‘We all speak normally here’: New dialect formation in Dronten, the Netherlands

Anne Broekhuis
s1574582
a.broekhuis@umail.leidenuniv.nl

Leiden University
Faculty of Humanities
Research Master Linguistics
MA Thesis

Supervisor: dr. D. Smakman
Second reader: dr. E. D. Botma

15 June 2016

Table of contents

Abstract

The current paper set out to investigate new dialect formation in progress in the Dutch new town of Dronten. Designated in the early 1960s, this city provided to be an excellent place to study new dialect formation in progress. This study looked into the phonetic characteristics of this variety of Dutch and it was examined how this variety could be defined. Further, the time scale of koineization was addressed. Lastly, the perceived degree of standardness was studied, based on a claim made by Scholtmeijer (1992). Interviews and an online survey provided data that shed more light on these issues. The current study has identified a number of remarkable phonetic features, such as lowering of the first element of (ei) and devoicing of (v) and (z). However, these features seem to be part of a more general tendency found in Standard Dutch and are therefore not exclusive to the Dronten variety of Dutch. In addition, Dronten Dutch was associated with a high degree of perceived standardness, as expert analysis as well as the online survey confirmed. Note, however, that this applies particularly to second-generation speakers, revealing evidence of focusing towards a more homogeneous linguistic variety in this generation.

1 Introduction

Trudgill's *Dialects in Contact* (1986) was an important work that introduced an expanding sociolinguistic research field looking into language variation and change in general, and the effects of mobility and dialect contact in particular. One particular type of dialect contact is new dialect formation, which is also referred to as koineization (e.g. Kerswill & Williams). It can be defined as process whereby a new, mixed language variety develops as a result of dialect contact in an area where no original dialect is spoken. It can lead to relatively swift and considerable linguistic changes. Most studies on koineization and new dialect formation focused on the outcomes of the process, and therefore these are well-described (see for instance Siegel 1985). However, up until now few studies investigated the process in itself.

The central subject of the current work is new dialect formation in the new town of Dronten, the Netherlands. It was Scholtmeijer (1992) who first described the linguistic situation in this town. Dronten is an interesting town from a dialectological point of view. Designated in the early 1960s, the population is composed entirely of in-migrants and their offspring originating from different parts of the Netherlands, creating a heterogeneous language community. This situation provides an excellent opportunity to study the process of new dialect formation while it is currently taking place.

2 Literature review and background

Before turning to the current study itself, previous literature on the subject matter will be examined. First of all, important notions and theories of language change and variation will be considered. The next section then goes on to examine the process of koineization as well as reviewing previous studies that looked into this phenomenon. This chapter's final section will give a brief overview of the history of Dronten, the new town that is central in the current thesis. Also, it will discuss factors that are important in koine formation and relate these to the situation in Dronten.

2.1 Models of language change and variation

In order to understand the particular language contact situation that is the topic of the current thesis, it is important to first consider several models and views of language change and linguistic variation.

Labov's variationist model

Different theories exist in the literature regarding language variation and change. Firstly, Labov (1972) was one of the first scholars who showed that language variation is systematic, rather than chaotic, and can be related to several social constructs such as age and gender. In other words, Labov maintained that language varies in a systematic manner, which corresponds with specific social characteristics of language users. For instance, imagine there is a language situation where two realizations of the diphthong (ei) are semantically similar. The first realization, which has a lowered first element, is mainly used by young, powerful people. The second realization, then, which does not have a lowered first element, is primarily used by old, poor people. Labov would argue that the observed language variation is a change in progress. In this case, it is more likely that the (ei) realization with a lowered first element will prevail since its users are young and have more prestige, according to Labov.

Before Labov's investigations, language variation was usually regarded as noise that could not be explained or attributed to any causing factors. In his famous studies of New York City department stores and the island of Martha's Vineyard, Labov (1963, 1966) demonstrated that the spread of linguistic variables is in accordance with certain aspects of social structure. For example, in Labov's (1966) New York City department study, he was able to show that different realizations of postvocalic (r) could be associated with a speaker's membership to a particular social class. In this study, Labov found that speakers with a higher socio-economic status pronounced (r) in postvocalic position more frequently than those with a lower socio-economic status. Therefore, linguistic variation is socially embedded. Labov's view of language variation is commonly referred to as the variationist model. By systematically examining the relationship between language variation and speaker characteristics, more light can be shed on the mechanisms behind language change as well.

