of the scoring. As to (ee) and (oo), occurrences before [r] are not

scored because of the lengthening of these vowels in which the (ee) is almost pronounced as [i] in a word like *pit* (seed). As to (z), words in which this consonant was preceded by the consonants [p], [k], [f] or [t] have been left out of consideration. The voiced alveolar fricative (z) becomes devoiced in words such as *opzeggen* (cancel), *spraakzaam* (talkative) and *grafzerk* (gravestone) and both devoiced and tensed in such word combinations as *het zand* (the sand).

The language use scores, together with the codes for all the other variables were computer processed using procedures from the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

2.3.4 Informal and formal speech

Part of the informal section of the interview was transcribed and about fifty occurrences of each of the linguistic variables (aa), (ee), (oo), (au), (ei) and (z) were scored.

During the formal part of the interview a text and word list were read by the informants. The reading text contained 51, 27, 26, 12, 39, 21 and 38 occurrences of the linguistic variables (aa), (ee), (oo), (au), (ei), (ui) and (z) respectively and the word list 10 of each of the variables (Appendices 2 and 3).

2.4 LANGUAGE ATTITUDE COMPONENT

2.4.1 Language variation and language evaluation

Sociolinguistics - 'the study of language and speech within the context of society and culture' (Appel, Hubers and Meijer 1979: 129) - is a relatively young field of research. Similarly, linguists have only recently discerned the questions of language variation and language evaluation as a result of an enduring normative conception of their task. In 1951, the Dutch linguist C.B. van Haeringen advocated a clear standard language norm:

'Is there something "linguistically unscientific" in determining the apparent limits of phonetic freedom? And why should we not have the right to propagate the norm thus found? To a certain extent, it is even our duty to do so, as language pedagogues (...)' (Van Haeringen 1951: 316, 317).

In the Sixties such a conception of linguistic norms was gradually pushed into the background in the research community in favour of the idea that no linguistic variety can be seen as better or more attractive than another for inherent reasons. The use of the vernacular has become recognized, especially since the study of William Labov on Black English. Given the structural and

functional equivalence of standard and non-standard varieties, the latter were no longer seen as deficient but as different (Labov 1972a). As regards language evaluation, the hypothesis of 'inherent value' was replaced by the hypothesis of an 'imposed norm' (Trudgill and Giles 1976). The fact that speakers give favourable judgements about the standard variety is due to the cultural pressure from the ruling social class upon the other members of a speech community; this class sets up the norms, and possesses the means (school, mass media) to impose them on others. However, not only norms, but also social connotations play a part in this process. Language varieties are judged on the basis of a complex of social, cultural, regional, political and personal associations and prejudices. Such social connotations are, however, also evaluated within the norms and values prevailing in a society. In short, both social norms and values and a personal stand towards these contribute to the evaluation of a language variety (e.g. Ebertowski 1980).

Ideas and feelings about language varieties, language behaviour and language users can be denominated attitudes. The notion of attitude, coming from social psychology, cannot easily be caught in one definition. An attitude is a disposition or inclination towards a social object, which either directly determines or at least colours and influences the reactions towards that object (Knops 1987). It is generally assumed that the concept of attitude consists of a cognitive, affective or evaluative and conative component, which can be conceived as people's knowledge and appraisal of the attitude object and action tendencies with respect to the object (e.g. Fishbein and Ajzen 1975). The cognitive component consists of all kinds of information and knowledge or beliefs about the object, mostly of a social- stereotypical nature. The feelings linked with all the attributes associated with the object form the affective or evaluative component. The complexity of research into attitudes becomes immediately clear: it is possible for people with similar beliefs to have diverging attitudes because of their different evaluations of the attributes, in the same way as it is possible to have different beliefs and similar attitudes. A strong relation between attitudes and behaviour was hardly ever found. It seems, however, likely that attitudes are learned from previous experience, that they are enduring and are positively related to behaviour in the sense that they can be seen as 'predisposition' to behaviour (Agheysi and Fishman 1970: 139).

The importance of studying linguistic attitudes, particularly within a sociolinguistic framework, has been concisely stated by Uus Knops (Knops 1983: 281). First, language attitudes are an integrated part of the communicative competence and therefore explain both the language behaviour and the reactions to it on the part of the members of a speech community. Second, language attitudes are learned during the socialization process within a

speech community and therefore both are determined by and in turn determine the social structure and cultural value system within a speech community.

There are several ways to study and measure attitudes: a) observation of behaviour, b) direct or indirect questions about the attitude object, in which a measuring instrument, an attitude scale, is often applied. Observation of behaviour as a method to measure attitudes seems to be least preferable (e.g. Agheyisi and Fishman 1970). Firstly, since the attitude object is not constantly present, it is often difficult to conduct sufficient observations. Secondly, attitudes are not always manifest in actual behaviour, which may even be aimed at hiding feelings and attitudes. Thirdly, it is impossible to determine valency, or the degree of approval or disapproval. Disadvantages of direct questions include a social aversion to overt statements about feelings and attitudes, unawareness of attitudes or any chance of rationalizing them. An additional problem in the case of open questions is the impossibility of drawing comparisons within the great diversity of responses. In view of this, an attitude scale is usually applied, involving in questionnaire form, a series of meticulously selected statements about a specific object and a cumulative scale which gives the opportunity to measure both the valency and the attitude intensity. In addition, the 'matched- guise' technique developed by the Canadian social psychologist Wallace E. Lambert and his other colleagues (Lambert et al. 1960) is often used in order to reveal judgements about language use in a more indirect or hidden way. This procedure involves informants listening to a series of apparently different speakers who provide the linguistic stimulus material, each reading on tape the same passage of prose. The informants are then required to evaluate the speakers on various rating scales. The speaker is in fact one and the same person using different guises of the dialect under study in order to exclude intervening variables such as voice quality and make sure that the answers reflect the attitudes towards the particular language variety. The answers given in such more indirect attitude measurement can be taken as reports of linguistic behaviour.

The research results on linguistic variation and linguistic attitudes with regard to both the attitudes of women and men towards language varieties, and their attitudes towards the language use of female and male speakers, were presented in section 1.3 of the first chapter.

The attitude tests from the Amsterdam investigation described below reveal feelings about certain linguistic variants, while at the same time indicating the degree to which people adapt to the norms, values and stereotypes prevailing in society. Since the results from the attitude tests can in part be compared with the linguistic data from the interviews, some insight can also be gained into

the relation between linguistic attitudes and actual speech behaviour.

The Amsterdam investigation utilizes in its own way actually both approaches mentioned above to measure linguistic attitudes. Firstly, there is the speech behaviour of women and men during the interview, where they may differ in their use of standard pronunciation and Amsterdam vernacular. Secondly, the linguistic attitude tests on the phonetic-phonological, morpho-syntactic and lexical levels concern direct questions about the language use of the informants and the test on feelings about the Amsterdam dialect in general direct and more indirect questions. Besides, in the linguistic attitude tests on social status, toughness, personality traits, and on femininity and masculinity, the more sophisticated 'matched-guise' technique is used in order to discover the more unconscious judgements about the language use of women and men.

Below, I will refer to the first four linguistic attitude tests as self-evaluation tests, although the Amsterdam dialect test also contains more general questions, and to the latter four attitude tests, using the matched-guise technique, as subjective reaction tests. I made this distinction using as a criterion a more direct or indirect measurement of linguistic attitudes and the resulting more conscious or unconscious linguistic attitudes revealed.

We presented the informants with four self-evaluation tests in order to gain insight into the attitudes of the Amsterdam women and men toward standard Dutch and Amsterdam vernacular followed by four subjective reaction tests - using two speech recordings - in order to determine any connotations of either varieties with social competence and with femininity or masculinity. In addition, male and female stimuli were used in all recordings, to get an evaluation of the informants' own speech as accurately as possible, by giving both men and women the opportunity to identify themselves, as well as to investigate whether the female and male stimuli would be evaluated differently.

In the next two sections I will describe the language attitude tests on self-evaluation and subjective reaction.

2.4.2 Four self-evaluation tests

Three linguistic attitude tests on self-evaluation involve questions about standard Dutch and Amsterdam vernacular on phonetic-phonological, morpho-syntactic and lexical levels, while the fourth test contains more general questions with regard to the Amsterdam dialect.

The items of the second and third test rely heavily on our own intuitions, since little is known in detail about morpho-syntactical or lexical variants of Amsterdam vernacular. Only Marinel Gerritsen has investigated some morpho-syntactic and lexical variants in women's and men's speech using the same

corpus of Amsterdam speech as mentioned above in section 2.3.1 (Heikens 1978, De Jong ed. 1979). She gives as examples the morpho-phonological variant *ken* versus the standard Dutch variant *kan* (can), the morpho-syntactic variant *hun* versus *zij* (they) and the phenomenon of double negation. As lexical variables, she studied the use of swear words and slang. In this study, no significant differences between women's and men's speech were found with respect to these morpho-syntactic and lexical variables (Gerritsen 1980).

I. Phonetic-phonological test

Recordings of one female and one male voice were listened to. These comprised the standard and non-standard pronunciations of twenty words containing the phonetic-phonological variables under study. For each word pair the informants were asked which of both pronunciations was closest to their own. A two-point rating scale was used: 1. standard variant, 2. non-standard variant.

The words presented were chosen from the reading text and word list and contained two examples of the linguistic variables (aa), (ee) and (oo), three of (au) and (ui), four of (ei), one of (s) and three of (z).

A reliability test was carried out to ensure that the test items were unidimensional, i.e. that they measured the same property. The results generally showed strong item-total correlations ($r > .40$) and internal consistency of the test ($\alpha > .85$). Three of the items with a lower item-total correlation (14, 18, 20) have been omitted from further analyses, for the following reasons. Test item 14, containing the linguistic variable (ij) in [vrɛi] (free) was often heard as [fra.j] (pretty) by the informants; the items containing (z) have been left out because of their relatively high means (Appendix 4).

II. Morpho-syntactic test

The informants were presented with twelve examples of standard and non-standard usage containing morphological and syntactic variants, and asked to indicate which variant was closest to their own usage. A two-point rating scale was used: 1. standard variant, 2. non-standard variant.

The first eight items are examples of morphological variants of the verbs *kennen* (to know), *hebben* (to have), *liggen* (to lie), and *kunnen* (can) and of the personal pronouns *zichzelf* (himself), *zij* (they), *mij* (me) and *ik* (I); the last four items concern variants which are representative of the Dutch language rather than of Amsterdam dialect specifically:

1. singular past *kon* versus standard Dutch *kende* (knew)
2. 3rd person singular present *heb* versus *heeft* (has)

3. 3rd person singular present *legt* versus *ligt* (lies)
4. 3rd person singular present *ken* versus *kan* (can)
5. 3rd person singular reflexive pronoun *z'n eigen* (literally: his own) versus *zichzelf* (himself)
6. oblique 3rd plural *hun* versus *zij* (they) in subject position
7. *van mijn* versus *van mij* (mine)
8. 1st person oblique *mij* versus *ik* (I) in subject position
9. the double negation *nooit geen* (never none) versus *nooit* (never)
10. the adjective *enigste* versus *enige* (only) originally a superlative
11. syntactical construction involving comparative *als* rather than *dan* (than)
12. syntactical construction involving hypercorrective *dan* versus *als* (as)

On the basis of a reliability test, seven items (2, 4, 6 to 9, 12) had to be omitted (Appendix 5).

III. Lexical test

The informants were presented with a list of ten expletives and asked whether they would use them or not and in which situation they would use them: alone, in the presence of partner, child, friends, formal acquaintances. A six-point rating scale was used: 0. no usage of the expletive; 2., 3., 4., 5. usage of the expletive in two, three, four, five situations.

It was decided to focus on expletives and coarse expressions because of their strong connotations of femininity and masculinity. In addition, some studies about expletives based on questionnaires carried out in the United States showed that women reported that they used swear words less than men, let alone the stronger ones, and that they used them more often when alone than in the presence of others (Oliver and Rubin 1975, Bailey and Timm 1976).

The lexical items in the test concern two weaker expletives, five stronger ones and three terms of abuses (approximate translations are given bearing the same connotation):

1. (*mijn*) *hemel* (heavens)
2. *jasses/jesses* (bother)
3. *verdomme* (damn)
4. *jezus* (Jesus)
5. *godverdomme* (goddamn)
6. *kut* (cunt; fuck, shit)
7. *klote* (balls)
8. *trut* (cow)
9. *lul* (prick; asshole)

10. *klootzak* (jerk)

On the basis of a reliability test, two items (1, 2), the weaker expletives, have been omitted (Appendix 6).

IV. Amsterdam dialect test

Five direct and three indirect questions were asked to determine the informant's attitude towards the standard pronunciation and the local accent. The first three questions concerned the local accent, the fourth and fifth the Amsterdam dialect compared to a northern and southern Dutch dialect respectively, while the last three questions concerned the attitude of outsiders against the Amsterdam dialect.

The Amsterdam dialect test appeared to be too heterogeneous to take the summated responses into further consideration, so that the items will be dealt with separately in further analyses (Appendix 7).

2.4.3 *Four subjective reaction tests*

The linguistic attitude tests on subjective reaction focus on the social and gender-linked connotations of standard Dutch pronunciation and Amsterdam vernacular, using the matched-guise technique and semantic differential scaling.

Two different speech recordings were used, one for the first three tests and the other for the fourth test.

In the first three tests on social status, toughness, and personality traits, the informants were asked to give judgements about eight speakers; the recordings were made according to the matched-guise procedure, using two female and two male voices speaking the same passage of prose containing the phonetic-phonological variants under study, in standard and non-standard pronunciation.

The passage of prose was:

'Kruispunten in Amsterdam zijn veel te gevaarlijk om even gauw over te steken. Als je niet uitkijkt, lig je voor je het weet in het ziekenhuis.'
(Crossings in Amsterdam are much too dangerous to just rush over. If you don't watch out, you are in hospital before you know it.)

After each passage three questions were asked, concerning the social prestige, the gender-based connotations, and social and gender-stereotypical connotations of language varieties.

I. Social status

After each of the eight passages of prose recorded as described above the following question was asked:

'Which is the highest ranked occupation he/she could fulfil?'

The informants could choose from five occupations ranked from high to low (medical doctor, teacher, policeman / woman, waiter / waitress, factory worker). The occupation choice represented the occupational groups 6, 5, 3, 2 and 1 (Van Westerlaak, Kropman and Collaris 1975).

II. Toughness

The second question after each of the eight passages of prose as described above was:

'Which part in a film would give her / him the least trouble?'

The informants could choose from five film roles ranked from feminine to masculine (fashion designer, bank-clerk, reporter, taxi-driver, gangster). The choice of the film roles was inspired by the toughness ('ruigheid') scale used by Arjen Florijn (Florijn 1980).

III. Personality traits

Finally, nine questions were asked after each of the eight passages of prose as described above about the personality traits of the speaker:

'How would you judge the personality of the speaker?'

Nine contrasting traits (bipolar adjectives) had been chosen to represent the dimensions of social success, personal integrity, social attractiveness and gender-stereotyping. Six-rating scales were used (independent - dependent, easy-going - complaining, strong - weak, reliable - unreliable, warm-hearted - cool, hard - gentle, bold - shy, aggressive - quiet, egotistic - self-effacing). The gender-stereotypes represent both positive 'female' and 'male' traits, gentleness and independence, and negative ones, weakness, complainingness and aggressiveness, egotism (Elyan et al. (1978: 127)

IV. Femininity - masculinity

In the fourth test on subjective reaction, the informants listened to ten recorded passages of prose according to the matched guise procedure. The passages were identical except for pronunciation, i.e. standard and non-standard:

'Eigenlijk zou je zomers naar de zee of de duinen moeten gaan' (Actually, one should go to the sea or dunes in summertime).

They were recorded by a woman with an androgynous voice and by one woman and one man with their real voices and their phonetically manipulated voices, with equalized pitch contours. After each passage the informants were asked to say whether a man or a woman was speaking.

The phonetic manipulations aimed at equalizing the female and male voices, creating a sort of 'middle voice', for which purpose the F_0 of the female speaker was lowered and the F_0 of the male speaker was raised; moreover, the F_0 variability in the female voice was reduced. However, the manipulations in which the pitch contours of the female and male speaker were equalized as much as possible, did not result in the perfect middle voices as was the intention, partly since this was impossible because of the unequal duration of the voiced components. In addition, the pitch contours were equalized as far as was consistent with the recordings sounding natural.

The results from the Amsterdam investigation will be presented in the following three chapters: two concerning language use and one on language attitudes. In the next chapter, I will document the linguistic variation found.

Linguistic variation

3.0 INTRODUCTION

A central component in our research was sociolinguistic variation in Amsterdam Dutch. I will deal with it in two chapters. In this chapter, the results on the use of standard Dutch and Amsterdam vernacular by women and men will be presented on the basis of an analysis of the seven linguistic variables, (aa), (ee), (oo), (au), (ei-height), (ei-monophthongization) and (z). First, in section 3.1, I will compare the language use of all informants during the informal and formal parts of the interview (casual speech, reading style, word list). The phenomenon of style shifting is analyzed by taking into account both the degree of shift between styles and the degree of variance within a style. In section 3.2 the language use of women and men in the several interview situations is looked at in order to test the basic hypotheses about a greater standard usage and greater style shift by women and a greater use of Amsterdam vernacular and smaller style shift by men. In section 2.2.1 of the second chapter, I formulated two hypotheses, a. and b., to this effect. Finally, in section 3.3 I will try to uncover a covariation pattern among the seven linguistic variables under study, and to answer the question to what extent the pattern found can be interpreted in terms of a more general underlying standard/non-standard dimension in Amsterdam vernacular. Apart from the importance of establishing whether the linguistic variables under investigation are representative for language variation between standard and non-standard in Amsterdam vernacular, a general measure for the degree of standard and non-standard usage will make it possible to determine the influence of gender relative to that of the other independent variables in a more reliable and valid way. This is what I will attempt in the next chapter.

3.1 STYLE SHIFT AND VARIATION WITHIN STYLES

3.1.1 *Mean scores in style shifting*

Concerning the phonetic-phonological variables under study, the variants distinguished and rating scales used were presented in section 2.3.3 of the second chapter (Table 2.5). Following sociolinguistic tradition, indexes were calculated. The average index scores of the linguistic variables were calculated by attributing a score of 0 to the first (standard) variant and a score of 1 to the second, 2 to the third etc., after which the total sum of the scores is divided by the maximum possible total score and multiplied by 100. The resulting index ranges from 0 (throughout usage of the standard variant) to 100 (throughout usage of the most extreme non-standard variant). In case of, for example, (aa) where four variants were rated, the formula is:

$$(((n_{(aa)-1} * 0 + (n_{(aa)-2} * 1) + (n_{(aa)-3} * 2) + (n_{(aa)-4} * 3)) / (N_{(aa)} * 3)) * 100.$$

Suppose that of 50 occurrences of (aa) scored in casual speech, there were 28 occurrences of (aa)-1, 16 of (aa)-2, 4 of (aa)-3 and 2 of (aa)-4, this would give the following formula:

$$(((28 * 0) + (16 * 1) + (4 * 2) + (2 * 3)) / (50 * 3)) * 100 = 30/150 * 100, \text{ resulting in an average index score for (aa) of 20.00.}$$

Similarly, the means of the other linguistic variables for each of the three styles were calculated.

The procedure of using mean scores for establishing style shifting is especially suitable if the rating scale used corresponds with the standard/non-standard dimension and at the same time with an unidimensional phonetic-phonological scale. This applies, for example, to the variable (aa) which ranges from a - standard - front unrounded vowel towards a - non-standard - back rounded vowel. Before calculating mean scores the frequency patterns of the separate variants of a linguistic variable were examined in order to estimate their relative position and importance and the consistency and regularity of the style shifting pattern.

As an example, the frequency pattern of the four variants of the variable (aa) is given in Table 3.1. The frequencies are the sum of the occurrences of the variants for all informants (n=96) together in the three styles. From the informal section of the interview (casual speech) about 50 occurrences of (aa) were scored, while the text (reading style) and word list contained 51 and 10 occurrences of this variable respectively.