Milroy & Milroy's consensus model

Another approach towards language change and variation was proposed by Milroy & Milroy (1992), called the consensus model. This model is based on a view of a unified society, where all societal elements are closely integrated. Also, it has a strong focus on the role of social networks and argues that speech behaviour is shaped by the social network of the speaker. In turn, this would lead to close-knit and cohesive speech communities. Milroy & Milroy (1992) argue that in these cohesive networks, there are strong mechanisms that promote norm enforcement, and these reduce possible changes in behaviour in general, and linguistic behaviour in particular. This observation leads to the claim that in less cohesive social networks, where people are more mobile in geographical sense and social sense, there are more opportunities for linguistic change. Particularly, people who have many weak ties outside their own communities promote and speed language change. Following this line of thought, the Milroys suggest that the individual is responsible for language change. As Kerswill (2002: 3) writes: 'the only circumstance under which language change may result is when the collective use of a new linguistic feature by individual speakers is sufficiently frequent to be taken up as a new norm'.

Acts of Identity Theory

The third approach that will be discussed here is the Acts of Identity Theory, put forward by Le Page & Tabouret-Keller (1985). The principal hypothesis of this theory can be summarized as that 'the individual creates for himself the patterns of his linguistic behavior so as to resemble those of the groups with which from time to time he wishes to be identified or so as to be unlike those from whom he wishes to be distinguished.' (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985: 181). This premise entails that speakers have multiple identities, and these are based on gender, ethnicity, age, and social class, amongst others. These different identities are closely connected and interact with each other, and they become more or less prominent at various times. Language, then, is used to express a feeling of association with a particular social group. In this way, identity is created by accommodating speech. Four criteria or qualifications that underlie this central thesis can be discerned, as Le Page & Tabouret-Keller (1985: 182) put into words: '[w]e can only behave according to the behavioral patterns of groups we find it desirable to identify with to the extent that:

i. we can identify the groups
ii. we have both adequate access to the groups and ability to analyze their behavioral patterns
iii. the motivation to join the groups is sufficiently powerful, and is either reinforced or reversed by feedback from the groups
iv. we have the ability to modify our behavior.'

Speech Accommodation Theory

The next theoretical approach that will be discussed in this section is the Speech Accommodation Theory (SAT) laid out by Giles & Coupland (1991). This model evolves around the central notion that speakers have a strong tendency to change the way they speak when they interact with other people. This tendency arises because people aim to control for social differences between interlocutors. Further, speech can be accommodated for approval or acceptance. 'Convergence' and 'divergence' are two key notions within speech accommodation theory. Convergence is a linguistic strategy where speakers alter their speech to be more resembling of that of their interlocutor, whereas with divergence Giles & Coupland (1991) referred to the process where speakers alter their speech in order to sound less alike the speech of the person they are talking to. Whether a speaker converges or diverges depends on a number of factors, such as the attitude towards the interlocutor, shared social context, and the different language varieties of the interlocutors. These linguistic strategies tend to have an instantaneous and transient character, although it can develop into more permanent changes in speech. This is what Trudgill (1982, 1986) identified as long-term accommodation.

Indexicality

The final theory that will be considered revolves around the notion of indexicality (Silverstein 2003; Eckert 2008). In this theory, meaning is taken as a point of departure instead of the sound changes that are usually the subject of sociolinguistic studies. Eckert (2008) builds on the notion of indexical order, originally proposed by Silverstein (2003). This theory claims that language users construct social meaning by using different variables. Therefore, meaning is not fixed, but instead it forms a field of possible meanings. This is referred to as an indexical field. To make this clearer, Eckert (2008) described the example of (ing) in English, based on a study by Campbell-Kibler (2007). (ing) can be realized as apical (in) or velar (ing) in e.g. *walking*. Both variants have a range of different meanings. Apical (in) can be associated with being lazy and impolite but also with being relaxed and easy-going. The opposite can be said about velar (ing), i.e. educated and effortful but also formal and pretentious. Depending on the style in which the variant occurs and the social context, one of the meanings will be linked to the realization. In this way, linguistic variation does not only reflect social differences, as e.g. Labov (1963, 1966) proposed, but it also constructs social meaning. In this way, it can drive social change.

2.2 Language-contact situations

The theories and models described above are relevant in different kinds of language-contact situations. One interesting case of language contact is when two or more dialects of the same language come into contact with each other. Scholtmeijer (1992) distinguished two main dialect contact situations. First, a small group of dialect speakers can settle in an already established town. Since

these in-migrants are a minority group, it will be likely that they converge and accommodate their speech, while speakers who already lived in the settlement will not. Second, a large group of dialect speakers can move to a place that was not inhabited before, what is referred to as colonisation. If the new inhabitants are speakers of distinct dialects, this can give rise to dialect levelling. Williams & Kerswill (1999: 149) define dialect levelling as follows: 'a process whereby differences between regional varieties are reduced, features which make varieties distinctive disappear, and new features develop and are adopted by speakers over a wide geographical area'. Also, it typically involves a reduction in the number of phonological and morphological variables. Dialect levelling usually entails loss of dialects, too, and this is widespread in modern Western Europe. Regional dialect levelling shares important properties with the process of koineization, which will be the subject of the following section.

2.3 Koines and koineization

Koineization or new dialect formation (Trudgill, 1986) is a particular mechanism of language contact. The terms 'new dialect formation' and 'koineization' are used interchangeably in the literature, and both can be defined as follows: 'the emergence of distinctive, new language varieties following the migration of people speaking mutually intelligible dialects to what, to all intents and purposes, is linguistically 'virgin' territory' (Kerswill & Trudgill 2005: 196). Koineization is composed of a number of processes, namely mixing, levelling, and simplification. The remainder of this section will discuss these notions.

To start with, 'mixing' is 'the coexistence of features with origins in the different input dialects within the new community, usually because speakers have different dialect origins' (Kerswill & Trudgill 2005: 197). With mixing, then, certain features co-occur. For instance, soft and hard (g) are used by different speakers in a Dutch new town. This is because speakers who are from the southern part of the Netherlands still speak with soft (g) while speakers from the northern or western part of the country do not do this. In this way, there is mixing in the variable (g).

Levelling, then, can be defined as the selection of forms that arise during the process of mixing. Of the two variants of (g), for instance, one variant is selected, most likely hard (g) since soft (g) is more often considered to be marked and not standard.

Lastly, Siegel (1985: 358) noted that simplification is 'either an increase in regularity or a decrease in markedness'. Marked forms, such as soft (g), will be discarded in the process of simplification. After these processes, it can be the case that a number of competing features have survived from the mixture of original dialects. For example, both soft (g) and hard (g) are still used. In such as a case, reallocation could occur, and these features take on new meanings or functions in the new dialect.

Time scale of koineization

The previous section discussed important processes that take place during koineization. The current section will zoom in on the time scale of koineization. In their list of principles of koineization, Kerswill & Williams (2000: 84-85) included three principles that pertained to time span of koineization:

> '*The time scale of koineization:*
> 6) There is no normal historical continuity with the locality, either socially or linguistically. Most first- and second-generation speakers are oriented toward language varieties that originate elsewhere.
> 7) From initial diffusion, focusing takes place over one or two generations.
> 8) Because of sociolinguistic maturation, the structure of the new speech community is first discernible in the speech of native-born adolescents, not young children.'

Principle 6 refers to the fact that in koineization, speakers originate from other regions than where the process takes place. Therefore, they tend to speak and orient to linguistic varieties that are spoken elsewhere. In this way, there is no linguistic tradition that can be continued. The next principle described by Kerswill & Williams (2000) deals with the time scale of focusing. Focusing refers to a process where linguistic uniformity is being achieved. Clearly, in the early stages of koineization, the situation seems to be diffused rather than focused. Focusing will be achieved when time goes by. Based on the data collected in Milton Keynes, Kerswill & Williams (2000) concluded that focusing primarily takes place in the second generation, and it is this generation that is close to complete focusing. The last principle stresses the important role that adolescents play in forming a koine. Whereas young children rely heavily on their parents' speech, adolescents slowly mature sociolinguistically. In the (2000) study, adolescents showed to use a particular variant more often than their caregivers. Therefore, the authors concluded that this age group is the driving force behind linguistic change.