Table 3.1 Absolute frequencies and percentages of (aa)-variants in three styles

	casual speech		reading style		word list	
(aa)-1	1467	32.7%	1914	39.5%	499	52.0%
(aa)-2	2583	57.6%	2693	55.6%	427	44.5%
(aa)-3	418	9.3%	233	4.8%	33	3.4%
(aa)-4	5	0.3%	4	0.1%	1	0.1%
Total	4473	100%	4844	100%	960	100%

The data in Table 3.1 show the very low frequency of occurrence of the, extreme non-standard, (aa)-4 variant. Otherwise, it shows a regular shifting pattern. From informal to formal speech the frequency of non-standard forms declines in favour of standard forms.

The individual score per style was then calculated as described above to find out whether such a style shift takes place in the speech of all informants. The question then is whether the scores in the three styles are different, or, whether differences between the scores observed can be attributed to the style factor. An analysis of variance was carried out to determine the significance of the style shifting.

Analysis of variance is a statistical technique to test whether differences between scores or measurements (the dependent variable) can be attributed to an independent variable or factor. The test statistic used is the so-called F ratio. The value of the F ratio has to exceed the critical probability level of .05 in order to reject the hypothesis that the independent variable involved does not influence the magnitude of the dependent variable and to accept the hypothesis that the independent variable brings about differences between the scores or measurements of the dependent variable. If the F value exceeds the probability level of .05, the effect of the independent variable is said to be significant. The F value depends on the so-called degrees of freedom (df) associated with the F ratio calculated; the degrees of freedom are related to, for instance, the number of categories in the effect to be tested and the number of subjects or measurements involved.

In order to test the effect of the style factor or the three style conditions on one of the linguistic variables a one-way analysis of variance with repeated measurements was applied (the style factor constitutes a fixed factor). The F ratios found for the seven linguistic variables and the mean scores in the three style conditions are given in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2 Mean scores for the seven linguistic variables in three styles and the F ratios of the differences between the three styles (n = 96)

	casual speech	reading style	word list	F ratio df=2,190
(aa)	26.24	21.88	16.03	130.83***
(ee)	40.00	36.88	34.34	44.83***
(oo)	48.34	43.92	42.59	27.51***
(au)	29.25	19.91	13.00	134.22***
(ei-height)	33.15	33.03	20.15	64.29***
(ei-monophthongization)	23.69	7.94	3.54	94.92***
(z)	69.13	66.03	54.84	81.69***

*** $p < .001$

one-way analysis of variance with repeated measurements (= style factor; fixed effect)

Figure 3.1 shows the casual speech, reading style and word list mean scores in a graph.

Figure 3.1 The distribution of (aa), (ee), (oo), (au), (ei-height), (ei-monophthongization) and (z) by style

A comparison of the mean scores in the three styles clearly shows a fall from informal to formal speech for all variables studied. So generally a regular and consistent style shifting was found. Evidently, (au) and (ei) in particular are stigmatized markers in Amsterdam vernacular, given their relatively steep slope of style shifting. However, the degree of shifting between casual speech and reading style was not always equal to that between reading style and word list and not all the variables showed the same degree of shifting. For example, with respect to (ei-m) a sharp fall took place between casual speech and reading style, while in the case of (ei-h) the sharpest fall occurred between reading style and word list.

The means of (ee) and (oo) appear to be relatively high. This is not surprising given the fact that the pure monophthongs (ee)-1 and (oo)-1 are barely found in the speech of inhabitants of the urban agglomeration in the West of the Netherlands (the 'Randstad'). The extremely high mean of the variable (z) indicates that the distinctive feature 'voiced' is disappearing in the standard variety as spoken in the West of the Netherlands.

3.1.2 *Variation scores in style shifting*

The above mean scores point to a different amount of non-standard and standard variants when comparing the three styles. They give insight into different usage of variants between styles rather than within styles. If style shifting is only looked at as a shift in mean occurrences, a shift is assumed to be a process in which speakers direct their attention merely to a greater non-standard or standard usage. But this might not be the whole story. It is conceivable that speakers not only change the object of their attention but also may use a more extensive speech repertoire in some styles, especially in informal speech, while restricting this in formal styles more to the standard part of the dialect-standard continuum (e.g. Van Hout 1984). In some situations it is more suitable to use a wide range of variants as a speech strategy than in others. The reasons are manifold. An extensive repertoire can be meaningful because of metaphorical language use, a speaker's wish to speak in a vivid way or to avoid a definite choice between language variants in respect of neutrality strategies (Scotton 1976). Until now, sociolinguists have paid little attention to these aspects in style shifting.

To establish the amount of variation in the choice of variants in one of the styles, the variance for each speaker within the style concerned has been calculated. The results are presented in Table 3.3.

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 (n = 96)

	casual speech	reading style	word list	F ratio df=2,190
(aa)	.204	.189	.161	6.83 **
(ee)	.263	.213	.181	21.02 ***
(oo)	.233	.223	.203	3.11 *
(au)	.261	.195	.154	23.73 ***
(ei-height)	.165	.175	.153	1.80
(ei-monophthongization)	.139	.054	.021	113.90 ***
(z)	.168	.199	.285	35.60 ***

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

one-way analysis of variance with repeated measurements (= style factor; fixed effect)

These results reveal a significant shift in the variation scores for all of the linguistic variables except for (ei-height). The informants obviously adapted the range of variants according to the formality of the speech style: the more formal the speech situation, the smaller the number of different variants of a linguistic variable used.

Only in the case of (z) does the pronunciation variation go the opposite way. Figure 3.2 shows the (z) variation as compared with that of (au).

Figure 3.2 Mean variation of (au) and (z) in three styles

There appears to be a sharp contrast between use of (z) and the other linguistic variables as regards the variation in pronunciation: the more formal the speech situation, the greater the number of different (z) variants used. This finding is in total agreement with both the great amount of non-standard usage in (z) as shown above in Table 3.2 and other observations about the disappearance of the opposition of voiced and voiceless fricatives in western Dutch : the voiced fricatives (v) and (z) are in the process of becoming voiceless (e.g. Gussenhoven and Bremmer 1983).

The usage of a greater amount of different variants of (z) as the formality of the speech situation increased indicates linguistic insecurity. Although the scores do not show this, we found examples of hypercorrection as well; the voiceless (s) was alternated with (z), resulting in hypercorrect pronunciations with voiced (s) in words such as *samen* (together) and *suiker* (sugar). Probably, many of the informants still knew that they ought to use the 'standard' voiced fricative, especially in more formal speech situations, but were no longer sure about exactly which fricatives had to be voiced.

3.2 LANGUAGE USE BY WOMEN AND MEN

3.2.1 *Gender and style*

Figures 3.3 through 3.9 give an impression of the degree of standard and Amsterdam dialect usage by women and men for the seven linguistic variables - (aa), (ee), (oo), (au), (ei-height), (ei-monophthongization) and (z) - and at the same time demonstrate the distribution of the linguistic variables along the standard/non-standard axis.

Figure 3.3 The distribution of (aa) by gender and style

Figure 3.4 The distribution of (ee) by gender and style

Figure 3.5 The distribution of (oo) by gender and style

Figure 3.6 The distribution of (au) by gender and style

Figure 37 The distribution of (ei-height) by gender and style

Figure 38 The distribution of (ei-monophthongization) by gender and style

Figure 39 The distribution of (z) by gender and style

The gender and style stratifications shown in Figures 3.3 through 3.9 indicate roughly the same pattern for all the linguistic variables: men use consistently more non-standard variants than women and both women and men show a shift from non-standard toward standard usage as the formality of the speech situation increases.

With regard to the basic hypothesis about a greater standard Dutch usage by women and a greater non-standard usage by men, a first comparison of the female ($n=48$) and male ($n=48$) mean scores for the seven phonetic-phonological variables for casual speech, reading style and word list reveals significant differences in eighteen of twenty-one cases: women indeed use the standard variants significantly more than men. In Table 3.4 the F ratios and levels of significance are given.

Table 3.4 F ratios of the differences in mean scores between women and men for the seven linguistic variables in three styles (number of couples = 48)

F ratio df=1,47	casual speech	reading style	word list
(aa)	45.77 **	48.29 **	49.03 **
(ee)	37.38 **	32.68 **	22.13 **
(oo)	22.24 *	42.58 **	21.20 **
(au)	11.65 **	8.01 **	3.38
(ei-height)	3.55	14.01 **	9.34 **
(ei-monophthongization)	24.07 **	8.35 **	1.70
(z)	10.13 **	6.98 **	9.19 **

** $p < .01$

one-way analysis of variance with repeated measurements (= couples; fixed effect)

Although we had expected our results to correspond with those found in the United States and Britain, the above pattern is even more pronounced than predicted: the Dutch women appeared to speak more standard than Dutch men on almost all phonetic-phonological variables.

Next, an analysis of variance was carried out for the female and male group to determine the significance of their style shift.

In Tables 3.5 and 3.6 the mean linguistic scores in the three styles, F ratios and levels of significance are given for women and men respectively.

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 (n = 48)

women	casual speech	reading style	word list	F ratio df=2,94
(a)	18.46	14.52	9.00	81.25***
(ee)	35.23	32.33	29.83	29.82***
(oo)	43.98	39.17	37.33	15.44***
(au)	24.79	16.50	10.75	57.04***
(ei-height)	30.46	25.02	15.23	55.56***
(ei-monophthongization)	14.15	3.90	1.88	34.36***
(z)	66.52	63.75	49.81	81.27***

*** p<.001

one-way analysis of variance with repeated measurements (= style factor; fixed effect)

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 (n = 48)

men	casual speech	reading style	word list	F ratio df=2,94
(aa)	34.02	29.23	23.06	57.29***
(ee)	44.77	41.42	38.85	18.40***
(oo)	52.71	48.67	47.85	12.05***
(au)	33.71	23.31	15.25	79.45***
(ei-height)	35.83	41.04	25.06	31.10***
(ei-monophthongization)	33.23	11.98	5.21	75.69***
(z)	71.73	68.31	59.88	21.77***

*** p<.001

one-way analysis of variance with repeated measurements (= style factor; fixed effect)

The results presented in Tables 3.5 and 3.6 point clearly to the significance of style shifting by both women and men for all linguistic variables.

3.2.2 Two approaches to women's and men's style shifting

As to the second of the basic hypotheses, do the Amsterdam women and men show differences in the degree of style shifting?

Table 3.7 shows the absolute difference scores between casual speech and word list reading style, the most informal and most formal part of the interview, for the seven linguistic variables.

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 (number of couples = 48)

linguistic variable	total	women	men	F ratio df=1,47
(aa)	10.21	9.46	10.96	.83
(ec)	5.66	5.40	5.92	.14
(oo)	5.75	6.65	4.85	.82
(au)	16.25	14.04	18.45	3.57
(ei-height)	13.00	15.23	10.77	4.01
(ei-monophthongization)	20.15	12.27	28.02	24.78 **
(z)	14.28	16.71	11.85	2.54

** $p < .01$

one-way analysis of variance with repeated measurements (= couples; fixed effect)

A comparison of these absolute difference scores between informal and formal speech points, contrary to our expectation, to a greater style shift by men for four of the seven linguistic variables; only in the case of (ei-monophthongization) is this difference significant.

However, in analyzing style shifting it may be more accurate to base the interpretation of the amount of shift on the relative position of the mean scores involved. The possible amount of style shifting is closely connected with the mean score for casual speech, or the degree of non-standard usage in the informal situation. The amount of standard in informal speech conditions the maximum possible style shift, in respect of the 'ceiling' of the possible degree of style shifting (Van Hout 1982a). Given a potential mean score between 0 (maximum standard usage) and 100 (maximum non-standard usage) a score of 40 in informal speech allows a maximum decrease of 40 in formal speech, a score of 80 a maximum decrease of 80 etc. In other words, the greater the standard usage in casual speech, the smaller the maximum possible style shift, and, the smaller the standard usage the greater the potential shift. Before determining relative style shifting it is necessary to test the implied assumption of a positive correlation between the actual mean score of a speaker in casual speech and her or his degree of style shifting. The data from the Amsterdam research confirm this assumption, as can be seen in Table 3.8. For five of the seven linguistic variables there appears to be a positive correlation between the mean scores in casual speech and the degree of style shift: the more non-standard variants in casual speech, the greater the style shift (see Table 3.8. on page 55).

Table 3.8 Correlations between absolute style shift and mean scores in casual speech (n = 96)

linguistic variable	correlation
(aa)	.47**
(ee)	.16
(oo)	.21*
(au)	.53**
(ei-height)	.23*
(ei-monophthongization)	.81**
(z)	.01

** p<.01, * p<.05
one-tailed test

In view of the speech differences between women and men described above, it seems the more appropriate to divide the style shift score by its maximum in order to compare women's and men's style shift as adequately as possible. Given a continuum ranging from non-standard (maximum score) towards standard (minimum score), the following formula may be applied to calculate the relative style shift:

Relative Style Shift = (Mean casual - Mean formal) / Mean casual.

In Table 3.9 the relative style shift of women and men thus found is presented

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 (number of couples = 48)

linguistic variable	total	women	men	F ratio df=1,47
(aa)	.474	.613	.336	19.78**
(ee)	.142	.151	.133	.28
(oo)	.107	.134	.080	1.48
(au)	.588	.606	.569	.27
(ei-height)	.444	.577	.311	11.73**
(ei-monophthongization)	.734	.664	.804	3.38
(z)	.210	.252	.167	3.92

** p<.01
one-way analysis of variance with repeated measurements (= couples; fixed effect)

Viewed in this perspective, it is the women who show a greater style shift. They score higher on six of the seven linguistic variables, although this is significant only in the case of (aa) and (ei-height). This result is more in line with the findings about absolute style shift in the work of William Labov and Peter Trudgill (e.g. Labov 1966, Trudgill 1972). Consequently, in their work, an approach to style shifting as a relative instead of absolute phenomenon would have revealed an even sharper contrast between women's and men's style shifting when applied to their data.

3.3 THE STANDARD/NON-STANDARD DIMENSION

3.3.1 *From variables to variety*

The analysis presented in this section is aimed at finding a general measure for the degree of standard/non-standard usage in order to determine the influence of gender on speech relative to those of other independent variables in a clear and more reliable and valid way. It focusses on the question whether the seven linguistic variables form a cluster representing one language variety. In other words, is there one underlying dimension for all variables which may be interpreted as standard/non-standard? Most of the findings described below have been evolved in cooperation with Roeland van Hout (cf. Brouwer and Van Hout 1984, Brouwer and Van Hout in preparation).

The study of language variation in sociolinguistics is rather one-sidedly directed towards separate analyses of linguistic variables. Little attention has been paid to the nature and strength of the relationships between linguistic variables. This may be due to the pessimistic idea that every linguistic variable has its own specific distribution pattern (cf. Hudson 1980). Empirical research into the co-occurrence of linguistic variables in the form of varieties, styles or registers is scarce. A strict co-occurrence relationship is not to be expected in a situation of language variability, of course. Given a continuum from standard to non-standard, relations of covariation among the linguistic variables are more probable, i.e. a certain degree of co-occurrence (e.g. Weinreich, Labov and Herzog 1966: 169ff). Covariation, or in a more technical sense, covariance, is a familiar concept in statistics and many methods and techniques have been developed to analyze covariation patterns of which the most well-known is factor analysis. For example, this technique has been applied for the analysis of sociolinguistic data to a set of linguistic variants in English and Spanish speech of Puerto-Rican speakers (Ma and Herasimchuk 1972).

Factor analysis is an analytic technique used for reducing a large set of

variables into a restricted set of meaningful, more general and underlying dimensions or factors. In this case, it is based on the correlation matrix between the variables. The three customary steps in factor analysis are: 1) the calculation of the correlation matrix, 2) the determination and extraction of the number of relevant factors, i.e. the exploration of possible data reduction, 3) the rotation to a terminal solution, i.e. the interpretation and naming of the factors.

Our data for a factor analysis are the 21 mean scores of the linguistic variables (seven variables in three styles) per informant. The degree of co-occurrence can be measured by the calculation of correlation coefficients, in this case the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. It is assumed that the relationships between the variables are linear: the value of one variable steadily increases or decreases as the value of the other variable increases or decreases in such a way that the pairs of values are ordered along a straight line. The actual relationships between pairs of variables can be examined by plotting the values of the variables on a graph (a so-called scatter diagram). The plots did not give cause for rejecting the assumption of linearity. The method used to extract the factors was principal axis factoring. In the next two sections I will discuss the step of data reduction and the interpretation of the factors.

3.3.2 Factor analysis of casual speech

First a separate factor analysis per style was carried out. The outcomes showed a great similarity, with the exception of those for the variable (ei-m), which is probably due to its low variance in the reading styles.

The analysis of casual speech will be discussed here briefly to illustrate the kind of outcomes. The correlations between the seven linguistic variables are presented in Table 3.10.

Table 3.10 Correlation coefficients of the seven linguistic variables in casual speech (n = 96)

	(aa)	(ee)	(oo)	(au)	(ei-h)	(ei-m)	(z)
(aa)	—	.72**	.73**	.56**	.51**	.64**	.54**
(ee)		--	.76**	.56**	.43**	.57**	.30**
(oo)			--	.62**	.65**	.54**	.47**
(au)				--	.65**	.68**	.43**
(ei-h)					--	.54**	.41**
(ei-m)						--	.30**
(z)							--

** p <.01
one-tailed test

In general, the correlations between the linguistic variables turn out to be quite high or very high (above .60) as can be seen from Table 3.10.

The factor analysis of the correlation matrix points to a solution with one underlying factor (only the first factor had an eigenvalue above 1). The explained variance for the unifactorial solution is 56.6%. Consequently, the factor loadings of the linguistic variables on this factor are high (most of them far above .40, which is considered to be the yardstick) as Table 3.11 shows.

Table 3.11 Factor loadings of the linguistic variables for a unifactorial solution ($n = 96$)

	factor 1
(aa)	0.84
(ee)	0.76
(oo)	0.86
(au)	0.78
(ei-height)	0.70
(ei-monophthongization)	0.73
(z)	0.52

The one underlying dimension looks easily interpretable as the standard/non-standard dimension. But how is the remaining variance to be explained? In case of the variable (z) errors in scoring seem a plausible explanation. The consensus in scoring this variable was far from impressive, which is only to be expected given the common feelings of insecurity about the voicedness of this consonant as described above in relation to style shifting, and this affected the people who scored as well, of course (cf. section 2.3.3). So a part of the remaining variance can be attributed to this kind of error, which also applies to a lesser extent in the case of the other linguistic variables. In addition, it is theoretically possible that each linguistic variable has its own autonomous variation pattern independently of the standard/non-standard continuum or that a subgroup of variables clusters around a specific (co)variational pattern.

The number of (seven) variables in the factor analysis above is not ideal to reveal less outspoken or moderate dimensions. Therefore, the whole set of seven linguistic variables by three styles, i.e. 21 variables, is factor analyzed in order to reveal possible factors typical of clusters of variables.

3.3.3 A model for the linguistic variables

To solve the question how many underlying factors are required to explain the correlational pattern between the linguistic variables satisfactorily, it would be helpful to have a model for the composition of the score of linguistic variables. It could be hypothesized that a mean score of a linguistic variable, and thereby the variance of the mean scores, consists of four components or effects:

- the effect of the standard / non-standard dimension;
- the cluster effect typical for a subgroup of variables (e.g. a process affecting a subset of vowels such as diphthongization);
- an effect specific to one particular linguistic variable
- error.

Statistical information on the first six factors regarding the total set of linguistic variables is given in Table 3.12.

Table 3.12 Initial statistics on the first six factors regarding the seven linguistic variables in three styles (n = 96)

factor	eigenvalue	pct. of variance	cum. pct.
1	12.16441	57.9	57.9
2	1.75545	8.4	66.3
3	1.48523	7.1	73.3
4	1.23631	5.9	79.2
5	0.70567	3.4	82.6
6	0.56363	2.7	85.3

A minimal eigenvalue of 1 is usually accepted as the criterion in determining the number of factors in a factor analysis. A decision to opt in further analyses for four factors could be based on both an eigenvalue of 1 (cf. Table 3.12) and the interpretability of the results in terms of the above multidimensional model of the composition of the score of a linguistic variable hypothesizing four components. First the most widely used method, (orthogonal) varimax rotation, was applied to the four factors. Table 3.13 gives the results.