Another attempt to describe the time scale of new-dialect formation was performed by Trudgill (1986). In this model, three chronological stages were recognized, and these stages correspond to the first three successive generations of speakers of the new dialect. In the first stage, rudimentary dialect levelling occurs among the first generation of adult migrants. These adults bring to the new location different regional dialects, and via face-to-face interactions, rudimentary levelling takes place. During this stage, it is likely that there is a lot of inter-individual variability, in that people are inconsistent in their usage of forms at this point of new-dialect formation.

The second stage that Trudgill (1986) described pertains to the second generation, which consists of the first generation that is born in the new location.

This stage is characterized by two linguistic processes, namely considerable variability as well as further levelling. The first generation of native-born speakers does not have a stable adult norm. Instead, they can select features mainly based on their frequency of occurrence, and are not influenced by prestige or other identity-marking functions (Trudgill, 2004), creating a 'tabula rasa' situation. Like the first stage, this phase of the process is still characterized by high levels of inter- and intra-individual variability.

The last stage that Trudgill (1986) proposed concerned subsequent generations. Linguistically, the new variety will be focused during this phase. Only one, or two in the case of reallocation to a particular linguistic or sociolinguistic function, realizations will be levelled out (Britain & Trudgill, 1999). Figure 2.1 below gives an overview of the stages discussed:

Stage	*Speakers involved*	*Linguistic characteristics*
I	Adult migrants (first generation)	Rudimentary leveling
II	First native-born speakers (second generation)	Extreme variability and further leveling
III		

Figure 2.1. Stages of koineization (adopted from Kerswill 2010: 234).

As can be noted, it remains unclear when focusing is completed. Kerswill & Williams (2000) argued, based on their study in Milton Keynes, that focusing takes place in the second generation already. Trudgill (1986), however, proposed in his model that it is only completed in the third generation.

End product of koineization

The end product of koineization process is called a 'koine' or 'new dialect'. Siegel (1985: 363) defines 'koine' in the following way: '[...] a koine is the stabilized result of mixing of linguistic subsystems [...] it usually serves as a lingua franca among speakers of the different contributing varieties and is characterized by a mixture of features of these varieties and most often by reduction or simplification [...]'. In addition, two categories of koines can be identified (Siegel, 1985). The first kind of koine is a regional koine. A regional koine is the result of contact of regional dialects. Importantly, the dialects involved here are considered to be the same language, e.g. varieties of Irish English and Scottish English. The second type of koine that can be distinguished is an immigrant koine. An immigrant koine may arise also from regional dialect contact. However, an important difference from the regional koine is that the dialect contact does not take place where the dialects come from. Instead, the dialect contact occurs at a place where speakers of different dialects moved to, for instance a new town or reclaimed land. Also, the immigrant koine tends to develop into the

immigrants' primary language in the new community. The immigrant koine is said to be equivalent to a new dialect (Trudgill, 1986).

In sum, this section discussed koineization, and considered important processes and the time-scale. There are, however, a number of language contact situations that are similar to koineization to some extent. This will be the focus of the following section.

Koineization and related forms of contact-induced language change: pidginization, creolization, and regional dialect levelling

The previous section has looked at the process of koineization in greater detail. However, there are a number of processes that are very similar to koineization to some extent, such as pidginization, creolization, and regional dialect levelling. The purpose of this section is therefore to discuss the differences and similarities between koineization and these other forms of contact-induced language change. Koineization shares important features with both pidginization and creolization. An example of such a similarity is the highly important role of the face-to-face contacts between speakers of the different dialects or languages (Kerswill & Trudgill, 2005). Koineization and creolization are also alike in that both their outcomes are a native language, unlike pidginization. Koineization and pidginization are similar in that both may result in a new variety, which generally displays features that are simplified and reduced.

There are, however, important differences between koineization on the one hand and pidginization and creolization on the other (Siegel, 1985). First of all, speakers involved in koineization do not need to leave behind their own language varieties, whereas in pidginization and creolization this is usually the case. Further, in pidginization and creolization there is often a target variety, while this is not true in koineization. Moreover, koineization is considered to be a process that takes a long time to complete (at least three generations), but this is not true in pidgin or creole formation. The latter two are in fact believed to develop in a short period of time since there is an urgent need for a language to communicate in. Another difference can be found in the prolonged social interaction that is involved in koineization. This is not required in the development of pidgins and creoles, where the contact is oftentimes more confined. Lastly, the varieties that contribute in the development of koine are typologically more similar than those involved in pidginization or creolization. The varieties contributing to koineization are often different dialects of the same language, whereas pidginization and creolization involves typologically different languages.

Apart from pidginization and creolization, certain aspects of regional dialect levelling also resemble koineization. In particular, it is the process of levelling that also an important part of koineization. Regional dialect levelling refers to the decrease of linguistic variation in a situation where mutually intelligible dialects are spoken. This results in that local dialects may slowly

attrite or even disappear completely. Levelling and simplification often complement each other, and these are the aspects that are shared with koineization. However, these processes occur in koineization as a consequence of face-to-face contacts, while this cannot be the case in regional dialect levelling because the latter involves an entire dialect area. Therefore, Kerswill & Trudgill (2005) argued that the mechanisms underlying koineization and regional dialect levelling are different, although their outcomes show similarities. Further, Siegel (1985) pointed out that in regional dialect levelling, no compromise dialect evolves. Clearly, this is different in the case of koine formation.

2.4 Previous studies on koineization

Previous studies have investigated the process of koineization. A well-studied new town is Milton Keynes, England (Kerswill & Williams 2000; Kerswill & Williams 2005). Milton Keynes is situated in a dialect area that is already extensively levelled. By analysing speech of children and their caregivers, the authors argued that focusing is already taking place in the second generation, although it is not fully completed yet. The authors propose three possible reasons why focusing is taking place in the second generation. They note that there was no social segregation, and the high proportion of children made it easy to form new social networks. Further, the input dialects were quite similar. This seems to apply to the situation of Dronten as well.

Studies in the Norwegian new towns of Høyanger, Odda and Tyssedal (Sandve 1976; Omdal 1977) presented a different picture. In these towns, the authors observed that focusing is only taking place in the third generation, based on their findings. The reasons for this were similar to those in Milton Keynes: strong social segregation and distinct input varieties. Based on the findings of Milton Keynes and the Norwegian new towns, it can be said that the extent of social segregation and the similarity of the input dialects are important factors in the rate of focusing.

Another interesting study was performed by Bortoni (1991). She examined the capital of Brazil, Brasília. The investigation of the Brasília accent showed an interesting focusing pattern, namely the emergence of unmarked variants, resulting in a dialect without any salient features that could not be associated with any other regional varieties.

Last of all, Scholtmeijer (1992) studied the IJsselmeerpolders, including the city of Dronten in the Netherlands. He observed an apparently abrupt break between the speech of the first settlers, which was often heavily accented, and the speech of the first generation of children who were born in the polders. Focusing, then, was taking place in the second generation, as in Milton Keynes. According to Scholtmeijer (1992), the speech of the children resembled standard Dutch to a high extent, and did not include many dialectal features of their parents' speech, similar to Bortoni's (1991) findings. Reasons for this break could be that there was a strong need for a neutral language variety for

communication. Also, schooling can have a strong impact on standardization of language. Further, some scholars have argued that there is general tendency towards standardization and dialect levelling in the Netherlands (see for instance Hinskens, 1998). The following section will elaborate more on Dronten and its history.