Table 3.13 Factor matrix of the linguistic variables, varimax rotation (n = 96)

linguistic variable	factor 1	factor 2	factor 3	factor 4
casual speech (aa)	<u>.72</u>	.27	.22	<u>.40</u>
reading style (aa)	<u>.75</u>	.24	.25	<u>.35</u>
word list (aa)	<u>.73</u>	.17	.19	<u>.45</u>
casual speech (ee)	<u>.81</u>	.23	.26	.09
reading style (ee)	<u>.75</u>	.30	<u>.41</u>	.18
word list (ee)	<u>.68</u>	.14	<u>.53</u>	.17
casual speech (oo)	<u>.73</u>	<u>.41</u>	.08	.25
reading style (oo)	<u>.73</u>	.38	.14	.21
word list (oo)	<u>.65</u>	.25	.23	.12
casual speech (au)	.34	<u>.60</u>	.39	.23
reading style (au)	.32	<u>.52</u>	<u>.45</u>	.36
word list (au)	.28	<u>.40</u>	<u>.53</u>	.32
casual speech (ei-h)	.27	<u>.82</u>	-.04	.22
reading style (ei-h)	.32	<u>.88</u>	.09	.24
word list (ei-h)	.37	<u>.58</u>	.28	<u>.42</u>
casual speech (ei-m)	.37	<u>.56</u>	<u>.54</u>	.13
reading style (ei-m)	.24	.20	<u>.86</u>	.13
word list (ei-m)	.18	-.04	<u>.74</u>	.09
casual speech (z)	.21	.21	.03	<u>.78</u>
reading style (z)	.25	.25	.26	<u>.84</u>
word list (z)	.32	.27	.24	<u>.52</u>

(ei-h) (ei-height)

(ei-m) (ei-monophthongization)

In Table 3.13 the highest loadings of the linguistic variables are boxed and those loadings which are fairly high (>.40) are underscored. The results are not difficult to interpret. Roughly, the variables (aa), (ee) and (oo) can be traced back to factor 1, (au) and (ei-h) to factor 2, (ei-m) to factor 3, and (z) to factor 4. The dimension of standard/non-standard does not emerge clearly as a separate autonomous factor.

The ultimate goal of any rotation is, apart from obtaining some theoretically meaningful factors, to achieve the simplest structure possible. Several options are available. The above varimax rotation simplifies the columns of the factor matrix by maximizing the variance of the loadings in each column, i.e. minimizes the number of variables which have high loadings on a factor. The standard/non-standard dimension may become more manifest in a quartimax rotation, which maximizes the variance of the loadings in each row, i.e. minimizes the number of factors needed to explain a variable and is therefore more suited to reveal one general factor. Table 3.14 shows the resulting factor

matrix.

Table 3.14 Factor matrix of the linguistic variables, quartimax rotation
(*n* = 96)

linguistic variable	factor 1	factor 2	factor 3	factor 4
casual speech (aa)	<u>.87</u>	-.08	-.14	.08
reading style (aa)	<u>.88</u>	-.05	-.18	-.04
word list (aa)	<u>.84</u>	-.10	-.24	.14
casual speech (ee)	<u>.83</u>	-.04	-.19	-.22
reading style (ee)	<u>.90</u>	.10	-.11	-.14
word list (ee)	<u>.82</u>	.26	-.22	-.11
casual speech (oo)	<u>.84</u>	-.22	-.01	-.06
reading style (oo)	<u>.84</u>	-.16	-.03	-.09
word list (oo)	<u>.72</u>	-.02	-.10	-.15
casual speech (au)	<u>.74</u>	.16	.34	.02
reading style (au)	<u>.75</u>	.22	.27	.15
word list (au)	<u>.68</u>	.34	.18	.13
casual speech (ei-h)	<u>.64</u>	-.25	<u>.57</u>	.04
reading style (ei-h)	<u>.75</u>	-.15	<u>.60</u>	.03
word list (ei-h)	<u>.77</u>	.04	.30	.20
casual speech (ei-m)	<u>.75</u>	.30	.30	-.08
reading style (ei-m)	<u>.60</u>	<u>.70</u>	.03	-.03
word list (ei-m)	<u>.40</u>	<u>.64</u>	-.15	-.02
casual speech (z)	<u>.53</u>	-.12	.02	<u>.64</u>
reading style (z)	<u>.67</u>	.08	.02	<u>.66</u>
word list (z)	<u>.62</u>	.06	.03	.34

(ei-h) (ei-height)

(ei-m) (ei-monophthongization)

Again, the highest loadings of each variable are boxed and fairly high loadings (>.40) are underscored. The first rotated factor constitutes a general factor (that is, many variables tend to load highly on it), while subsequent factors seem to form subclusters of variables. The obvious conclusion is to interpret the first factor as the standard/non-standard dimension, while the other three factors may be used to subgroup the linguistic variables, e.g. (ei-height), (ei-monophthongization) and (z). These last outcomes meet the theoretical assumption of several components in a compositional model for the mean scores of the linguistic variables.

The covariation pattern found among the seven linguistic variables appears to be highly structured, and, for the greater part, this pattern can be traced back to one underlying dimension of standard/non-standard in the Amsterdam

vernacular. On the basis of the above analysis, there is no reason to distinguish separate or discrete varieties, registers or styles. The findings are in favour of the sociolinguistic notion that styles, varieties and registers consist of sets of co-occurrent language elements and contradict the idea that every linguistic variable is mainly characterized by its own unique distribution pattern.

The standard/non-standard dimension revealed will be used in further analyses of the relationships between the independent variables and speech in the next chapter.

Sociological factors

4.0 INTRODUCTION

We saw in chapter 3 that women used the standard Dutch forms more often and men the Amsterdam dialect forms (cf. section 3.2.1). Here this difference is analyzed in relation to the other primary independent variables, children and woman's employment, and in relation to the secondary independent variables, division of domestic tasks, social network, education and occupation.

In order to shed some light on the social mechanisms by which an association between speech features and gender is brought about, other variables in addition to gender were investigated. The inequality between the positions of women and men was incorporated in the research design by introducing having children and woman's employment in addition to gender as primary independent variables. Furthermore, data have been gathered on other social attributes such as division of tasks at home, social network features, education and occupation. The main purpose of using this design was to assess the impact of gender relative to having children and the woman being employed. The actual change in language behaviour is not observable of course, but by a static comparison of groups it may be possible to show the outcome of an underlying process of change. This research strategy is often applied in sociolinguistics in studying language change over time: by comparing age groups (apparent time; static comparison of groups) attempts are made to detect the process of language change over time (real time; dynamic process). By gathering further data about other attributes, e.g. division of domestic tasks, social contacts, educational level, occupational level and occupational type, possible causal relationships between them can be explored.

The primary independent variables, children and woman's employment, have been discussed in detail in the second chapter, with regard to the selection of the informants (section 2.1.2). Here, in section 4.1.2, I deal with the secondary independent variables, division of domestic tasks, social network, education and occupation, the distribution of the informants according to these variables, and correlations between the variables.

In section 4.1.1, the greater standard usage by women and greater non-standard usage by men will be analyzed in order to test the hypotheses about having children and employment, i.e. women with children use the standard pronunciation more often than women without children, and, women without paid work use the standard pronunciation more often than women with paid work (cf. section 2.2.1). Then the most salient factor in language use apart from gender, educational level, will be included in an analysis of covariance. In section 4.2, I will try to explain the relations between the different social factors and language use.

Below, I will use the general index for the amount of standard/non-standard usage derived from the co-occurrence pattern of the linguistic variables (cf. section 3.3.3) to analyze the influence of and the relationships between the social variables with respect to language use. Based on the results from the factor analysis (21 variables, i.e. seven linguistic variables in three styles), the factor scores of the informants were calculated on the first factor, the standard/non-standard dimension. The lower this factor score is, the more standard forms are involved; the higher the factor score, the more non-standard forms are used by an informant.

4.1 LANGUAGE USE BY WOMEN AND MEN REVISITED

4.1.1 *Gender, children and woman's employment*

An analysis of variance in order to trace the influence of gender, children and woman's employment must take into account that women and men were not sampled independently. The sample consists of married couples and, therefore, it is not improbable that the language use of a woman and a man who are a couple is more alike than that of a woman and a man sampled independently of each other. The correlations of the factor scores on the four extracted factors (cf. section 3.3.3) of the factor analysis confirm this idea.

Table 4.1 on the next page shows that there is a positive, although weak, correlation between the language use of a woman and a man within a couple on three of four factors, including the first factor representing the standard/non-standard dimension which will be used in further analyses.

Table 4.1 Correlation between the language use of partners (number of couples = 48)

language use	correlation language use partners
factor 1	.32*
factor 2	.32*
factor 3	.50**
factor 4	.15

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$
 one-tailed test

This correlational effect can be dealt with by applying a three-factorial analysis of variance design with repeated measurements on the gender factor (within couples). All three factors - gender, children and woman's employment - are fixed. However, there are some other, unwanted correlations which are more difficult to deal with. As already stated in section 2.1.2, some cells of the research design could not be filled with the fifteen couples planned. The group without children where the woman did not have paid work consisted of only four couples. This low number brings about a correlation between the variables of having children and woman's employment. The consequence is an unintended correlation between the variables in the research design, i.e. between having children and woman's employment. The variables are in fact no longer independent and it is not possible anymore to assign an unique effect to a variable. Therefore, in the analysis of variance, both the pooled effects of these two correlated variables and their separate effects were examined. The separate effects vary dependent on the order of introduction in the analysis of variance; the effects of both orders of introduction were examined.

Table 4.2 on page 66 shows the results of the analysis of variance of language use factor 1, the standard/non-standard dimension. The three-way interaction effect (gender by children by employment) turns out to be significant immediately. This finding does not make the interpretation of the other effects easier, since in interpreting these other effects we continuously have to keep in mind the presence of this higher order interactional effect. The effect of the variable gender, however, turns out to be very strong (explained variance is $28.57/93.26 = 30.6\%$). The obvious conclusion is that within the group of informants which is homogeneous with respect to occupational level, the variable gender is a powerful predictor of language use. The next significant effect can be found in the clustered pair children and employment. Because of the unequal cell frequencies, these variables are tested in both orders of

introduction into the analysis of variance. In both cases, it turns out that it is the variable employment which brings about a significant effect.

Table 4.2 Analysis of variance of the standard/non-standard language use factor: gender, children and woman's employment (number of couples = 48)

source of variation	sum of squares	df	mean square	F
between couples	42.72			
children+employment	6.54	2	3.27	4.18 *
children	.73	1	.73	.93
employment	5.81	1	5.81	7.42 **
employment	4.34	1	4.34	5.54 *
children	2.20	1	2.20	2.81
interaction children*employment	1.73	1	1.73	2.21
error between couples	34.45	44	.78	
within couples	50.54			
gender	28.57	1	28.57	63.40 **
interaction				
gender*children+gender*employment	.22	2	.11	.25
gender*children	.00	1	.00	.00
gender*employment	.22	1	.22	.50
gender*employment	.21	1	.21	.46
gender*children	.02	1	.02	.04
interaction				
gender*children*employment	1.91	1	1.91	4.23 *
error within couples	19.83	44	.45	
total	93.26	95		

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

three-factorial analysis of variance with repeated measurements on gender (all factors fixed)

In Figure 4.1 the mean scores of the different groups, for women as well as men, are shown as a graph to reveal where the three-way-interaction effect stems from. The lower the factor score is, the more standard Dutch forms are used.

Figure 4.1 Mean cell scores for the standard/nonstandard language use factor

The scores of the men, the two upper lines in Figure 4.1, are consistently higher than the scores of the women: they obviously more often use Amsterdam vernacular forms. At the same time the source of the interactional effect is evident: women without children and without a job use more non-standard forms than can be predicted from the variables children and employment separately, whereas women without children and with employment are the group which uses the most standard. The small group of women without children and without a job ($n=4$) is the only female group for which the mean score exceeds zero. The three other female groups have about the same mean score. So the women do not show the regular, differential pattern found for men.

The point now is whether the groups are homogeneous with respect to aspects or characteristics which could also influence language behaviour, for example, the level of education of the informants. The correlative pattern of the three variables incorporated in the analysis might be explained by variables not

present in the design. The possibility cannot be excluded, that the interactional effect found can be traced back to an external variable. This is an extra reason to examine the secondary variables, i.e. division of domestic tasks, the kind of social network the informants belong to, education and occupation.

4.1.2 Division of domestic tasks, social network, education and occupation

Apart from the primary independent variables gender, children and woman's employment, five secondary variables were analyzed: division of domestic tasks, contacts in a social network, educational level, occupational level, and occupational type.

With regard to division of domestic tasks, a three-point scale was applied, ranging from more to less rigidly traditional: 1. woman's responsibility; 2. man helps about once a week (usually in Saturday shopping); 3. man helps about once a day (usually by drying the dishes).

The concept of network has been operationalized by inquiring about the number of social contacts an informant regularly had, i.e. the number of persons an informant talked to at least once a week. Admittedly, this operationalization is not the optimal one, but a more subtle and thorough way to apply this concept was not attainable in this large-scale investigation. Three levels are distinguished: 1. a few contacts (up to 4); 2. a medium number of contacts (5-9); 3. many contacts (more than 9).

In education, three levels were distinguished: 1. primary school; 2. vocational education; 3. secondary school.

As regards occupation, two different variables were studied. For the first, occupational level, the categories were as follows: 1. no paid job (this applies to the 18 women, 4 without and 14 with children, who were not employed); 2. manual labour (occupational groups 1 and 2); 3. white collar (occupational groups 3 to 5). The second occupation variable, occupational type, takes into account the fact that occupations may differ as to the required language behaviour. For instance, saleswomen and -men or receptionists are expected to speak a more standard variety than other people of a similar social or economic position. Using the concept of the 'linguistic market' as described by Pierre Bourdieu and Luc Boltanski (Bourdieu and Boltanski 1975, Bourdieu 1982), an index was constructed to assess how a speaker's economic activity requires or is associated with competence in the legitimized or standard language (Sankoff and Laberge 1978). Apart from the nature of the job, we also took into account whether someone conferred with colleagues or clients and had meetings regularly. These points were covered during the interview. Because of this additional information, the same occupation may vary as regards occupational

type. Being a clerk, for example, requires a greater amount of standard language use in one case than in the other. The degree of standard language a job required was rated on a scale of 1 to 5, i.e. from no standard language to a great deal of standard language (cf. Appendix 2.1). The eighteen women without employment (cf. Table 2.3) were placed in the first group, i.e. no standard language required.

Table 4.3 shows the frequency distribution of the five variables discussed and thus the variance within the informants.

Table 4.3 Frequency distribution of division of domestic tasks, social contacts, educational level, occupational level and occupational type

values	1	2	3	4	5
division of domestic tasks (1 - 3: woman's responsibility - man's help about once a day)	32	12	4	-	-
social contacts (1 - 3: up to 4 - more than 9)	7	31	58	-	-
educational level (1 - 3: low - high)	61	29	6	-	-
occupational level (1 - 3: no occupation - manual labour - white collar)	18	26	52	-	-
occupational type (1 - 5: no standard language - a great deal of standard language)	39	16	20	19	2

Table 4.4 on page 70 gives the means of number of social contacts, education and occupation in order to find out whether there are differences for women and men.

Tables 4.3 and 4.4 are rather revealing as regards the way of life and social situation of the Amsterdam couples. The division of domestic tasks shows little variation, being in general close to rigidly traditional. The woman bears the responsibility alone in two-thirds of the couples, while the man offers a daily helping hand in four couples only.

The group under investigation appeared not to have a great deal of social contact, which applies equally to women and men. About half of the couples see less than ten people, while the other half are usually acquainted with a little

more than ten.

Table 4.4 Mean scores of division of domestic tasks, social contacts, educational level, occupational level and occupational type

	women	men	total
division of domestic tasks (1 - 3: woman's responsibility - man's help about once a day)			1.42
social contacts (1 - 3: up to 4 - more than 9)	2.48	2.58	2.53
educational level (1 - 3: low - high)	1.62	1.23	1.43
occupational level (1 - 5: low - high)	2.57	2.81	2.72
occupational type (1 - 5: no standard language - a great deal of standard language)	2.87	2.35	2.55

The education of the group of women is higher than that of their husbands (two-tailed t-test: $p < .01$). Nevertheless, the men's jobs were in a higher occupational level than those of the women, while the women's jobs required more standard language.

Neither having children nor employment by women affected the number of women's social contacts, nor did a more or - little - less rigidly traditional division of domestic tasks, contrary to our assumptions (cf. section 2.2.1).

Social contacts and division of domestic tasks have been left out of further analyses, because none of the correlations of these variables turned out to be high enough, probably due to both the relatively small variation of these variables and the fact that only the number and not the nature of social contacts was taken into account.

Table 4.5 on the next page shows the correlations between the remaining variables of educational level, occupational level and occupational type for the total group and for women and men separately.

The correlations in Table 4.5 clearly show that the higher the educational level and the higher the occupational level, the more standard language is required. There is also some correlation between educational level and occupational level for the female and male group separately, which does not hold for the group as a whole. This is probably due to the disparity between education and

occupation within women and men as mentioned above.

Table 4.5 Correlations between educational level, occupational level and occupational type

	women (n = 48)		men (n = 48)		total (n = 96)	
	occupational level	type	occupational level	type	occupational level	type
educational level	.33*	.52**	.36**	.50**	.16	.46**
occupational level	--	.77**	--	.75**	--	.70**

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$
one-tailed test

Since the educational level, occupational level and occupational type of a woman might affect the language use of her husband, and vice versa, in addition to their own four scores, those of their partners were added. Consequently, for each informant there are six variables which may be correlated with language use factor 1, the use of standard/non-standard. The results can be found in Table 4.6, both for the total group and for women and men separately.

Table 4.6 Correlations between educational level, occupational level, occupational type and the standard/non-standard language use factor

language use factor score (low - high: standard - non-standard)	women (n = 48)	men (n = 48)	total (n = 96)
educational level (1 - 3: low - high)	-.47 **	-.20	-.44 **
occupational level (1 - 5: low - high)	-.25 *	-.30 **	.03
occupational type (1 - 5: no standard language - a great deal of standard language)	-.31 **	-.37 **	-.25 **
partner's educational level	-.18	.06	.10
partner's occupational level	-.05	-.30 *	-.39 **
partner's occupational type	.02	-.16 -	.10

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$
one-tailed test

It turns out that a significant correlation between level of education and use of standard variants is present only for women: the higher their educational level, the more standard language they use. This does not hold for men, which is not surprising because the male group is more homogeneous with respect to this variable than the female group. The restricted range of educational level in the male group suppresses the correlation. For both women and men there is a relation between both level and type of occupation and language use: the higher the occupational level and the more standard language is required at work, the more standard variants are used. The partner variables do not produce impressive correlations. Apart from partner's occupational level, none of the variables yields significant results. Men seem to be particularly affected by the occupational level of their partner. This effect is incorporated in the research design, since it is precisely the influence of the woman's employment that was investigated as one of the explanatory factors. It has to be kept in mind that the absence of an effect of partner's occupational level on the speech of women can be spurious because of the intended homogeneity of men with respect to this variable.

To assess the influence on language use of the six variables in Table 4.6, a stepwise regression analysis has been carried out. After the selection of educational level as the strongest effect, none of the remaining variables had an influence strong enough to be selected in the second step of the analysis (the criterion for entering a variable in the analysis of variance was a partial correlation of $p < .05$). The conclusion is that for a further analysis educational level is the most relevant variable.

4.1.3 Analysis of covariance including education

Before reconsidering the effects on language use of the primary independent variables gender, children and woman's employment when analyzed in combination with the education of the informants, we shall look at the mean educational level within the different subgroups. Table 4.7 on the next page gives the mean distribution of the variable educational level over the cells in the research design.