2.5 History of Dronten

Dronten can be characterized as a so-called 'new town', which is 'a new, planned urban settlement placed on previously more or less unoccupied land, built throughout the twentieth century but particularly since World War II' (Kerswill 2010: 240). It is situated in the central part of the Netherlands, roughly 60 kilometres from Amsterdam. Figure 2.2 shows its position on a map of the Netherlands. However, before taking a closer look at the variety of Dutch that is spoken there, it might be worthwhile to briefly examine its history.

Figure 2.2. A map of the Netherlands, indicating Dronten by the red arrow.

From the 17th century onwards, lakes were drained by windmills in the Netherlands, creating fertile agricultural ground and preventing floods. However, areas surrounding the Zuiderzee continued to be afflicted by floods. Therefore, it was decided around 1890 that the Zuiderzee needed to become a polder, in order to protect the surrounding land from floods. Cornelis Lely was appointed to investigate how this could be achieved in the best way. During the years that followed, the plans were slightly delayed because of the crisis during the 1930s and World War II. Yet during the 1950s, the Dutch government decided it was time start the immense project. Importantly, there was need for more land for

agriculture after prolonged periods of famine during the war. In 1957, Oostelijk Flevoland was drained. It was in this polder that Dronten was planned to be build. However, at that time there was only mud, and a lot of labour was needed to create a place to live. The first settlers arrived in 1962. At that time, the town was aimed at housing around 20,000 inhabitants, although nowadays it has a population of more than 40,000 people.

The influx of new settlers was carefully managed and controlled by the authorities. There were strict policies concerning who could live in the new land. Farmers were selected, and only those with the best qualities could obtain a farm. For instance, prospective farmers had to be between 26 and 60 years of age, married and financially stable. Also, religion should be equally divided, with one-third of the settlers catholic, one-third protestant, and one-third unreligious. In this way, a balance was created that reflected society. Because of the so-called 'spreidingspolitiek', in-migrants from all provinces of the Netherlands were invited to come to the new polder, to make sure that all regional groups were evenly represented. Once they arrived in the polder, they were evenly distributed across the area, so that not all in-migrants from e.g. Zeeland would live in the same village or in the same neighbourhood.

The population of Dronten in the first few years after settlement was characterized by a number of aspects. The birth rate was relatively high, whereas the mortality rate was low. Moreover, there were more people who moved to Dronten than there were people who left the village. The average age of the population was young, and many people worked in agriculture. Figure 2.3 presents the regional origin of the population in 1965, just three years after first settlement:

Figure 2.3. Regional origin of Dronten population in 1965.

In Figure 2.3, the darker the colour, the higher the percentage of migrants of that province. For a complete list of the regional origin of the in-migrants, see Appendix A. As can be seen in Figure 2.3, regional origin was rather varied, although there was a remarkably larger group of in-migrants who originated from the neighbouring province of Overijssel. Also, among the first group of settlers was a large group originating from the Noordoostpolder. This polder was similar to the Dronten polder, however, it was slightly older. Between 1970 and 1975, there was a large influx of people from Amsterdam and between 1975 and 1985, many people from the Veluwe arrived.

Factors in studying koine formation: the case of Dronten

According to Kerswill & Williams (2000: 69-70), there are several questions regarding the linguistic and social history that are helpful when studying koine formation. These are listed below, followed by an attempt to answer them for the case of the city of Dronten.

1. *The original population of the area: its size, its social characteristics, and its speech forms.*

   In the case of Dronten, there is no original population. Therefore, this factor can be discarded.

2. *The size of the incoming population in relation to the original population.*

   As pointed out in Question (1), there was no original population in Dronten. Therefore, all settlers were part of the incoming population.

3. *The abruptness of the settlement: Was it sudden and finite, or did it continue over a long period? Did it continue after koineization had taken place?*

   Clearly, the abruptness of settlement was sudden, although it was not finite. Influx of new groups of people (and later also departure) continued over a number of decades, and is still happening at the present day. In this way, new settlers continued to arrive in Dronten throughout the process of koineization.

4. *The proportion of children to adults among the incomers and the original population, and the rate at which children were born to the incomers after migration.*

   What is true for most groups of migrants is that they are of childbearing age. Dronten is no exception to this. The birth rate was high, especially in the first few years after settlement. Consequently, there was a high proportion of children to adults.