The mean scores for education shown in Table 4.7 vary widely between the several subgroups. Again, men are the most homogeneous group. It is certainly not surprising that their educational level lies between low and middle, since they were selected on the basis of having a lower middle class occupation. As regards women, two cells should be especially noted: women without children and without employment appear to have a relatively low educational level, women without children and with employment a relatively

high one. This pattern parallels the sharply falling line in Figure 4.1 in section 4.1.1 for the women without children as regards their usage of non-standard variants.

Table 4.7 Educational level within the different subgroups

	educational level (1 - 3: low - high)			
	women -employment	+employment	men -employment	+employment
-children	1.00	2.13	1.25	1.13
+children	1.50	1.40	1.14	1.40

Because of the similarity of the distribution of educational level and the language use scores in some cells of the research design, it seems worthwhile to incorporate educational level in the analysis of variance of the primary variables gender, children and employment. In order to determine their effect on language use properly, the effect of education needs to be eliminated. After calculating the correlation between educational level and the standard/non-standard language use score, the language use score was corrected for the influence of education. On the basis of the residual score, the effects of gender, children, and woman's employment were assessed. The effect of educational level is similar within the eight subgroups (the regression coefficients are homogeneous; the b's in the separate groups are not significantly different from each other, $F=1.11$, $df=3,40$).

Table 4.8 shows the results from an analysis of variance of gender, children and woman's employment, in which educational level was introduced as a covariate (see page 74).

A comparison of Tables 4.8 and 4.2 (page 66) reveals three important differences. Firstly, there is no longer a three-way interaction between gender, children and woman's employment. The disappearance of this interaction is probably mainly a consequence of introducing education as a covariate, given the extremely low educational level of the group of women without children and without employment. Secondly, the factors children and employment in combination again appear to have a significant influence on language use, but, depending on the order in which they are analyzed, the factor responsible for this effect varies. We would expect that both having children and having employment by women would show significant effects on language use, if the cell frequencies had been more equal. Thirdly, although the effect of gender has

become less, it is still by far the most important variable, accounting for 23% of the variance in the language use factor.

Table 4.8 Analysis of variance of the standard/non-standard language use factor: gender, children and woman's employment with educational level as covariate (number of couples = 48)

source of variation	sum of squares	df	mean square	F
educational level	18.45	1	18.45	
between couples	31.95			
children+employment	5.00	2	2.50	4.06 *
children	2.06	1	2.06	3.34
employment	2.94	1	2.94	4.77 *
employment	1.66	1	1.66	2.70
children	3.34	1	3.34	5.42 *
interaction children*employment	.47	1	.47	.76
error between couples	26.48	43	.62	
within couples	42.85			
gender	21.87	1	21.78	48.39 **
interaction				
gender*children+gender*employment	.35	2	.18	.39
gender*children	.07	1	.07	.15
gender*employment	.28	1	.28	.63
gender*employment	.34	1	.34	.75
gender*children	.01	1	.01	.03
interaction				
gender*children*employment	1.20	1	1.20	2.66
error within couples	19.43	43	.45	
total	93.26	94		

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

three-factorial analysis of variance with repeated measurements on gender (all factors fixed)

As a consequence, Figure 4.2 reveals a much more regular pattern than Figure 4.1.

Figure 4.2 Mean cell scores for the standard/non-standard language use factor with education as covariate

The four lines in Figure 4.2 are almost parallel. The hypothesis regarding children (cf. hypothesis c., section 2.2.1) is confirmed: women with children use the standard pronunciation more often than women without children. The hypothesis regarding woman's employment (cf. hypothesis d., section 2.2.1) is falsified: contrary to expectation, women with paid work use the standard pronunciation more often than women without paid work.

This last finding, however, was not totally unexpected either. First, there appeared to be no connection at all between having employment or not by women and their number of social contacts (cf. section 4.1.2), whereas in formulating the hypothesis, we had assumed that women without employment would be less embedded in a social network and therefore might speak more standard. Second, our hypothesis was also based on the rather speculative argument that unemployed women are eager to derive status by using standard

language (Trudgill 1972), whereas findings in West Germany, although mainly concerned with regional variants, point in the opposite direction (Ammon 1973).

Both women and men without children use more Amsterdam vernacular forms than women and men with children. This also holds for both partners in a couple where the woman is not employed compared with those where the woman is employed. Women and men seem to be affected in the same way by the circumstance of having children as well as by the circumstance of the woman being employed.

4.2 LANGUAGE AND SOCIAL POSITION: GENDER-RELATED SPEECH DIFFERENCES

The scores on the standard/non-standard continuum showed a significantly greater usage of Amsterdam vernacular by men than by women. In an effort to explain these scores, two other primary variables were studied: children and woman's employment. The picture emerging in the first analysis of variance was rather unclear regarding the role of these variables. The introduction of education as a covariate in the analysis sharpened the picture remarkably. Both having children and the woman being employed appeared to go together with a greater usage of standard language. Educational level turned out to be an important variable which drastically affected the relationship between children, employment and language use. Given the set of variables investigated, we must assume a direct influence of educational level on language behaviour as well as on having children and the woman being employed. The educational level (scale 1-3: low-high) of women in employment was much higher than that of the unemployed women (1.77 versus 1.39), which was also true for women without children as compared with those with children (1.89 versus 1.45). The relation between gender and educational level is striking, though the explanation is obvious. Most of the women in the sample were better educated than their husbands. This is probably not untypical for the upper working and lower middle class. But despite their higher education, the women worked in lower status jobs, as has often been observed in the literature. Women usually end up in jobs for which they are overqualified by education, with little opportunity for promotion, and they often earn less than men in similar jobs (Philips and Taylor 1980). Within the Netherlands, the usual positive correlation between educational and occupational level is only present for men and not for women, and in 1978 the hourly wage of women in industrial jobs and the service industries was 75,1% of that of men (Poldervaart et al. 1983:

160ff).

Concerning the variables children and woman's employment, in the second analysis of variance the order of introduction into the analysis determined which of the two was significant. It was always the second in order. This can only be explained by a mechanism of suppression. The attribute of children operates as a suppressor variable for work: no children mostly coincided with woman's employment, having children mostly with having no employment. This relation also holds the other way around: having work goes with no children, etc. The dependency between these two variables was an unintended one in the research design, but because of the general family structure in the neighbourhood sampled this dependency appeared to be unavoidable. The average family in the neighbourhood under investigation consisted of an employed man with a non-employed woman and children. Couples in which the woman was not employed and there were no children were very infrequent. The relations between education, having children and having employment are not restricted to the 48 women sampled. The findings are in total agreement with statistics about the participation of Dutch women in the labour market. Unfortunately, the division of labour by sex in the Amsterdam West neighbourhood is broadly similar to that in the country as a whole. After Ireland, the Netherlands has the lowest percentage of employed women in the E.E.C., i.e. about 35% versus about 50% for the other countries (Oudijk 1983: 191). Besides, educational level and having children influence having employment by women, as the following table shows (after Oudijk 1983: 195).

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)

	low educational level	high educational level
without children	46.6%	76.5%
with children	9.2%	19.7%

Table 4.9 clearly shows that more women from the high education group are employed than from the low education group. However, there is a sharp decrease for both educational groups when there are young children.

The fact that the variables employment and children suppress each other with respect to language use in our design means that both variables would have been significant had the design contained equal cells. Having children as well as the woman being employed is significantly correlated to language use, although this correlation is less strong than that between language use and

gender.

Curiously enough, having children seems to affect the language use of wife and husband in a similar way. On the average both use more standard forms. The interviews made clear that the men were hardly involved in bringing up the children, so it must be the idea of setting a norm or value which induced men to use more standard when there were children. The couples investigated generally showed a very traditional way of life. A roughly equal sharing of domestic tasks was never found, the woman almost always bearing the responsibility alone. This was even true for the group in which the woman had paid work, although then the husband did do a tiny bit more.

This traditionally oriented behaviour is confirmed by the average family structure (-woman's employment, +children). Most of the employed women had part-time jobs (24 out of 30, cf. Appendix 1). Again, this corresponds with the general pattern in the Netherlands, where in 1978 89% of the employed women had part-time jobs, versus 11% of the men (Poldervaart et al. 1983: 161). In addition, the interviews made clear that most women looked on their work as being temporary or bringing in extra money. It was definitely not the most important thing in their life: they still did 99.9% of the housekeeping and would quit their job as soon as a baby was on the way. Women with a higher educational level tended to postpone having children to a later age. Some of the women without children said that they could not have any and that they had considered adoption. Given the expectations about their social role, women apparently derive their social identity for the most part from being a housewife and mother rather than from paid work. The different ideas about how women and men ought to live and behave seem to be deeply rooted in society. Studies have shown that even when working outside the home women are unwilling or unable to hand over responsibility for running the household and, above all, taking care of the children (e.g. Diekerhof & Vierhout 1981).

The finding that employment promotes standard language use by women is in accordance with that of Ulrich Ammon in West Germany (Ammon 1973) and contradicts the hypothesis of Peter Trudgill about unemployed women hoping to derive status from greater use of standard (Trudgill 1972). Participation in social life appears to stimulate the use of standard variants. Since only employed men were involved in our study, we cannot examine whether being employed or not has a similar influence on men's standard usage. There are reasons to believe that the same mechanism would operate in men's language use, for it has been reported several times that retired older men often fall back on the language variety they spoke in their youth and use more non-standard language forms (e.g. Elias 1977).

Compared to gender, the influence of the variables of children and woman's

employment is only slight, but undeniably exists. This shows that people adjust their behaviour in a general way to the social situation they live in. By a static comparison of groups an attempt was made to detect the process of change, in this case the effect of having children and the woman being employed. The fact that such effects were established shows the dynamic and vital nature of language variation in Amsterdam vernacular.

The remaining secondary sociological variables, division of domestic tasks, social network (operationalized by the number of contacts), occupation (occupational level and occupational type), and educational level of the male partner, did not significantly affect language use.

Although the intermediating factors only explain a very small part of the variance, the sociological variables turned out to contribute in a significant way to the explanation of language use. An attempt to construct a structural model for the language use of the group of informants investigated can be found in Figure 4.3.

Figure 4.3 A model for the sociological variables and language use

The influence of the four sociological variables - gender, education, children and woman's employment - on language use is shown in the model in Figure 4.3. To the extent that dependency between the sociological variables was demonstrated, this is shown by dotted lines.

Gender is the strongest predictor of language use. Women use the standard Dutch variants more often, men the Amsterdam dialect variants. Having children and employment promotes the use of standard language. Women (and men) with children use less Amsterdam dialect variants than women (and men) without children; women with employment (and their men) use less

Amsterdam dialect variants than women without employment (and their men). In addition, education affects language use : the higher the educational level, the more standard variants are used.

There are a relatively large number of interdependencies between the sociological variables. The relation between gender and education - women are more highly educated than men - is probably specific to the group under investigation and certainly does not apply to Dutch women and men in general (Oudijk 1983: 109ff).

A relatively high educational level favours women having employment, a low educational level having children. The presence of children mostly implies the absence of woman's employment and vice versa; the presence of woman's employment mostly implies the absence of children and vice versa.

The picture that emerges is fairly complex and it shows that correlational sociolinguistic research is not by definition restricted to deriving simple correlations between a set of linguistic variables and a set of sociological variables. The results from this correlational study reveal that the mechanisms underlying speech differentiation are manifold and are embedded in a complex structure of interacting variables.

In the next chapter, I will explore to what extent the greater and smaller usage of standard language by women and men is reflected in their linguistic attitudes.

Linguistic attitudes

5.0 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter we saw that gender, education, having children, and employment of women each affected the use of standard Dutch or Amsterdam dialect variants. To understand the patterns of variation encountered, we need to know people's ideas and feelings about the linguistic variants used. Section 2.4.1 of the second chapter dealt with language variation and language evaluation, and methods and techniques in studying linguistic attitudes. In section 1.3 of the first chapter, I gave an overview of, for the greater part American and British, research findings concerning the evaluation of gender-related speech variation. Results from self-evaluation tests showed that women have a more positive attitude towards the standard variety and men towards the vernacular. Results from subjective reaction tests, in which data were usually gathered by the 'matched-guise' technique (cf. section 2.4.1), showed that the standard variety is associated with social competence and femininity, and the non-standard variety with masculinity. Finally, the test results from occasional studies which, apart from male voices, so-called 'stimuli', also included female stimuli, showed that people evaluated female and male speakers differently.

How do the Amsterdam women and men feel about their own language usage, about the standard and non-standard variety and about the language use of female and male speakers?

In section 5.1, I discuss the attitudes of women and men towards their own speech. The results from the self-evaluation tests - the phonetic-phonological, morpho-syntactic, lexical and Amsterdam dialect test - are presented, in order to test the hypothesis that women have a more positive attitude toward standard Dutch and men toward Amsterdam vernacular (cf. hypothesis f. in section 2.2.1). Then the correlations between the results from the self-evaluation tests and the actual speech behaviour of the informants during the interview are explored. Section 5.2 concerns the social and gender-linked connotations of standard Dutch and Amsterdam vernacular. In this section, I deal with the results from the linguistic attitude tests using subjective reactions with regard

to social status, 'toughness', personality traits and femininity or masculinity of female and male standard and non-standard speakers. In the last section, I will briefly discuss the findings on self-evaluation and the evaluation of female and male standard and non-standard speakers.

5.1 SELF-EVALUATION OF LANGUAGE USE

5.1.1 *Phonetic-phonological, morpho-syntactic and lexical tests*

The three self-evaluation tests - the phonetic-phonological, morpho-syntactic and lexical test - were described in the second chapter (cf. section 2.4.2). Here, the test answers will be dealt with, i.e. the language use at the phonetic-phonological, morpho-syntactic and lexical level as reported by the informants (the test items can be found in Appendices 4 to 6).

When asked directly which of several linguistic forms is closest to their own speech, people answers usually indicate the form which they believe has prestige or is appropriate rather than the form they actually use. Looking at the whole group of informants, the mean scores of the phonetic-phonological test (3.09; 17 items, scale 0 - 17: standard - non-standard), morpho-syntactic test (1.28; 5 items, scale 0 - 5: standard - non-standard) and lexical test (11.80; 8 items, i.e. 8 expletives in 5 situations, scale 0 - 40: no expletives - all in five situations) appear to be extremely low, indicating that the informants often reported using only the standard variants and hardly any coarse language. In this study, which is focussed on pronunciation, it is possible to compare the test results from the phonetic-phonological test with the informants' actual speech patterns during the informal and formal parts of the interview, especially since the test items were chosen from the reading text and word list which they read during the formal part of the interview. A comparison of the above mean score for the phonetic-phonological test with the mean scores for the linguistic variables in the informal and more formal interview situations, presented in Table 3.2 in the third chapter, points clearly to a general over-reporting: the informants reported using the standard Dutch variants much more often than was in fact the case.

Do the Amsterdam women and men evaluate their own speech differently at the phonetic-phonological, morpho-syntactic and lexical levels? This question was examined using the three tests. Analyses of variance were carried out in order to test the hypothesis that women have a more positive attitude towards standard Dutch and men towards Amsterdam vernacular. The mean percentages of non-standard or coarse language use reported for women and men are given in

Table 5.1.

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

	total (n = 96)	women (n = 48)	men (n = 48)	F ratio df=1,47
phonetic-phonological test	18.20%	12.01%	24.39%	10.53 **
morpho-syntactic test	25.63%	22.08%	29.17%	3.68
lexical test	29.51%	24.43%	34.58%	8.19 **

** $p < .01$

one-way analysis of variance with repeated measurements (= couples; fixed effect)

These results consistently point in one direction, women showing a more positive attitude toward standard Dutch and men toward Amsterdam dialect and coarse language. As Table 5.1 shows, in the phonetic-phonological test women reported using the standard variant more often than men and they reported using expletives less often.

The results from two American studies on expletives showed that women reported that they used expletives mostly when alone, and the weaker expletives rather than the stronger ones (Oliver and Rubin 1975, Bailey and Timm 1976).

Table 5.2 on page 84 gives the number of times women (n = 48) and men (n = 48) reported they used each of the ten expletives in each of the five situations, i.e. when alone or in the presence of partner, child, friends and formal acquaintances. In this table, the maximum score of each row for women or men is 240, i.e. 48 (women or men) * 5 (situations). The maximum score of each column for women or men is 480, i.e. 48 (women or men) * 10 (expletives). The frequencies of expletives reported in Table 5.2 reflect the rather low percentages of coarse language given in Table 5.1.

The row totals in Table 5.2 indicate the extent to which an expletive is used for all five situations. Women reported using 'Jesus' slightly less than 'bother' and 'damn' much more often than 'goddamn', and they score especially low on sexually connotated items such as 'cunt' and 'prick'. The column totals in Table 5.2 show the extent to which the ten expletives are used in each of the five situations. Women and men in general seemed to use swear words most often to themselves or to each other. Not surprisingly, both women and men use

more coarse language when among friends than in more formal contacts.

Table 5.2 Lexical test: frequency distribution of ten expletives in five situations

situation	alone	partner	child	friends	formal	total
1. (<i>mijn</i>) <i>hemel</i> (heavens)						
women	11	11	9	13	4	48
men	13	16	16	15	12	72
2. <i>jasses/jesses</i> (bother)						
women	19	24	21	18	9	91
men	11	13	12	11	8	55
3. <i>verdomme</i> (damn)						
women	35	39	25	20	3	122
men	37	35	21	27	10	130
4. <i>jezus</i> (Jesus)						
women	19	24	18	17	5	83
men	25	29	11	20	9	94
5. <i>godverdomme</i> (goddamn)						
women	20	18	10	5	0	53
men	32	26	12	15	5	90
6. <i>kut</i> (cunt; fuck, shit)						
women	3	6	1	3	0	13
men	18	15	5	10	3	51
7. <i>klote</i> (balls)						
women	12	17	2	9	1	41
men	26	22	9	19	8	84
8. <i>trut</i> (cow)						
women	21	17	15	16		1 70
men	14	23	11	15	3	66
9. <i>lul</i> (prick; asshole)						
women	6	10	4	5	0	25
men	20	15	7	15	4	61
10. <i>klootzak</i> (jerk)						
women	18	26	7	11	0	62
men	28	19	9	20	12	88
total women (n = 48)	164	192	112	117	23	608
total men (n = 48)	224	213	113	167	74	791
total (n = 96)	388	405	225	284	97	1399

However, men reported using coarse language among friends almost twice as much as women, and they said they used coarse language in front of formal acquaintances more than five times as much as women.

Finally, it would be interesting to know whether a positive or negative attitude is similarly strong in respect of variation in pronunciation, morpho-syntactic variation and lexical variation. The correlations between the first three self-evaluation tests presented in Table 5.3 confirm this to a certain extent.

Table 5.3 Correlations between the phonetic-phonological, morpho-syntactic and lexical test scores

	phonetic-phonological test			lexical test		
	total (n = 96)	women (n = 48)	men (n = 48)	total (n = 96)	women (n = 48)	men (n = 48)
phonetic- phonological test				.24**	.29**	.13
morpho- syntactic test	.35**	.35**	.31**	.17*	.22	.10

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$
one-tailed test

Table 5.3 shows that the responses from the phonetic-phonological, morpho-syntactic and lexical tests appeared to be correlated: the more standard variants people reported using on the phonetic-phonological level, the more standard variants on the morpho-syntactic level, and the less coarse language they reported using. In short, a more or less positive attitude toward the standard variety is consistently present at several linguistic levels. On the other hand, it should be noticed that the correlation coefficients in Table 5.3 are not very high.

5.1.2 *Amsterdam dialect test*

The responses to eight more general questions about Amsterdam dialect are analyzed separately because of the lack of homogeneity of the test items (cf. Appendix 7). Table 5.4 on page 86 shows the mean scores and mean differences between women and men for each of the eight items of the Amsterdam dialect test. On the whole men think more positively about the Amsterdam dialect than women, which is significant for five of the eight items.

Table 5.4 Mean scores for Amsterdam dialect test and the F ratios of the differences in the mean scores between women and men

Amsterdam dialect (1 - 3: negative - positive)				
	total (n = 96)	women (n = 48)	men (n = 48)	F ratio df=1,47
1. What do you think of the way they speak in Amsterdam?	2.10	1.81	2.40	19.35 ***
2. How would you feel about the radio and TV newscasters speaking Amsterdam vernacular?	1.45	1.31	1.58	5.61 *
3. Do you watch the pirate TV station 'Mokum'?	2.19	2.13	2.24	.90
4. Do you like Amsterdam speech more or less than that of Groningen?	2.44	2.29	2.58	5.66 *
5. Do you like Amsterdam speech more or less than that of Limburg?	2.25	2.15	2.35	2.89
6. Can people outside Amsterdam tell from your accent where you come from?	2.22	2.02	2.41	9.43 **
7. How do you think that people from outside Amsterdam feel about Amsterdam vernacular?	2.05	1.98	2.13	.86
8. Do you think that your speech differs from that of your parents?	2.07	1.92	2.22	8.45 **

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

one-way analysis of variance with repeated measurements (= couples; fixed effect)

Furthermore, the lowest scores show that the informants would least like to watch a newsreader speaking Amsterdam dialect and that they think people from outside Amsterdam have a poor opinion about their accent.

The ninth question in the Amsterdam dialect test was: 'Do you think it makes a difference whether a woman or a man speaks Amsterdam vernacular?' None of the informants found Amsterdam vernacular more appropriate for a woman than for a man; 35 informants (16 women, 19 men) found it more appropriate for a man, and 61 (32 women, 29 men) thought it made no

difference.

5.1.3 *Self-evaluations and language use*

In this section I will compare the informants' self-evaluations regarding their speech with their actual language use during the interview. One might assume that a more positive attitude toward the standard variety went together with a greater use of standard variants. I had not formulated hypotheses as regards a relationship between language attitudes and language use. In the first place, the findings from social psychological studies do not give rise to great expectations: in most studies there was no relationship at all between attitudes and behaviour (see Wicker 1969 for a comprehensive overview). Secondly I could hardly rely on sociolinguistic results concerning such relationships (see Knops and Van Hout 1988: 14ff). Several studies (e.g. Labov 1966, Trudgill 1972) pointed to a greater standard usage by women combined with a more positive attitude toward standard language and a smaller standard usage by men together with a more positive attitude toward non-standard language, suggesting an implicit connection. However, the interrelationship itself, between language attitudes and actual language use, was never examined thoroughly, as far as I know. Where the relation between attitudes and language behaviour has been investigated, in the field of second language acquisition, the object of study was often attitudes toward the community and culture rather than attitudes toward language. There is one study in which the responses from Likert-type questionnaires about the use of standard Dutch and - regional - dialects were analyzed in relation to the responses from matched-guise tests involving dimensions such as solidarity and prestige (Münstermann and Van Hout 1988). In this study, hardly any correlations were found between the dialect usage as reported in the questionnaire and the matched-guise test responses. The authors suggest that the low correlations might be partly due to the different attitude techniques, the questionnaire responses being influenced by the social desirability of certain types of language behaviour, while the matched-guise test responses tend to reveal more hidden feelings about the appropriateness of standard language and dialect usage. In fact, this study examined correlations between language attitudes: the relationship between reported (regional) dialect usage and more unconscious feelings about standard and dialect. In contrast, the results presented below concern the relationship between reported (social) dialect usage from self-evaluation tests and actual dialect usage during the interview.

By looking at the correlations between the linguistic attitude scores and the language use scores, it is possible to determine the extent to which the

attitudes of the informants might help to explain their language use.

Is there a positive correlation between the responses of the Amsterdam women and men in the phonetic-phonological, morpho-syntactic, lexical and Amsterdam dialect tests, and their language use scores?

Table 5.5 Correlations between self-evaluation scores and language use scores

language use score	total (n = 96)	women (n = 48)	men (n = 48)
phonetic-phonological test	.48**	.51**	.35**
morpho-syntactic test	.29**	.23	.27*
lexical test	.17	.10	.02
Amsterdam dialect test			
1. What do you think of the way they speak in Amsterdam?	.30**	.17	.10
2. How would you feel about the radio and TV newsreaders speaking Amsterdam vernacular?	.31**	.29*	.22
3. Do you watch the pirate TV station 'Mokum'?	.14	.10	.14
4. Do you like Amsterdam speech more or less than that of Groningen?	.23*	.22	.05
5. Do you like Amsterdam speech more or less than that of Limburg?	.09	.13	-.07
6. Can people outside Amsterdam tell from your accent where you come from?	.46**	.60**	.26*
7. How do you think that people from outside Amsterdam feel about Amsterdam vernacular?	.26**	.40**	.13
8. Do you think that your speech differs from that of your parents?	.28**	.33**	.15

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$
one-tailed test

In Table 5.5 the correlation coefficients are given. There appeared to be some relation between language attitudes and language use for both women and men. The more phonetic-phonological and morpho-syntactic standard variants people claimed to use during the self-evaluation tests and the more negatively they felt about the Amsterdam accent, the more (phonetic-phonological) standard variants they in fact used during the interview. With respect to the Amsterdam dialect test, the informants' ideas about whether people from outside Amsterdam would recognize them by their speech and about what these people would think of the local accent (items 6 and 7) were especially positively correlated to their actual language use. Informants who said that people from outside Amsterdam of course knew that they were from Amsterdam and those who said that people from outside Amsterdam appreciated the local accent used many non-standard variants. Their reported use as regards scolding and swearing clearly had little to do with their actual usage of standard or non-standard language. So, apart from a more or less 'correct' pronunciation of expletives, standard and non-standard speaking people seem to use just as much coarse language.

The correlations found between the responses from the phonetic-phonological, morpho-syntactic and Amsterdam dialect tests and the actual speech behaviour are rather remarkable, given the low correlations found in the study of two linguistic attitude tests by Henk Münstermann and Roeland van Hout (Münstermann and Van Hout 1988). On the other hand, the correlation coefficients are rather low. The coefficient as regards the phonetic-phonological test is relatively high (explaining 23% of the total variance). This is not quite unexpected, since the level of the linguistic attitude measurement in this test exactly represents the level of the aspect of linguistic behaviour measured.

Table 5.6 on page 90 shows the correlations of the phonetic-phonological test responses with the language use scores for each of the linguistic variables separately.

In the case of six of the seven linguistic variables, Table 5.6 shows that the more standard phonetic-phonological variants people reported using, the more they in fact used during the interview. The deviant scores for (z) correspond totally with the different linguistic patterns found for this variable as described in the third chapter (section 3.1).

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

	women (n = 48)			men (n = 48)		
	casual speech	reading style	word list	casual speech	reading style	word list
(aa)	.29*	.32**	.25*	.12	.26*	.25*
(ee)	.33**	.40**	.39**	.36**	.31*	.38**
(oo)	.23*	.21	.15	.25*	.27*	.42**
(au)	.40**	.47**	.43**	.25*	.39**	.46**
(ei-h)	.52**	.45**	.55**	.10	.23	.19
(ei-m)	.40**	.56**	.26*	.40**	.29*	.17
(z)	.20	.22	.43**	-.07	.13	.11

(ei-h) (ei-height)

(ei-m) (ei-monophthongization)

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

one-tailed test

5.2 SUBJECTIVE REACTIONS TO STANDARD AND NON-STANDARD LANGUAGE USE AND TO FEMALE AND MALE SPEAKERS

5.2.1 *Social status*

The four linguistic attitude tests using subjective reactions were described in detail in the second chapter (cf. section 2.4.3). All the tests results presented below concern reactions to both female and male voices (stimuli).

During the first three tests the informants listened to eight recordings made according to the matched-guise procedure, involving two female and two male stimuli's standard Dutch and Amsterdam dialect guises. After each passage three questions were asked concerning the social competence, the toughness and the personality of the speakers. Here, I will look at the judgements about the female and male standard and non-standard speakers with regard to social status, while those about their toughness and personality will be dealt with in the following two sections.

In the first test on social status, the informants were asked to assign eight speakers an occupation out of five ranked from high to low (from medical doctor to factory worker).

Do the Amsterdam women and men evaluate the standard and dialect variety differently, and do they evaluate female and male speakers differently as regards social status?

The mean scores of the occupation assignments by the informants with respect to the standard Dutch and non-standard Amsterdam dialect guises of two female and two male speakers are given in Table 5.7 and Figure 5.1.

Table 5.7 Mean subjective reaction scores for social status

social status (1 -5: high - low)							
female 1		female 2		male 1		male 2	
standard	non-standard	standard	non-standard	standard	non-standard	standard	non-standard
2.34	4.40	3.78	4.53	1.51	4.15	1.83	4.87

Figure 5.1 Social status scores for standard Dutch and Amsterdam dialect guises of two female and two male stimuli

Both the female and the male standard speakers were, as expected, attributed a higher social status than the female and male dialect speakers, as shown in Table 5.7 and Figure 5.1.

In addition, there appeared to be a difference in judgement of the female and the male standard speakers and the female and male dialect speakers. For both varieties in seven of eight cases a higher occupation was assigned to the male than to the female speakers.

T-tests were carried out as regards all combinations possible, in order to determine the significance of these different judgements of the standard and non-standard guises and of the female and male speakers. Table 5.8 shows the results from the t-tests applied to the scores of the informants with regard to

social status. The exact outcomes of the t-tests are not given, because I was primarily interested in whether particular effects showed a consistent pattern or not (the same applies to Tables 5.10 and 5.12).

Table 5.8 Social status: significance of the differences in effects of standard Dutch and Amsterdam dialect guises and of two female (f1, f2) and two male (m1, m2) stimuli (n = 96)

stimulus	f1	f2	m1	m2	f1/f2	m1/m2	f1/m1	f1/m2	f2/m1	f2/m2
standard					**	*	**	**	**	**
dialect	**	**	**	**	**	**	*	**	**	**

f female

m male

/ comparison of (standard guise and dialect guise) effects between stimuli

** p<.01, * p<.05

t-test, paired samples

The first four columns in Table 5.8 give the significance of the different effects of the standard and non-standard guise for each of the four, two female and two male, speakers. Indeed, the standard and non-standard guises of the two female and two male speakers evoked significantly different reactions, as, of course, was the intention. The standard guises of both the female and male speakers are attributed a higher status occupation than their dialect guises. The last four columns in Table 5.8 give the significance of the different effects of the two female and the two male speakers for both their standard and their non-standard guises. As regards social status, all differences between the reactions to female speakers and those to male speakers appeared to be significant. Both the standard and dialect female speakers were attributed lower status occupations than the standard and dialect male speakers.

The fifth and sixth columns of Table 5.8 show the significance of the different effects of the two female speakers on one hand and of the two male speakers on the other for both their standard and dialect guises. The standard and dialect guises of the first female speaker were consistently attributed a higher occupation than those of the second female speaker. The standard and dialect guises of the first male speaker were attributed a higher occupation than those of the second male speaker. However, in spite of these differences, the higher occupation assignments to standard guises and those to male speakers still hold.

The social status assignments to standard or non-standard speakers and to

female or male speakers by women and men was the same. There were no significant differences between the judgements of female and male listeners.

5.2.2 Toughness

In the second test on toughness, the informants were asked to assign eight speakers a film role out of five ranked from feminine to masculine (from fashion designer to gangster, cf. section 2.4.3 of the second chapter).

Do the Amsterdam women and men evaluate the standard and dialect variety differently, and, do they evaluate female and male speakers differently as regards toughness?

The mean scores of the toughness assignments by the informants with respect to the standard Dutch and non-standard Amsterdam dialect guises of two female and two male speakers are given in Table 5.9 and Figure 5.2.

Table 5.9 Mean subjective reaction scores for toughness

toughness (1 - 5: feminine - masculine)							
female 1		female 2		male 1		male 2	
standard	non-standard	standard	non-standard	standard	non-standard	standard	non-standard
2.59	3.69	2.50	3.63	2.23	4.04	2.09	4.27

Figure 5.2 Toughness scores for standard Dutch and Amsterdam dialect guises of two female and two male stimuli

There were again differences in the judgements of the standard and the non-standard speakers and of the female and male speakers, as Table 5.9 and Figure 5.2 show. Both the female and male standard speakers were thought to be more suitable for a feminine role in a film, the female and male non-standard speakers more suitable for a masculine role. Figure 5.2 shows that the scores for the male speakers were the most extreme. The results from t-tests done to determine the significance of the different judgements of the standard and non-standard guises and of the female and male speakers are given in Table 5.10.

Table 5.10 Toughness: significance of the differences in effects of standard Dutch and Amsterdam dialect guises and of two female (f1, f2) and two male (m1, m2) stimuli (n = 96)

stimulus	f1	f2	m1	m2	f1/f2	m1/m2	f1/m1	f1/m2	f2/m1	f2/m2
standard					**	-	**	**	-	**
	**	**	**	**						
dialect					-	*	**	**	**	**

f female

m male

/ comparison of (standard guise and dialect guise) effects between stimuli

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

t-test, paired samples

The first four columns in Table 5.10 give the significance of the different effects of the standard and non-standard guise for each of the four, two female and two male, speakers. The standard and non-standard guises of the two female and two male speakers evoked significantly different reactions as regards toughness. The standard guises were associated with femininity, the non-standard guises with masculinity. The last four columns in Table 5.10 give the significance of the different effects of the two female and the two male speakers for both their standard and their non-standard guises. All differences between the reactions to female speakers and to male speakers appeared to be significant, except for one, i.e. the difference between the standard guises of the second female and first male speaker (cf. Table 5.10, the ninth column of the first row). In general, however, the female standard speakers were allocated a less feminine film role than the male standard speakers, and the female dialect speakers a less masculine film role than the male dialect speakers. The pattern in Figure 5.2 confirms the significantly different judgements of the female and the male standard and dialect speakers; on the toughness scale men tended to be judged in terms of one extreme or the other.

There was less difference between the reactions to the two female stimuli on

the one hand and the two male stimuli on the other. In this case, the standard guises of the two female stimuli and the dialect guises of the two male stimuli evoked significantly different reactions (cf. the fifth and sixth columns of Table 5.10). The first female standard guise was assigned a more feminine film role than the second female standard guise, and the first male dialect guise was assigned a less masculine film role than the second male dialect guise.

Again, no significant differences have been found between the judgements of the female and male listeners.

The total standard/non-standard difference score for social status appeared to be positively correlated with that for toughness (.25, $p < .01$; $n = 96$), so the standard variety was attributed both a high-ranked occupation and a soft feminine film role, the non-standard variety both a low-ranked occupation and a tough masculine film role.

5.2.3 *Personality traits*

In the third test on personality traits, the informants were asked to judge the personality of eight speakers on six-point scales with regard to nine contrasting traits (independent - dependent, easy-going - complaining, strong - weak, reliable - unreliable, warm-hearted - cool, hard - gentle, bold - shy, aggressive - quiet, egotistic - self-effacing, cf. section 2.4.3 of the second chapter).

Do the Amsterdam women and men evaluate the standard and dialect variety differently, and do they evaluate female and male speakers differently as regards personality traits?

The mean scores of the personality traits assignments by the informants with respect to the standard Dutch and non-standard Amsterdam dialect guises of two female and two male speakers are given in Table 5.11 and Figure 5.3 on pages.96 and 97.

Table 5.11 Mean subjective reaction scores for personality traits

personality traits (scale 1 - 6)							
female 1		female 2		male 1		male 2	
standard	non-standard	standard	non-standard	standard	non-standard	standard	non-standard
independent							dependent
1.94	3.00	3.81	3.25	1.99	2.65	2.29	2.60
easy-going							complaining
2.70	2.97	3.77	3.30	2.46	2.78	2.97	2.92
strong							weak
2.21	2.90	3.90	3.39	2.24	2.93	2.69	2.85
reliable							unreliable
1.98	2.89	2.75	2.95	2.13	2.95	2.09	2.85
warm-hearted							cool
3.77	2.93	3.13	3.30	3.38	3.24	3.06	2.77
hard							gentle
3.71	3.35	4.59	3.60	3.66	3.39	4.26	3.19
bold							shy
3.33	2.01	3.69	2.49	3.16	2.21	3.72	2.00
aggressive							quiet
4.99	3.18	4.51	3.43	4.75	3.21	4.81	2.92
egotistic							self-effacing
3.64	3.16	3.77	3.25	3.53	3.14	3.77	3.11

At first sight, the results shown in Table 5.11 and Figure 5.3 on the next page appear to be baffling and present no clear pattern. Particularly regarding the first five personality traits, the different effects of the standard and non-standard guises of each of the four, two female and two male, speakers are largely contradictory, which also applies to the different effects of the two female and the two male speakers. The same is true of the different effects of the standard and dialect guises of the two female stimuli on the one hand and the standard and dialect guises of the two male speakers on the other.

Figure 5.3 Personality traits scores for standard Dutch and Amsterdam dialect guises of two female and two male stimuli

Table 5.12 shows the results of the t-tests applied to the scores of the informants.

Table 5.12 Personality traits: significance of the differences in effects of standard Dutch and Amsterdam dialect guises and of two female (f1, f2) and two male (m1, m2) stimuli (n = 96)

stimulus	f1	f2	m1	m2	f1/f2	m1/m2	f1/m1	f1/m2	f2/m1	f2/m2
independent	**	**	**	*						dependent
standard					**	*	-	**	**	**
dialect					*	-	**	**	**	**
easy-going	-	**	**	-						complaining
standard					**	**	-	-	**	**
dialect					-	-	-	-	**	*
strong	**	**	**	-						weak
standard					**	**	-	*	**	**
dialect					**	-	-	-	**	**
reliable	**	-	**	**						unreliable
standard					**	-	-	-	**	**
dialect					-	-	-	-	-	-
warm-hearted	**	-	-	-						cool
standard					*	*	*	**	-	-
dialect					*	**	*	-	-	**
hard	*	**	*	**						gentle
standard					**	**	-	**	**	*
dialect					-	-	-	-	-	**
bold	**	**	**	**						shy
standard					*	**	-	**	**	-
dialect					**	*	-	-	-	**
aggressive	**	**	*	**						quiet
standard					**	-	*	-	-	*
dialect					*	*	-	-	-	**
egotistic	**	**	-	**						self-effacing
standard					-	*	-	-	-	-
dialect					-	-	-	-	-	-

f female

m male

/ comparison of (standard guise and dialect guise) effects between stimuli

** p<.01, * p<.05

t-test, paired samples

Not unexpectedly, the different scores for personality traits in Table 5.12 also show a confusing pattern. I deal below with the differences in effect as far as they in some meaningful way uncover more or less systematic reactions, i.e. for at least three of the four stimuli, with respect to standard and non-standard speakers and with respect to female and male speakers.

A comparison of the significance of the different reactions in Table 5.12 with the standard and dialect scores for personality traits in Table 5.11 and Figure 5.3 led me to the following conclusions. I left three items out of further consideration (easy-going - complaining, strong - weak, warm-hearted - cool), since the judgements on these personality traits were too irregular to draw any meaningful conclusions.

The different effects of the standard and non-standard guises (cf. the first four columns in Table 5.12) for the six personality traits left show that standard speakers were judged to be more independent and reliable, and dialect speakers more dependent and unreliable. This was true for the first female stimulus and both male stimuli. The second female stimulus had either an opposite effect or a slight differentiating effect: her dialect guise was judged to be more independent, her standard and dialect guises as about equally reliable and unreliable. Both female and male dialect speakers were consistently judged to be more hard, bold, aggressive and egotistic, and standard speakers more gentle, shy, quiet and self-effacing.

The significant differences in the effects of female and male speakers (cf. the last four columns in Table 5.12) as regards the six personality traits are negligible given the scattering of the data. Only in the case of the first personality trait was there a consistent difference as regards the dialect guises: male dialect speakers were seen as more independent, female dialect speakers as more dependent.

There were no significant differences between the judgements of female and male listeners. This was fortunate, since it would have been extremely difficult to find logical interpretations for these differences in view of the chaotic variation already present.