5. *The continued contacts of the incomers with their place of origin: Did they break off relations with their original home completely, or did they maintain links with it to the exclusion of new, local contacts?*

   In this particular case, the in-migrants did not break off relations with their original hometowns completely. However, during the first few years, communication devices were not always accessible for everyone, and mobility levels were rather low. Making new contacts in the new town, then, was also important. Surely, communication became easier later on, and it also became easier to travel back to family living in other places of the country.

6. *The social characteristics and ethnicity of the incomers: Did they come to take up specific jobs, e.g. in a new industry? Were they socially mixed? Were they an ethnically distinct group?*

   Many of the first settlers were either farmers, or people who worked for the local government. In this way, they were not socially mixed nor an ethnically distinct group.

7. *The speech of the incomers: Was it diverse or homogeneous? Was it similar to that of the native population? Were some social dialects better represented than others?*

   The speech of the incomers was diverse on the level of dialect. All incomers spoke Dutch, although they all spoke their own dialect of Dutch. There seems to be no evidence that certain social dialect were better represented than others.

3 Scope of the research

As becomes clear from the sections above, the outcomes of new dialect formation are well-documented and several studies have investigated dialect contact situations after koine formation was completed (e.g. Britain 1997). However, relatively few studies have looked at the process of koineization in progress. Therefore, the current study aims to study this subject in the new town of Dronten, the Netherlands. As the second generation of speakers is now between

20 and 30 years of age, it can be said that new dialect formation is still in progress. The following research questions are formulated to address this issue:

1. Is there a Dronten dialect, and if so, what are its phonetic characteristics and how can it be defined?
2. What is the time scale of koineization in Dronten?
3. To what extent can the speech of the first and second-generation be regarded as 'standard'?

The first research question consisted of two elements. First, the phonetic characteristics of the Dronten variety of Dutch were investigated. In order to examine this, spontaneous speech of 20 inhabitants of Dronten was recorded through interviews. These recordings formed the primary source of data for phonetic analysis. Second, this study was interested in defining Dronten Dutch. This was operationalized through an online survey that asked questions about what defines Dutch spoken in Dronten. In addition, qualitative questions concerning this topic were asked in the interviews as well.

The second research question concerned the time scale of the process of koineization. In the literature, there is disagreement about when the process of koineization is completed. Kerswill & Williams (2000) observed that a more homogeneous language variety is already present in the second generation, whereas Trudgill (1986) argued that this could only be observed in the third generation. To shed more light on this matter, the group of speakers that were interviewed were separated into two groups. The first group consisted of 10 speakers who were born outside Dronten, and were therefore first-generation speakers. The second group also consisted of 10 speakers, however, these speakers were born and raised in Dronten, while their parents were not. These speakers were considered to be second-generation speakers. In this way, it would be possible to observe a possible contrast between the two groups. Unfortunately, it was not possible to interview third-generation speakers because there are hardly any third-generation speakers at the moment in Dronten.

The final research question looked into the degree of perceived standardness of Dronten Dutch. It was based on a prediction that Scholtmeijer (1992) made. He argued that the speech of speakers of Dronten at that time did not contain any regional dialectal features, and was therefore resembled Standard Dutch to a high extent. In order to rate the level of perceived standardness, several approaches were taken. First, in the online survey and the interviews, questions were asked that were aimed at perceived standardness. Further, Dutch language experts were asked to listen to clips of the recorded inhabitants, and then rate the degree of standardness. The following chapter will present the methodology that was used in the current thesis in more detail.

4 Methodology

The methodology used in the current thesis can be divided into two main components, namely interviews and a survey. In this manner, quantitative and qualitative approaches could be combined. Both components will be discussed separately in this chapter.

4.1 Part 1: interviews

The first component consisted of 20 interviews with speakers who lived in Dronten at that time, aimed at collecting spontaneous speech as well as qualitative data.

Sample

The sample for the interviews was constructed via the friend-of-a-friend technique, similar to those used in Britain (1997) and Milroy (1987). This technique is also known as 'snowball sampling'. This way of creating a sample implies that the potential speakers are approached by the researchers themselves at first. Then, those speakers are asked if they know someone else who would like to participate in the study, thus introducing the researcher to new potential speakers. In composing a sample, it was an advantage that the researcher was a native to the area, therefore having an elaborate social network.