5.2.4 *Femininity - masculinity*

During the fourth linguistic attitude test using subjective reactions the informants listened to ten recordings made according to the matched-guise procedure (cf. section 2.4.3). They listened to the standard Dutch and Amsterdam dialect guises of one woman with an androgynous voice, and of one woman and one man each using their real voices and phonetically manipulated voices. After each passage the informants were asked to say whether a man or a woman was speaking.

In this test on femininity and masculinity connotations of the standard and dialect variety, I hypothesized that the androgynous voice and the phonetically manipulated voices would more often be judged to be that of a woman when speaking standard and that of a man when speaking dialect. The judgements of the informants can be found in Table 5.13.

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

stimulus		judged female by	judged male by
female 1	real voice		
	standard	95	1
	dialect	96	0
male 1	real voice		
	standard	1	95
	dialect	0	96
female 1	phonetically manipulated		
	standard	72	24
	dialect	88	8
male 1	phonetically manipulated		
	standard	4	92
	dialect	0	96
female 2	androgynous voice		
	standard	91	5
	dialect	80	16

Table 5.13 shows that the phonetically manipulated voices and the androgynous voice certainly confused the listeners: the guises are both judged to be a woman and a man. As regards the hypothesis concerning judging a voice to be female when speaking standard and to be male when speaking dialect, the phonetically manipulated male voice and the androgynous voice had similar effects: their standard guises were more often judged to be the voice of a woman, their dialect guises that of a man. The phonetically manipulated female voice had the opposite effect: it was judged more often to be a man when speaking standard and to be a woman when speaking dialect.

The McNemar test for significance of changes gives a significant result for the androgynous voice ($p < .01$) and for the female phonetically manipulated voice ($p < .01$); the male phonetically manipulated voice did not evoke significantly different judgements.

Table 14 shows the frequencies representing the changes in the judgements of

the androgynous voice's and female phonetically manipulated voice's standard and dialect guises.

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

female androgynous voice			female phonetically manipulated		
	standard judged male	guise judged female		standard judged male	guise judged female
judged male	3	13	judged male	3	5
dialect guise			dialect guise		
judged female	2	78	judged female	21	67

The results from this test which confirm that voices tend to be judged as female when speaking standard and as male when speaking non-standard resemble those from a study about the identification of the sex of children from speech fragments, in which middle class boys were often judged to be girls and working class girls to be boys (Edwards 1979).

There were no significant differences between the judgements of female and male listeners.

5.3 LANGUAGE USE AND SOCIAL NORMS: GENDER-STEREOTYPED ATTITUDES

The results from the self-evaluation tests reflect the norms people have with regard to language use. Women appear to have a more positive attitude towards the standard variety, and men towards Amsterdam dialect, which is in accordance with the speech differences in pronunciation between women and men.

The results from the subjective reaction tests reveal their less conscious social judgements. Speech functions as an important indicator of social status and of feminine and masculine characteristics, the standard pronunciation being associated with high social status and femininity, dialect being associated with low status and masculinity. But there is obviously a double norm: in the case of both standard and dialect men are believed to have a higher social status than women, and, on the toughness scale, they tended to be judged more in terms of one extreme or the other than women. No matter how correctly a woman may

speak, she never reaches a social evaluation as high as a correctly speaking man. When speaking dialect a man is judged to be macho, when speaking standard he is immediately seen as effeminate.

The results from the androgynous voice test show clearly that people simply think women more likely to speak standard than men. These different expectations about women's and men's speech seem to be largely unconscious. 'Unconscious social judgements about language can be measured by techniques such as Lambert's "matched guise" test (...)' (Labov 1972b: 248). In reply to a direct question in the Amsterdam dialect test about the suitability of the local dialect for women and men, one-third of the informants thought it better for a man while two-thirds thought that it made no difference at all. Thanks to the more sophisticated matched-guise procedure we see that it certainly does make a difference.

Stereotype assignments are generally held across population groups differing in sex, age, religion, and schooling (Broverman et al. 1972, Ehrlich 1973). In this case, women and men hardly varied in their judgements.

The different social attitudes towards women's and men's speech and the correspondingly different attitudes of women and men towards their own speech are reflected in their language use. Women speak more correctly than men to fulfil the expectations which Cheri Kramarae has characterized as: 'kind, correct - but unimportant' (Kramer 1977: 159). The use of swear words would obviously conflict with kindness and the use of standard fits perfectly well with correctness. Unfortunately, women do not benefit from the usual advantages of speaking the upper class variety in the same way as men: they are still seen as less important than men.

In the following chapter I shall summarize and briefly comment on the findings concerning the differences in language use and language attitudes between women and men.

Concluding remarks

6.1 SOCIOLINGUISTIC DIFFERENCES BETWEEN WOMEN AND MEN

The aim of this study was both to describe speech differences between women and men accurately and to gain insight into the factors underlying gender-related linguistic variation. Therefore, the different social positions of women and men were taken into account in the language use component and the perceptions of their social roles in the language attitude component.

Seven phonetic-phonological variables were studied in the speech of 48 Amsterdam couples, aged between 25 and 40, from the upper working and lower middle class. Apart from the occupation of the men, we also took the living situation of the women into account in the selection of the informants, i.e. whether they spent more time in the domestic or public sphere. Whether or not there were children and whether or not a woman had outside employment were also stratifying factors in the research design. Furthermore, we gathered data about division of domestic tasks, social network, education and occupation. Finally, the test component of the research went into linguistic attitudes towards the standard and non-standard variety, and, at the same time, towards female and male speakers.

Analysis of the seven linguistic variables separately showed that women and men differed consistently in their usage of standard Dutch and Amsterdam dialect, women using the standard variants more often, men the social dialect variants. Factor analyses applied to the linguistic variables under investigation revealed a highly structured covariation pattern, which could be interpreted as one underlying dimension of standard/non-standard usage in Amsterdam vernacular. The general measure for the degree of standard and non-standard usage thus found made it possible to determine the influence of gender relative to that of the other sociological variables in a more reliable way.

Both having children and having outside employment appeared to promote the use of standard language by women (and their husbands). In addition, educational level affected their language use: the higher the education, the more standard variants were used. This finding underlines the dangers of defining

women's social status according to the husband's occupation (cf. section 1.2). The women in our study were in general more highly educated than their husbands, so indeed 'married couples might not turn out to be parallel at all' (Cameron 1985: 51).

The division of domestic tasks and the social network had no impact at all on language use. This was mainly due to the limited variation present, division of domestic tasks being close to rigidly traditional in the whole sample, and social contacts in general few and far between. Although we could not carry out an optimal operationalization of social network in this large-scale study, the lack of clear results might also be due to characteristics of the social group which we investigated. Lesley Milroy's results, which showed some effect of the social network on language use, were based on speech differences between working-class women and men who were all 'friends of friends' (Milroy 1980). It is possible that the influence of social network on language use would have been more apparent in a close-knit working-class neighbourhood, such as the 'Dapperbuurt' or the 'Jordaan' used to be in Amsterdam.

The linguistic attitude tests on self-evaluation revealed that women had a more positive attitude towards standard Dutch and a more negative attitude towards coarse language, and men a more positive attitude towards Amsterdam vernacular and a more positive attitude towards coarse language. There also appeared to be a relation between the informants' language attitudes and their actual language use - at the phonetic-phonological level - during the interview: the more standard variants they reported using and the more negatively they felt about the Amsterdam accent, the more standard variants they used in fact. Furthermore, the results from the linguistic attitude tests using subjective reactions revealed that the standard variety was associated with both high social status, particularly for men, and femininity, and the non-standard variety with both low social status, particularly for women, and masculinity. The responses from the matched-guise test using a female speaker with an androgynous voice showed with especial clarity that people think a standard pronunciation suitable for women rather than for men.

It has sometimes been argued that speech differences between women and men are 'subtle and few' (Smith 1985: 9), and that, given that they are mostly instances of sex-preferential tendencies, 'the observed covariation may be the result of a coincidental correlation of sex with another social division (e.g. occupation) which has stronger implications for speech than does sex' (Smith 1979: 115). In this study of Amsterdam vernacular, the sex of the speaker proved to be an important predictor of language use on the continuum between standard and non-standard. This conclusion is, of course, confined to this

relatively homogeneous group of upper working class and lower middle class women and men, but in other studies of similar groups gender proved to be equally determining for language use (e.g. Labov 1966, Trudgill 1972). Our findings certainly contradict the statement that speech differences between women and men are subtle and few. Firstly, the speech differentiation between women and men is clear and consistent. Secondly, the speech differences are not specific to one or several isolated linguistic features. Seven linguistic variables were selected which are representative of language variation between standard and non-standard in Amsterdam. The first factor emerging in factor analysis is this standard/non-standard continuum and it is exactly this factor which was investigated in further analyses and which appeared to be closely correlated with the variable of gender. The other sociological variables investigated were far from having sufficient impact for me to claim that they occupy an intermediating position between language use and gender. In short, the results of this study do not support the hypothesis of an indirect link between language use and gender.

6.2. EXPLANATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

The aim of all sociolinguistic research into the speech behaviour of different social groups should be to focus on explanations of why people speak as they do, in addition to, and as a condition for, describing the speech differences properly. Otherwise, the result is merely knowing curious linguistic facts about no one in particular. So far, explanations of gender-related sociolinguistic variation have usually been put forward within a framework which assumes that male behaviour and male norms are prototypical; as a consequence, explaining speech differences between the sexes amounted to little more than explaining the 'deviant' language usage of women (e.g. Cameron and Coates 1985). Apart from the inadequacy of the explanations, they were not particularly flattering for women either. Women were believed to be conservative, socially ambitious or upwardly mobile, and hypercorrect. In contrast, men were associated with group solidarity and on the basis of this a 'covert' prestige norm for men was easily invented. Furthermore, why should the language use of women require explanation, and not that of men? After all, using the standard variety, which most researchers, male included, naturally do, is generally seen as desirable in our society.

The language behaviour of women and men may be accounted for not so much by their unequal social positions as by the differing ideas about their social

roles. The results from the language attitude component support this view. Although the results regarding the variables children and woman's employment are in agreement with an observation by Dell Hymes that participation in different social situations leads to different linguistic behaviour (Hymes 1973), their effect is overshadowed by that of sex of speaker.

Language can be seen as the product of the social system, consisting of relations between people, and of the cultural system, consisting of concepts, values and norms. A person's identity is formed in close connection with both the society and the culture of which one is part, or, more concretely, in connection with one's social position and social role. The norms for the latter are derived from the former, but the ideas, values and norms may easily take on a separate existence, as, for instance, is the case with the ideology prevailing in our society according to which women ought to be housewives and men breadwinners.

Erving Goffman has argued that people are divided into groups by nothing as much as by sex - the sexual subculture (Goffman 1977). From birth virtually everybody belongs to one of the two sexes; each implies a set of expectations, values and norms on which parents and other educators draw. Girls and boys respond to these socializing signals in order to develop gender identities appropriate to their sex, and the amount of standard or non-standard language use seems to be an inherent part of the identity. In a way, 'the linguistic differences between women and men can be seen as functioning to maintain their separate identities' (Coates 1986: 77). Because of the differentiation of sex roles in our culture, it is difficult to break through the role allocations, and employment is evaluated differently, not least by the subjects themselves. This double norm applies to parenthood as well. The different expectations about parenthood are also evident in the terms used in the social sciences. In the case of incomplete families, the absence of one of the parents is called 'absence of the father' and of the other 'maternal deprivation'.

In her theories about psychoanalysis and the sociology of gender, Nancy Chodorow sees the asymmetrical organization of parenting in which women mother as the basic cause of significant contrasts between feminine and masculine identification processes. In our society, a mother is present in a way that a father is not. Girls, then, can develop a personal identification with their mother, often in combination with other female models, e.g. teachers, and learn what it is to be womanlike, while boys must attempt to learn the masculine role in the absence of a continuous personal relationship with their fathers. Ideology about men and definitions of what is masculine come predominantly from men's nonfamilial roles; women's roles are basically familial, whereas men are defined primarily in occupational terms. The resulting production of

feminine and masculine personalities fits these roles and contributes to their perpetuation (Chodorow 1978: 173ff). The different socialization of girls and boys has been put forward by Rosalien Schenk-van Witsen as an important explanation for their later different speech behaviour (Schenk-van Witsen 1983). She focusses on the working-class background of the parents of most of the informants. The employment of mothers, if they had any, often implied contact with the well-spoken middle class - while cleaning their dirt -, so that they became acquainted with the standard variety.

One explanation for gender-related speech differentiation might lie in the different identities of women and men which are almost opposites as a consequence of gender-stereotyping. 'Intimate Strangers' by Lilian Rubin demonstrates how still in the Eighties the traditional family structure together with the socio-cultural requirements in respect of femininity and masculinity create a gulf between the ways women and men see the world which seems difficult to bridge (Rubin 1983). This penetrating portrayal of the separate life spheres points to the mountains of work - inside and outside the home - women and men will have to move in order to throw off the yoke of the prevalent gender-stereotyped ideology.

The construction of inequality between womanhood and manhood is the most striking of the manifold differences and inequalities within 'mankind'. Both genders occupy the world equally, but differently. Likewise, a speech community is characterized by manifold variation, between speakers and also within the speaker, according to situational factors such as addressee, topic and setting, and social factors such as the socio-economic status, age and sex of the speaker. This sociolinguistic study focussed on both description of and explanations for speech differentiation between women and men. One linguistic level, one socio-economic group and one speech situation were studied: the pronunciation of a group of lower middle class women and men during conversations with a female interviewer.

Quantitative sociolinguistic research is an extremely laborious, time-consuming business, especially when the aim is not only to describe linguistic variation but also to contribute to an explanation. In most cases, a project lasting years lifts only the tip of the veil both as regards the level of language variation and as regards possible generalizations about speech behaviour based on the groups investigated. None the less, I hope to have demonstrated that sociolinguistic research into 'language and sex' should really focus on language and gender, i.e. the different social positions and roles of women and men: the analysis of speech in relation to both the inferior position of women in society and the differing social norms for women and men.

Appendices

APPENDIX 1

OCCUPATIONS OF THE INFORMANTS

Occupational level; 1 - 5: low - high

Occupational type; 1 - 5: no - much standard language required

woman's occupation (hours a week)		level	type	man's occupation		level	type
01	-			bench fitter		2	1
02	-			telegraphist		3	4
03	-			tramdriver		3	1
04	-			greengrocer		3	3
05	-			postal employee		3	3
06	-			paperhanger		2	1
07	-			sales person		3	3
08	-			caretaker		3	2
09	-			electrician		2	1
10	-			tiler		2	1
11	-			photosetter		2	2
12	-			assistant accountant		3	4
13	-			printer		2	1
14	-			policeman		2	1
15	-			percussionist		3	3
16	-			bank clerk		3	4
17	-			bench fitter		2	1
18	-			butcher		4	3

woman's occupation (hours a week)				man's occupation		
		level	type		level	type
19	clerk (25)	3	4	security employee	3	2
20	health visitor (25)	3	4	clerk	3	3
21	stenographer (40)	3	4	air cargo worker	3	4
22	clerk (19)	3	4	plasterer	2	1
23	bank clerk (32)	3	3	clerk	3	4
24	typist (25)	2	4	clerk	3	4
25	dispenser's assistant (20)	3	2	clerk	3	4
26	terminal operator (20)	3	3	sales person	3	3
27	hairdresser (40)	2	2	technician	3	4
28	clerk (40)	3	4	house painter	4	3
29	clerk (40)	3	3	electrician	2	1
30	chiroprapist (15)	3	3	butcher	4	2
31	sales person (15)	3	3	shopkeeper	4	4
32	secretary (40)	3	5	electrician	2	1
33	clerk (20)	3	4	clerk	3	2
34	cleaner (15)	1	1	tanker driver	2	1
35	nursery school teacher (28)	5	5	technician	5	3
36	nurse (20)	3	2	museum attendant	3	2
37	nurse (28)	3	2	tramdriver	3	2
38	nurse (16)	3	4	ambulance driver	3	1
39	clerk (20)	2	1	technician	2	2
40	terminal operator (20)	3	3	printer	2	2
41	cashier (15)	3	2	carpenter	2	1
42	waitress (20)	2	3	dental technician	3	2
43	tea lady (20)	2	3	technician	2	1
44	cleaner (20)	1	1	clerk	2	1
45	cleaner (20)	1	3	clerk	3	4
46	caretaker (?)	3	2	printer	5	4
47	machine operator (40)	3	1	programmer	3	3
48	cleaner (15)	1	1	clerk	3	3

APPENDIX 2

READING STYLE TEXT

Instruction:

Would you please read the following story as casually as possible?

Samen naar de film...

Sjaan is stapel op ijs. Waar ze ook heen gaat, altijd wil ze ijs eten. Laatst zouden we samen de stad in naar de bios, maar vlakbij huis kregen we al grote heibel met elkaar. Al was het vrij koud ook nou begon Sjaan vrijwel meteen met haar gezanik om ijs. Ik zag dat helemaal niet zitten. Ik had veel meer zin in een haring met veel ui en zuur, maar Sjaan griezelt van uien. Hoewel we er eigenlijk nauwelijks tijd voor hadden kon ik toch de verleiding niet weerstaan om gauw even een zoute haring plus ui en zuur te kopen. Sjaan ging van kwaadheid bijna huilen. 'Als je maar weet dat ik mijn ijsje krijg', krijste ze. 'Samen naar de film, zo gezellig', zei ik en begon wat voor me uit te fluiten. Bij de ijskar stond een hele rij, maar Sjaan bleef ijskoud staan wachten. 'Weet je dat het de hoogste tijd is, schat?' fluisterde ik in haar oor. 'Zeker, de hoogste tijd voor een ijsje, heb ik al tijden zin in', zei Sjaan. Nou was ik het spuugzat. 'Stik in je ijsje meid, ik ga kaartjes kopen'. Toen ik eindelijk bij de kassa was gekomen bleken alle kaartjes uitverkocht te zijn. Balen dat ik deed! Met een beteuterd gezicht vertelde ik het Sjaan, maar die schaterde het uit en haalde twee kaartjes uit haar jaszak die ze van te voren had gekocht. Dat deed mijn boze bui verdwijnen als sneeuw voor de zon. Eenmaal in de bioskoop zagen we een film uit de oude doos. We zagen de Dikke en de Dunne met een grote hangsnor op een boot zitten met zomerse kleren aan. Ze kauwden op een kippebout en de Dikke zat zoveel te eten dat hij zeeziek werd. Hij zag lijkbleek, werd duizelig en viel doodleuk door een luik. Hij duikelde naar beneden het ruim in bovenop een dame met goudblond haar die een slagroomtaart met poedersuiker zat te eten. Uitbundig van plezier tuimelden we naar buiten. Wat hadden we een gein gehad.

APPENDIX 3

WORD LIST

Instruction:

Would you please read the following ten lines (of words) clearly and not too quickly?

- 1 balen - bleken - boot - gauw - bui - eigenlijk - bios - zat
- 2 dame - deed - bioskoop - kauwden - buiten - gein - hangsnor - zitten
- 3 haring - eenmaal - boven - nauwelijks - buitelen - heibel - plus - zon
- 4 kaartje - eten - doodleuk - bout - fluiten - meid - schat - zoveel
- 5 kassa - heen - doos - goud - ui - verleiding - schateren - zuur
- 6 laat - leek - grote - koud - duizelig - lijkbalek - slagroom - gezanik
- 7 maar - meteen - hoogste - nou - huis - tijd - spuug - gezellig
- 8 samen - twee - kopen - oude - luik - verdwijnen - staan - gezeur
- 9 Sjaan - veel - room - zouden - ruim - vrij - stad - griezelt
- 10 stapel - zeeziek - zomers - zoute - uitbundig - ijs - suiker - plezier

APPENDIX 4

PHONETIC-PHONOLOGICAL TEST

Items and Reliability coefficients of phonetic-phonological test

1 - 2: standard - non-standard	mean (n = 96)	corrected item-total correlation	
1. <i>kaartje</i> (ticket)	1.23	.56	.59
2. <i>dame</i> (lady)	1.13	.49	.52
3. <i>bleek</i> (pale)	1.28	.36	.34
4. <i>twee</i> (two)	1.04	.44	.43
5. <i>boot</i> (boat)	1.17	.36	.39
6. <i>kopen</i> (to buy)	1.16	.52	.54
7. <i>koud</i> (cold)	1.09	.61	.65
8. <i>zoute</i> (salt)	1.31	.42	.42
9. <i>kauwen</i> (to chew)	1.28	.42	.43
10. <i>huis</i> (house)	1.11	.56	.60
11. <i>uit</i> (out)	1.09	.61	.64
12. <i>buiten</i> (outside)	1.32	.56	.52
13. <i>ijs</i> (ice)	1.05	.46	.44
14. <i>vrij</i> (free)	1.26	.27	-
15. <i>meid</i> (girl)	1.07	.53	.61
16. <i>eigen</i> (own)	1.10	.56	.57
17. <i>schat</i> (dear)	1.54	.50	.50
18. <i>zuur</i> (pickles)	1.53	.11	-
19. <i>gezellig</i> (sociable)	1.08	.42	.39
20. <i>plezier</i> (fun)	1.33	.37	-
alpha		.85	.86

APPENDIX 5

MORPHO-SYNTACTIC TEST

Items and Reliability coefficients of morpho-syntactic test

1 - 2: standard - non-standard	mean (n = 96)	corrected item- total correlation	
1. ik <i>kende/kon</i> hem al jaren (I had known him for years)	1.45	.31	.32
2. zij <i>heeft/heb</i> het altijd druk (she is always busy)	1.02	.12	-
3. hij <i>ligt/legt</i> allang in bed (he has been lying in bed for a long time)	1.08	.30	.32
4. dat <i>kan/ken</i> echt niet waar zijn (that cannot be true)	1.04	.15	-
5. hij zorgt voor <i>zichzelf/z'n eigen</i> (he looks after himself)	1.10	.37	.28
6. <i>zij/hun</i> hebben het gedaan (they have done it)	1.03	.08	-
7. die jas is <i>van mij/van mijn</i> (that coat is mine)	1.07	.07	-
8. ze was net als <i>ik/mij</i> te laat (just like me she was too late)	1.07	.15	-
9. daar heb ik <i>nooit/nooit geen</i> zin in (I never/don't never feel like that)	1.16	.16	-
10. dat is m'n <i>enige/enigste</i> ideaal (that is my one ideal)	1.32	.29	.37
11. ik heb vandaag meer fut <i>dan/als</i> gisteren (today I have more energy than yesterday)	1.32	.24	.29
12. hij is even groot <i>als/dan</i> ik (he is as big as me)	1.03	.08	-
alpha		.49	.54

APPENDIX 6

LEXICAL TEST

Items and Reliability coefficients of lexical test

0 - 5: none - in five situations	mean (n = 96)	corrected item- total correlation	
1. (<i>mijn</i>) <i>hemel</i> (heavens)	1.27	.27	-
2. <i>jasses/jesses</i> (bother)	1.52	.28	-
3. <i>verdomme</i> (damn)	2.62	.47	.49
4. <i>jezus</i> (Jesus)	1.84	.52	.53
5. <i>godverdomme</i> (goddamn)	1.49	.47	.58
6. <i>kut</i> (cunt; fuck, shit)	.67	.62	.61
7. <i>klote</i> (balls)	1.30	.68	.69
8. <i>trut</i> (cow)	1.42	.59	.60
9. <i>lul</i> (prick; asshole)	.89	.73	.74
10. <i>klootzak</i> (jerk)	1.56	.71	.72
alpha		.83	.86

APPENDIX 7

AMSTERDAM DIALECT TEST

Items and Reliability coefficients of Amsterdam dialect test

1 - 3: negative - positive	mean (n = 96)	corrected item-total correlation
1. What do you think of the way they speak in Amsterdam?	2.10	.33
2. How would you feel about the radio and TV newsreaders speaking Amsterdam vernacular?	1.45	.32
3. Do you watch the pirate TV station 'Mokum'?	2.19	.15
4. Do you like Amsterdam speech more or less than that of Groningen?	2.44	.18
5. Do you like Amsterdam speech more or less than that of Limburg?	2.25	.29
6. Can people outside Amsterdam tell from your accent where you come from?	2.22	.30
7. How do you think that people from outside Amsterdam feel about Amsterdam vernacular?	2.05	.08
8. Do you think that your speech differs from that of your parents?	2.07	.29
alpha		.51

References

- Acker, Joan (1973). Women and social stratification: a case of intellectual sexism. *American Journal of Sociology* 78, 936- 945.
- Afdeling Bestuursinformatie der Gemeente Amsterdam (1979). *Amsterdam in cijfers. Statistisch zakboek 1979*. Amsterdam, Stadsdrukkerij.
- Agheysi, Rebecca and Fishman, Joshua A. (1970). Language attitude studies. A brief survey of methodological approaches. *Anthropological Linguistics* 12, 137-157.
- Ammon, Ulrich (1973). *Dialekt und Einheitssprache in ihrer sozialen Verflechtung. Eine empirische Untersuchung zu einem vernachlässigten Aspekt von Sprache und sozialer Ungleichheit*. Weinheim etc., Beltz.
- Appel, René, Hubers, Gerard and Meijer, Guus (1979). *Sociolinguïstiek*. Utrecht/Antwerpen, Het Spectrum.
- Bailey, Lee Ann and Timm, Leonora A. (1976). More on women's - and men's - expletives. *Anthropological Linguistics* 18, 438-449.
- Bal, Mieke (1981). Methoden in de literatuurwetenschap. *Tijdschrift voor Vrouwenstudies* 2, 394-416.
- Bird, Elizabeth, David, Miriam, Malos, Ellen et al., eds. (1979). *Half the sky. An introduction to women's studies*. The Bristol Women's Studies Group. London, Virago.
- Birke, Lynda, Faulkner, Wendy, Best, Sandy et al., eds. (1980). *Alice through the microscope. The power of science over women's lives*. The Brighton Women & Science Group. London, Virago.
- Bodine, Ann (1975). Sex differentiation in language. In Barrie Thorne and Nancy Henley, eds., *Language and sex: difference and dominance*. Rowley, Mass., Newbury House Publishers, 130-151.
- Booij, G.E. (1981). *Generatieve fonologie van het Nederlands*. Utrecht/Antwerpen, Het Spectrum, Aula Paperback 55.
- Boon, L.M. (1980). *Sociaal-economische gegevens over de Amsterdamse buurtcombinaties uit de volkstelling 1971, aangevuld met gegevens uit gemeentelijke statistieken uit 1978 en 1979*. Amsterdam, Afdeling Bestuursinformatie der gemeentesecretarie, Unpubl. Ms.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1982). *Ce que parler veut dire: l'Économie des échanges linguistiques*. Paris, Fayard.

- Bourdieu, Pierre and Boltanski, Luc (1975). Le fétichisme de la langue. *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales* 4, 2-32.
- Boves, L., Fagel, W. and Herpt, L. van (1982). Opvattingen van vrouwen en mannen over de spraak van mannen en vrouwen. *De Nieuwe Taalgids* 75, 1-23.
- Broeck, Jef van den (1977). *Social conditioning of syntactic variation*. Leuven, Universiteit van Leuven.
- Brouwer, Dédé (1982). The influence of the addressee's sex on politeness in language use. *Linguistics* 20, 697-711.
- Brouwer, Dédé and Gerritsen, Marinel (1980). Sociolinguïstiek en de tweede sekse. In G. Geerts and A. Hagen, eds., *Sociolinguïstische studies 1. Bijdragen uit het Nederlandse taalgebied*. Groningen, Wolters-Noordhoff, 50-61.
- Brouwer, Dédé, Gerritsen, Marinel and Haan, Dorian de (1979). Speech differences between women and men: on the wrong track? *Language in Society* 8, 33-50.
- Brouwer, Dédé and Hout, Roeland van (1984). Amsterdam vernacular: the analysis of style shifting and covariation. In Hans Bennis and W.U.S. Lessen Kloeke, eds., *Linguistics in the Netherlands 1984*. Dordrecht/Cinnaminson, Foris Publications, 33-43.
- Brouwer, Dédé and Hout, Roeland van (in preparation). Gender- related variation in Amsterdam vernacular.
- Brouwer, Dédé & Post, Annette van der (1976). *Taal en sexe; verschillen in taalgebruik en taalattitude tussen vrouwen en mannen*. Publikaties van het Instituut voor Algemene Taalwetenschap van de Universiteit van Amsterdam, no. 11.
- Broverman, I.K., Vogel, S.R., Broverman, D. et al. (1972). Sex- role stereotypes: a current appraisal. *Journal of Social Issues* 28, 59-78.
- Brown, Penelope and Levinson, Stephen (1978). Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena. In Esther N. Goody, ed., *Questions and politeness. Strategies in social interaction*. London etc., Cambridge University Press, 56-289.
- Cameron, Deborah (1985). *Feminism and linguistic theory*. Houndmills etc., MacMillan.
- Cameron, Deborah and Coates, Jennifer (1985). Some problems in the sociolinguistic explanation of sex differences. *Language and Communication* 5, 143-151.
- Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (1980). *Statistisch zakboek 1980*. 's-Gravenhage, Staatsuitgeverij.
- Chodorow, Nancy (1978). *The reproduction of mothering. Psychoanalysis and the sociology of gender*. Berkeley etc., University of California Press.
- Coates, Jennifer (1986). *Women, men and language. A sociolinguistic account of sex differences in language*. London & New York, Longman.

- Crosby, Faye and Nyquist, Linda (1977). The female register: an empirical study of Lakoff's hypotheses. *Language in Society* 6, 313-322.
- Daan, J. (1949). *Hij zeit wat. Grepen uit de Amsterdamse volkstaal*. Amsterdam, Van Campen, De Wijze Jacob 13, 2nd ed.
- Daan, J. (1954). Amsterdamse dialecten in het verleden. In J.G. Dillen and J. Daan, eds., *Bevolking en taal van Amsterdam in het verleden*. Lezingen gehouden voor de dialecten-commissie der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen op 12 juni 1954. Amsterdam, Noord-Hollandse Uitgevers Maatschappij, Bijdragen en mededelingen der dialecten-commissie van de Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam XIV, 13-24.
- Deprez, K. and Geerts, G. (1977). *Lexicale en pronominale standaardizatie*. Antwerpen, Universiteit van Antwerpen.
- Diekerhof, Els and Vierhout, Marian (1981). Vrouwen willen weer werken, maar... Vrouwen en de terugkeer op de arbeidsmarkt. In *Kongresbundel Zomeruniversiteit Vrouwenstudies*. Amsterdam, 303- 305.
- Dubois, Betty Lou and Crouch, Isabel (1975). The question of tag- questions in women's speech: they don't really use more of them, do they? *Language in Society* 4, 289-295.
- Ebertowski, Marianne (1980). Taalevaluatie en taalvariatie: de sociaal-psychologische bijdrage tot de sociolinguïstiek. In G. Geerts and A. Hagen, eds., *Sociolinguïstische studies 1. Bijdragen uit het Nederlandse taalgebied*. Groningen, Wolters- Noordhoff, 31-49.
- Edelsky, Carole (1979). Question intonation and sex roles. *Language in Society* 8, 15-32.
- Ehrlich, H. (1973). *The social psychology of prejudice*. New York.
- Elias, Michael (1977). *Plat-Haags. Een verkennend onderzoek naar enkele aspecten van het taalgebruik en de taalattitude van mannelijke Hagenaars in en om de Schilderswijk*. Publikaties van het Instituut voor Algemene Taalwetenschap van de Universiteit van Amsterdam, no. 15.
- Elyan, Olwen, Smith, Philip, Giles, Howard et al. (1978). RP- accented female speech: the voice of perceived androgyny? In Peter Trudgill, ed., *Sociolinguistic patterns in British English*. London, Edward Arnold, 122-131.
- Endt, Enno and Frerichs, Lieneke (1972). *Bargoens woordenboek. Kleine woordenschat van de volkstaal*. Amsterdam, Erven Thomas Rap.
- Faddegon, B. (1951). Analyse van een Amsterdamse klankwet. In *Album Dr. Louise Kaiser*. Alphen aan den Rijn, Samson, 26-30.
- Fairweather, Hugh (1976). Sex differences in cognition. *Cognition* 4, 231-280.
- Fishbein, Martin and Ajzen, Icek (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention and behavior: an introduction to theory and research*. Reading, Mass. etc., Addison-Wesley.

- Fishman, Pamela M. (1983). Interaction: the work women do. In Barrie Thorne, Cheri Kramarae and Nancy Henley, eds., *Language, gender and society*. Rowley, Mass. etc., Newbury House Publishers 89-101.
- Florijn, A.F. (1980). Stadsdialect en streekdialect: hoe denken de sprekers over elkaar? J.F. Matter, ed., *Toegepaste Taalwetenschap in Artikelen* 8, 163-183.
- Gal, Susan (1978). Peasant men can't get wives: language change and sex roles in a bilingual community. *Language in Society* 7, 1-16.
- Gauchat, Louis (1905). L'Unité phonétique dans le patois d'une commune. In *Aus Romanischen Sprachen und Literaturen. Festschrift Heinrich Morf*. Halle, Niemeyer, 175-232.
- Gerritsen, Marinel (1978). Het dialect van vrouwen, nu eens ouderwets dan weer modern. In Dédé Brouwer et al., *Vrouwentaal en mannenpraat. Verschillen in taalgebruik en taalgedrag in relatie tot de maatschappelijke rolverdeling*. Amsterdam, Van Gennep, 40-68.
- Gerritsen, Marinel (1980). Een kwantitatief onderzoek naar sekseverschillen in het Amsterdams. In G. Geerts and A. Hagen, eds., *Sociolinguistische studies I. Bijdragen uit het Nederlandse taalgebied*. Groningen, Wolters-Noordhoff, 154-179.
- Gerritsen, Marinel (1985). Alters- und geschlechtsspezifische Sprachverwendung. In Werner Besch und Klaus J. Mattheier, eds., *Ortssprachenforschung. Beiträge zu einem Bonner Kolloquium*, Erich Schmidt Verlag, 79-108.
- Giles, Howard and Marsh, Patricia (1979). Perceived masculinity, androgyny and accented speech. *Language Sciences* 1, 301-315.
- Giles, Howard and Powesland, Peter F. (1975). *Speech style and social evaluation*. London etc., Academic Press.
- Ginneken, Jacques van S.J. (1913). De vrouwentaal. In i.d., *Handboek der Nederlandsche taal. Deel I. De sociologische structuur der Nederlandsche taal*. Nijmegen, Malmberg, 520-539.
- Goffman, Erving (1977). The arrangement between the sexes. *Theory and Society* 4, 301-331.
- Gussenhoven, C. and Bremmer R.H. Jr. (1983). Voiced fricatives in Dutch: sources and present-day usage. *NOWELE* 2, 55-71.
- Haeringen, C.B. van (1951). Standaard-Nederlands. *De Nieuwe Taalgids* 44, 316-320.
- Hagen, Anton M. (1987). Sociolinguistic aspects in dialectology. In Ulrich Ammon, Norbert Dittmar and Klaus J. Mattheier, eds., *Sociolinguistics. Soziolinguistik. An international handbook of the science of language and society. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Wissenschaft von Sprache und Gesellschaft*. First Volume. Erster Halbband. Berlin/New York, Walter de Gruyter, 402-413.
- Heikens, Henk (1978). Een sociolinguistisch opgebouwd corpus Amsterdamse spreektaal. *Taal en Tongval* 30, 36-49.

- Holmes, Janet (1987). Hedging, fencing and other conversational gambits: an analysis of gender differences in New Zealand speech. In Anne Pauwels, ed., *Women and language in Australian and New Zealand society*. Sydney, Australian Professional Publications, 59-79.
- Horvath, Barbara and Sankoff, David (1987). Delimiting the Sydney speech community. *Language in Society* 16, 179-204.
- Hout, Roeland van (1982a). Sociolinguïstische transformaties rondom stijlverschuiving. *Gramma* 6, 144-168.
- Hout, Roeland van (1982b). Van taalvariabele naar taalvariëteit: een onderzoek naar de linguïstische coherentie van taalvariatie. ZWO-project 17-25-05.
- Hout, Roeland van (1984). The need for a theory of choice in sociolinguistics. *Linguïstische Berichte* 90, 39-57.
- Hudson, R.A. (1980). *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge etc., Cambridge University Press.
- Hymes, Dell (1973). Speech and language: on the origins and foundations of inequality in speaking. *Daedalus* 102. Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 59-86.
- Jansen, F. (1980). De sociolinguïstische benadering van spreektaalsyntaxis: het bijwoord achter de werkwoordelijke eindgroep. In G. Geerts and A. Hagen, eds., *Sociolinguïstische studies 1. Bijdragen uit het Nederlandse taalgebied*. Groningen, Wolters-Noordhoff, 131-153.
- Jespersen, Otto (1922). The woman. In i.d., *Language, its nature, development, and origin*. London, Allen & Unwin, 237-254.
- Jong, Eveline D. de, ed. (1979). *Spreektaal. Woordfrequenties in gesproken Nederlands*. Utrecht, Bohn, Scheltema & Holkema.
- Key, Mary Ritchie (1972). Linguistic behavior of male and female. *Linguistics* 88, 15-31.
- Klooke, G.G. (1934). *De Amsterdamsche volkstaal voorheen en thans*. Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeling Letterkunde, Deel 77, Serie A, no. 1. Amsterdam, Noord-Hollandische Uitgevers-Maatschappij.
- Knops, Uus (1983). Meet- en manipulatietechnieken in taalattitude-onderzoek. *Gramma* 7, 281-307.
- Knops, Uus (1987). *Andermans en eigen taal*. Groningen, Wolters-Noordhoff.
- Knops, Uus and Hout, Roeland van (1988). Language attitudes in the Dutch language area: an introduction. In Roeland van Hout and Uus Knops, eds., *Language attitudes in the Dutch language area*. Dordrecht/Providence, Foris Publications, 1-23.
- Kramer, Cheris (1977). Perceptions of female and male speech. *Language and Speech* 20, 151-161.
- Labov, William (1966). *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, Center for Applied Linguistics.

- Labov, William (1972a). *Language in the inner city. Studies in the black English vernacular*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, William (1972b). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lakoff, Robin (1973). Language and woman's place. *Language in Society* 2, 45-80.
- Lambert, Wallace E. et al. (1960). Evaluational reactions to spoken languages. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 60, 44-51.
- Lavandera, Beatriz R. (1978). Where does the sociolinguistic variable stop? *Language in Society* 7, 171-182.
- Ma, Roxana and Herasimchuk, Eleanor (1972). Speech styles in Puerto-Rican bilingual speakers. In Joshua A. Fishman, ed., *Advances in the sociology of language*. Volume 2. The Hague/Paris, Mouton, 268-295.
- Macaulay, Ronald K.S. (1978). Variation and consistency in Glaswegian English. In Peter Trudgill, ed., *Sociolinguistic patterns in British English*. London, Edward Arnold, 132-143.
- Martyna, Wendy (1978). What does 'he' mean - use of the generic masculine. *Journal of Communication* 28, 131-138.
- Mattheier, Klaus J. (1980). *Pragmatik und Soziologie der Dialekte. Einführung in die kommunikative Dialektologie des Deutschen*. Heidelberg, Quelle & Meyer.
- Milroy, Lesley (1980). *Language and social networks*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Mittelmeijer, J. (1959). *Taalkundige observatie van de schoolgaande jeugd in de Jordaen. Critische beschouwing van de klankleer en enige voorlopige opmerkingen over de verhoudingen binnen het vocalisme van het Amsterdams volksdialect: het Jordaans*. Amsterdam/Nijmegen, Unpubl. Ms.
- Münstermann, Henk and Hout, Roeland van (1988). Language attitudes and the prediction of dialect use. In Roeland van Hout and Uus Knops, eds., *Language attitudes in the Dutch language area*. Dordrecht/Providence, Foris Publications, 173-188.
- Nichols, Patricia C. (1978). Black women in the rural South: conservative and innovative. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 17, 45-54.
- Oakley, Ann (1974). *The sociology of housework*. New York, Random House, Pantheon Books.
- Oliver, Marion M. and Rubin, Joan (1975). The use of expletives by some American women. *Anthropological Linguistics* 17, 191-198.
- Oudijk, Corrine (1983). *Sociale atlas van de vrouw*. Sociale en Culturele Studies 3. 's-Gravenhage, Staatsuitgeverij.
- Philips, Susan U., Steele, Susan and Tanz, Christine, eds. (1987). *Language, gender, and sex in comparative perspective*. Cambridge etc., Cambridge University Press.
- Philips, Anne and Taylor, Barbara (1980). Sex and skill. Notes towards a feminist economics. *Feminist Review* 6, 79-88.

- Poldervaart, Saskia et al. (1983). *Vrouwenstudies. Een inleiding*. Nijmegen, Socialistische Uitgeverij SUN.
- Post, Annette van der (1978). Taalgebruik van vrouwen en mannen in niet-westerse gemeenschappen. In Dédé Brouwer et al., *Vrouwentaal en mannenpraat. Verschillen in taalgebruik en taalgedrag in relatie tot de maatschappelijke rolverdeling*. Amsterdam, Van Gennep, 12-39.
- Rubin, Lilian B. (1983). *Intimate strangers*. New York, Harper & Row.
- Sachs, Jacqueline (1975). Cues to the identification of sex in children's speech. In Barrie Thorne and Nancy Henley, eds., *Language and sex: difference and dominance*. Rowley, Mass., Newbury House Publishers, 152-171.
- Sachs, Jacqueline, Lieberman, Philip and Erickson, Donna (1973). Anatomical and cultural determinants of male and female speech. In Roger W. Shuy and Ralph W. Fasold, eds., *Language attitudes: current trends and prospects*. Washington, Georgetown University Press, 74-84.
- Sankoff, Gilian and Cedergren, Henriëtte J. (1971). Some results of a sociolinguistic study of Montreal French. In Regna Darnell, ed., *Linguistic diversity in Canadian society*. Edmonton etc., Linguistic Research Inc., 61-87.
- Sankoff, David and Laberge, Suzanne (1978). The linguistic market and the statistical explanation of variability. In David Sankoff, ed., *Linguistic variation. Models and methods*. New York etc., Academic Press, 239-250.
- Sapir, Edward (1915). Abnormal types of speech in Nootka. In David G. Mandelbaum, ed., *Selected writings of Edward Sapir in language, culture, and personality*. Berkeley 1968, University of California Press, 179-196.
- Schatz, H.F. (1986). *Plat Amsterdams in its social context: a sociolinguistic study of the dialect of Amsterdam*. Amsterdam, Publikaties van het P.J. Meertens-Instituut, no. 6.
- Schenk-van Witsen, Rosalien (1983). Uitgesproken verschillen: een verklaring van sekseverschillen in het taalgebruik van echtparen. *Sociologisch Tijdschrift* 10, 455-477.
- Schulz, Muriel R. (1975). The semantic derogation of women. In Barrie Thorne and Nancy Henley, eds., *Language and sex: difference and dominance*. Rowley, Mass., Newbury House Publishers, 64-83.
- Scotton, Carol Myers (1976). Strategies of neutrality. Language use in uncertain situations. *Language* 52, 919-941.
- Shuy, Roger W., Wolfram, Walter A. and Riley, William K. (1967). *Linguistic correlates of social stratification in Detroit speech*. Cooperative research project no. 6-1347. Michigan, United States Office of Education.
- Silveira, Jeanette (1980). Generic masculine words and thinking. In Cheris Kramarae, ed., *The voices and words of women and men*. Oxford, Pergamon Press, 165-178.
- Smith, Philip M. (1979). Sex markers in speech. In Klaus R. Scherer and Howard Giles, eds., *Social markers in speech*. Cambridge etc., Cambridge University Press, 109-146.

- Smith, Philip M. (1985). *Language, the sexes and society*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Swacker, Marjorie (1975). The sex of the speaker as a sociolinguistic variable. In Barrie Thorne and Nancy Henley, eds., *Language and sex: difference and dominance*. Rowley, Mass., Newbury House Publishers, 76-84.
- Terracher, A.L. (1914). *Les aires morphologiques dans les parlers populaires du Nord-Ouest de l'Angoumois* (1800-1900). Paris, Champion.
- Thorne, Barrie, Kramarae, Cheris and Henley, Nancy, eds. (1983). *Language, gender and society*. Rowley, Mass. etc., Newbury House Publishers.
- Trommelen, Mieke and Zonneveld, Wim (1979). *Inleiding in de generatieve fonologie*. Muiderberg, Coutinho.
- Trudgill, Peter (1972). Sex, covert prestige and linguistic change in the urban British English of Norwich. *Language in Society* 1, 179-196.
- Trudgill, Peter (1974). *The social differentiation of English in Norwich*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Trudgill, Peter and Giles, Howard (1976). Sociolinguistics and linguistic value judgements: correctness, adequacy and aesthetics. Reproduced by L.A.U.T. (Linguistic Agency University of Trier). In Peter Trudgill, ed., *On dialect. Social and geographical perspectives*. Oxford 1983, Blackwell, 201-225.
- Vangassen, H. (1965). *De Nederlandse ij te Amsterdam (XIVe-XVIIe eeuw)*. Historische dialektologie I. Tongeren, Michiels.
- Vries, J.W. de et al. (1974). De slot-t in consonantclusters te Leiden. *Forum der Letteren* 15, 235-251.
- Watson, Walter and Barth, Ernest (1964). Questionable assumptions in the theory of social stratification. *Pacific Sociological Review* 7, 10-16.
- Weinreich, Uriel, Labov, William and Herzog, Marvin I. (1968). Empirical foundations for a theory of language change. In W.P. Lehman and Yakov Malkiel, eds., *Directions for historical linguistics*. Austin/London, University of Texas Press, 95-195.
- Westerlaak, J.M. van, Kropman, J.A. and Collaris, J.W.M. (1975). *Beroepenklapper. Bestemd voor intern gebruik*. Nijmegen, Instituut voor Toegepaste Sociologie.
- Wicker, A.W. (1969). Attitudes vs. actions: the relationship of verbal and overt behavioral responses to attitude objects. *Journal of Social Issues* 25, 41-78.
- Wolfram, Walter A. (1969). *A sociolinguistic description of Detroit negro speech*. Washington, Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Zimmerman, Don H. and West, Candace (1975). Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversation. In Barrie Thorne and Nancy Henley, eds., *Language and sex: difference and dominance*. Rowley, Mass., Newbury House Publishers, 105-129.

Samenvatting

Dit proefschrift gaat over het taalgebruik en de taalattitudes van vrouwen en mannen. Uit sociolinguïstisch onderzoek in vooral de Verenigde Staten en Engeland komt herhaaldelijk hetzelfde variatie patroon naar voren met betrekking tot de uitspraak: vrouwen gebruiken vaker de varianten uit de standaardtaal, mannen vaker de non-standaard varianten. Ik heb geprobeerd enig licht te werpen op mogelijke verklaringen voor dit verschijnsel op grond van een onderzoek uitgevoerd in Amsterdam. De eerste doelstelling was een zo nauwkeurig mogelijke beschrijving te geven van de sociolinguïstische variatie, waarbij ik me concentreerde op de verschillende leefsituaties van vrouwen en mannen. In de tweede plaats heb ik de sociale evaluatie van standaard en non-standaard variëteiten onderzocht en de evaluatie van vrouwelijke en mannelijke sprekers, op zoek naar aanvullende verklaringen voor de sekse-gebonden taalvariatie.

In Hoofdstuk 1 geef ik een kort overzicht van wat er bekend is over het taalgebruik en de taalattitudes van vrouwen en mannen. Binnen de taalwetenschap is betrekkelijk weinig aandacht besteed aan de taal van vrouwen, oftewel aan de verschillen in taalgebruik tussen vrouwen en mannen. De verwaarlozing van vrouwentaal is allereerst te wijten aan de dominante positie van mannen in de (taal)wetenschap, die de taal van vrouwen hooguit als hoofdstuk apart behandelen. Een tweede oorzaak voor deze verwaarlozing moet worden gezocht in de in deze eeuw dominante strukturalistische en transformationeel-generatieve paradigma's, waarin taal wordt opgevat als autonoom verschijnsel, zodat alleen variatie gekonditioneerd door intra-linguïstische factoren aan bod komt. Pas in de jaren zestig komt hierin verandering door de opkomst van de sociolinguïstiek, waarin taal wordt benaderd als maatschappelijk-kultureel verschijnsel, zodat naast variatie naar sociaal milieu en leeftijd ook sekse-gebonden taalvariatie aan de orde kon komen. Er werd herhaaldelijk vastgesteld dat vrouwen vaker de standaardtaal gebruiken en mannen meer gebruik maken van non-standaard varianten. Bovendien bleken vrouwen een positievere attitude te hebben tegenover de

standaardtaal en mannen een positievere attitude tegenover (sociale) dialecten.

Hoofdstuk 2 bevat een beschrijving van het onderzoek in Amsterdam. Het onderzoek heeft drie componenten: een analyse van het taalgebruik, bestudering van de taalattitudes en bestudering van enkele aspecten van de levensomstandigheden van de informanten. Er zijn 96 sprekers geïnterviewd, bestaande uit 48 echtparen uit Amsterdam West. De leeftijd van de vrouwen ligt tussen de 25 en 35 jaar. Het beroep van de mannen valt noch onder de laagste noch onder de hoogste beroepskategorie; de onderzochte groep kan dus ruwweg worden ingedeeld als behorend tot de lagere middenklasse (lower middle class). In het onderzoek borduur ik voort op de sociolinguïstische bevindingen. Er is geprobeerd de sociolinguïstische benadering te combineren met een feministisch perspectief door rekening te houden met de verschillende oriëntaties van vrouwen en mannen op hun taalgebruik. De ongelijkheid in de leefsituatie van vrouwen en mannen is in de onderzoeksofzet geoperationaliseerd door de introductie als primaire onafhankelijke variabelen van het hebben van kinderen en het hebben van betaald werk van de vrouw; als sekundaire onafhankelijke variabelen zijn de opleiding, de aard van het werk en de sociale contacten van de informanten bestudeerd. De afhankelijke, fonetisch-fonologische, variabelen zijn: (aa), (ee), (oo), (au), (ei) en (z). De taalattitude component bevat vier zelf-evaluatie testen en vier subjectieve reactie testen, waarin wordt gebruik gemaakt van de 'matched-guise' techniek.

In Hoofdstuk 3 wordt linguïstische variatie met betrekking tot de fonetisch-fonologische variabelen behandeld. De stijlverschuiving wordt op twee manieren belicht: als een verschuiving die plaats vindt tussen de verschillende onderzochte stijlen en als variatie die binnen één stijl voorkomt. Een analyse van de linguïstische variabelen afzonderlijk toont dat vrouwen consistent vaker varianten uit het standaard Nederlands gebruiken en mannen vaker de Amsterdams gekleurde varianten. De stijlverschuiving van vrouwen en mannen wordt achtereenvolgens beschouwd als een absoluut verschijnsel en een 'relatief' verschijnsel, rekening houdend met de mogelijke mate van stijlverschuiving, waarbij de stijlverschuiving wordt afgezet tegen de mate van gebruik van standaardvarianten in het informele deel van het interview. Tenslotte ga ik in op het co-variantie patroon van de linguïstische variabelen, resulterend in een algemene maat voor de mate van standaard Nederlands en Amsterdams dialect.

In Hoofdstuk 4 onderzoek ik de taalvariatie tussen vrouwen en mannen met het oog op onderliggende factoren ter verklaring van de sekse-variatie in taal. De standaard/non-standaard dimensie, onthuld in het derde hoofdstuk, wordt

gebruikt om de effecten van het hebben van kinderen en het hebben van betaald werk van de vrouw te bepalen, samen met de effecten van het opleidingsnivo, specifieke kenmerken van het werk en van het sociale netwerk van de informanten. De variabelen sekse, opleiding, kinderen en werk van de vrouw zijn van invloed op het taalgebruik. De volgende verbanden worden vastgesteld:

- vrouwen gebruiken vaker varianten uit het standaard Nederlands, mannen vaker varianten uit het Amsterdams;
- vrouwen met een hoger opleidingsnivo gebruiken meer standaardtaal dan vrouwen met een lager opleidingsnivo;
- vrouwen (en mannen) met kinderen gebruiken meer standaardtaal dan vrouwen (en mannen) zonder kinderen;
- vrouwen (en mannen) uit een echtpaar waarin de vrouw buitenshuis werkt gebruiken meer standaardtaal dan vrouwen en mannen waarin dit niet het geval is.

Sekse blijkt de grootste invloed te hebben op het taalgebruik. Verder bestaan er relatief veel onderlinge verbanden tussen de onafhankelijke variabelen. Vrouwen met een hoger opleidingsnivo werken vaker buitenshuis dan vrouwen met een lager opleidingsnivo. Vrouwen met een lager opleidingsnivo hebben vaak kinderen, vrouwen met een hoger opleidingsnivo werken vaak buitenshuis. Het hebben van kinderen impliceert vaak de afwezigheid van werk buitenshuis, vice versa. Werk buitenshuis impliceert vaak de afwezigheid van kinderen, vice versa.

Hoofdstuk 5 behandelt de resultaten van de taalattitude testen. De zelf-evaluatie testen wijzen op een positievere houding van vrouwen tegenover het standaard Nederlands en een positievere houding van mannen tegenover het Amsterdams. Uit de subjectieve reactie testen blijkt dat de standaard variëteit wordt geassocieerd met hoge sociale status en femininiteit, de non-standaard variëteit met lage sociale status en masculiniteit. Bovendien worden vrouwelijke en mannelijke sprekers verschillend geëvalueerd. Een standaard sprekende man wordt een hogere sociale status toebedeeld dan een standaard sprekende vrouw, evenals een dialect sprekende man een hogere sociale status wordt toegekend dan een dialect sprekende vrouw. Wat betreft de oordelen over de femininiteit en masculiniteit van de sprekers werden mannen sterker gestereotypeerd dan vrouwen: spreekt hij standaard Nederlands dan wordt hij alras voor halfzacht versleten, spreekt hij Amsterdams, dan is hij een macho.

In Hoofdstuk 6 worden de resultaten kort samengevat. In deze studie blijkt de sekse van de spreker van doorslaggevende betekenis voor het taalgebruik: vrouwen gebruiken vaker standaard Nederlands en mannen vaker Amsterdams.

Daarnaast zijn het opleidingsnivo, het hebben van kinderen en het hebben van werk buitenshuis van de vrouw bepalend voor het taalgebruik: een hoger opleidingsnivo, de aanwezigheid van kinderen en werk buitenshuis van de vrouw impliceren een ruimer gebruik van standaard Nederlands. De taalattitudes korresponderen met het taalgebruik: vrouwen staan positiever tegenover standaard Nederlands, mannen tegenover het Amsterdams. Vrouwen worden geacht standaardtaal te spreken, terwijl van mannen het gebruik van non-standaardtaal meer wordt getolereerd. Kortom, zowel de sociale positie als de opvattingen over de sociale rollen van vrouwen en mannen zijn van invloed op het taalgebruik. Met deze studie hoop ik te hebben aangetoond dat sociolinguïstisch onderzoek naar het taalgebruik van vrouwen en mannen zich moet richten op een analyse van taalgebruik gerelateerd aan zowel de ondergeschikte positie van vrouwen in de maatschappij als de uiteenlopende sociale normen voor vrouwen en mannen.

Curriculum vitae

Dédé Brouwer werd geboren op 23 oktober 1947 in Amsterdam. Na het gymnasium-alpha diploma aan het Hervormd Lyceum West in Amsterdam, studeerde ze Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam. Ze behaalde in 1971 het kandidaatsexamen en in 1977 het doktoraalexamen met als hoofdvak Algemene Taalwetenschap en als bijvakken Nederlandse Taalkunde en Psycholinguïstiek. Van 1975 tot 1977 was ze kandidaatsassistent bij de Vakgroep Algemene Taalwetenschap van de Universiteit van Amsterdam. Na haar doktoraalexamen was ze een jaar docent Nederlands aan het Cartesius Lyceum in Amsterdam en vervolgens docent (socio)linguïstiek bij de Sectie Nederlands van de Lerarenopleiding van de Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam en de Vakgroep Nederlands van de Rijksuniversiteit Leiden. Van augustus 1980 tot augustus 1983 was ze uitvoerder van het NWO-project 'Sekseverschillen in taalgebruik en taalattitude'. Van september 1983 tot november 1987 was ze als toegevoegd onderzoeker verbonden aan de Vakgroep Linguïstiek van de Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht in het kader van een innovatiepost van de Interfacultaire Werkgroep Vrouwenstudies.

Stellingen

behorende bij het proefschrift

Gender variation in Dutch

A sociolinguistic study of Amsterdam speech

van Dédé Brouwer

te verdedigen aan de Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen

op 21 juni 1989 te 15.30 uur

1. In tegenstelling tot wat Peter Trudgill (1972) meent, heeft het ruime gebruik van standaardtaal door vrouwen niet te maken met een veronderstelde hang naar prestigieuze uiterlijkheden maar met hun feitelijke plaats op de arbeidsmarkt.

Peter Trudgill, Sex, covert prestige and linguistic change in the urban British English of Norwich. *Language in Society* 1 (1972), 179-196.

2. Een observatie van William Labov (1972) is dat mensen onverwacht veel standaardtaal spreken als ze uitvaren tegen hun kinderen. De bevinding in het Amsterdamse onderzoek dat mannen met kinderen meer standaard-Nederlands spreken dan die zonder, doet - gegeven de rigide sekse-specifieke taakverdeling - vermoeden dat vaders hun kinderen voornamelijk vermanend toespreken.

William Labov, Hypercorrection by the lower middle class as a factor in linguistic change. *Sociolinguistic patterns*. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia 1972, 122-142.

3. Ook vrouwen blijken individuen; een sociale stratifikatietheorie waarin vrouwen worden geklassificeerd als verlengstuk van vader of partner, is derhalve weinig bevorderlijk voor het wetenschappelijk ideaal van een 'onvooringenomen waarneming, zonder gekleurde bril' (Herman Koningsveld 1976).

Herman Koningsveld, *Het verschijnsel wetenschap. Een inleiding in de wetenschapsfilosofie*. Boom, Meppel/Amsterdam 1976.

4. Ondanks de veelvuldige konstatering waar 'alle moderne verstandige mensen het natuurlijk over eens zijn', aldus Andreas Burnier (1979), dat vrouwen niet tot hun recht komen in de wetenschap, krijgt onderzoek dat een zo fundamenteel universeel onderscheid als dat tussen vrouwen en mannen centraal stelt veelal het epitheton 'specialistisch'.

Andreas Burnier, Van masculinistische naar humane wetenschap. *De zwembadmentaliteit*. Querido, Amsterdam 1979, 135-153.

5. Het betitelen van de verdwijning van het woordgeslacht in het taalgevoel van de meeste Nederlanders als taalverloedering, zoals Elly de Waard (1989) doet, betekent een veronachtzaming van de verschillen tussen haar poëzie en die van Anna Bijns uit de zestiende eeuw en druist in tegen sociolinguïstische kennis over taalvariatie en taalverandering.

Elly de Waard, De brandende kwestie: In het hoofd van de gemiddelde Nederlander is de woordenschat geslonken tot een paar honderd. *Vrij Nederland*, 11 maart 1989, 13.

6. Semantisch beschouwd liggen i.p.v. *tandenstoker* en *aansteker* de vormen *tandensteker* en *aanstoker* meer voor de hand.
7. Er heerst een misverstand over het verband tussen geslachtelijke uitgangen en emancipatie: een feminist is niet minder feministisch dan een feministe.

Printed by ICG Printing, Dordrecht