The sample consisted of 20 speakers and can be divided into two groups. The speakers in the first group were born and raised in Dronten, while the other half moved to Dronten at a later age. Group 1 consisted of eight women and two men. Ages ranged from 21 to 54. For more detailed characteristics of Group 1, consider Appendix B.

Group 2 also consisted of ten speakers, who grew up in another area in the Netherlands and moved to the city of Dronten at a later age. This group can be considered as the first generation. This group can further be split into two subgroups, namely a group of five speakers who originated from the northern or eastern part of the Netherlands, and five speakers who used to live in the southern or western part of the country. Three speakers in this group were male and the other seven were female. The youngest speaker was 47, and the oldest was 82. Again, consider Appendix B for more detailed information about this group.

Variables

The variables under investigation are in accordance with those identified in Smakman (2006). According to Smakman (2006), these variables are important in identifying patterns of variation in the standard variety of Dutch. It is in these variables that phonetic variation occurs most often, and therefore it is insightful to study these and not, for instance, variation in (k). The variables that were studied included the following:

- (g)
- (r)
- (z), (v)
- (ee), (oo), (eu)
- (ei), (au), (ui)

Table 3.1 below presents the main focus of the analysis per variable

Table 3.1. Focus per variable.

Variable	**Focus**	**Context**
(g)	presence of voice,	word-initial,

	presence of rasp	word-internal
(r)	onset: place of articulation, manner of articulation coda: prominence	word-initial, word-final
(z), (v)	presence of voice	word-initial, word-internal
(ee), (oo), (eu)	degree of diphthongization	all
(ei), (au), (ui)	lowering of first element	all

Material

All interviews were conducted at the homes of the speakers. Furthermore, all interviews were recorded via Quicktime Player after written consent was obtained.

Procedure

The interviews consisted of two phases. First, the interviewer asked questions about work and living in Dronten, in order to collect spontaneous speech. Second, questions pertaining to the dialect of Dronten were posed; for example: 'Is there such a thing as a Dronten dialect, and if so, what does it sound like?' or 'Do you consider the variety of Dutch spoken in Dronten to be standard?'. These questions were asked aiming to gain qualitative data.

After recording the interviews, the analysis consisted of two elements. The first part involved a semi-consensus transcription, in which the descriptions of the variables were perceptually transcribed. Semi-consensus transcription was opted for in order to avoid intra- and intertranscriber variation. Also, it is important that another transcriber was involved in the analysis as well since the main researcher is a native to the area under investigation. Further, the perceptual description technique used in the current thesis was preferred over acoustic measurements because this technique enables the researcher to study what speakers actually hear (Smakman, 2006).

In the second part of the analysis, experts were asked to listen to fragments of the recorded speech. The experts were professors and university teachers who were specialized in the Dutch language. After listening to the fragments, the experts were requested to rate the degree of standardness.

4.2 Part 2: Survey

The second part of the current study consisted of an online survey, with the aim of collecting quantitative data. 148 residents of Dronten were asked to answer multiple-choice and open-ended questions about the variety of Dutch that is spoken in their hometown. Of all respondents, 42% was male and 58% was female. Further, 54% of the respondents were young (i.e. under the age of 20),

25% of the respondents were aged between 20 and 30 years, and the rest of the respondents were older than 30. What is more, the majority of the respondents (75%) were born and raised in the city of Dronten, while the other 25% moved to Dronten at a later age. The survey was distributed online and consisted of multiple-choice questions as well as open-ended questions. Examples of questions are 'Is there a Dronten dialect?' and 'Do you think people here speak in a different way than in other parts of the country?'. For a complete overview of all questions, see Appendix C. As can be understood from the questions, the survey was designed to get a better understanding of Dronten residents' insights and opinions on the variety of Dutch that is spoken in this city.

5 Results

As outlined in the previous chapter, the methodology of the current thesis consisted of two main components, i.e. interviews and a survey. This chapter will present the results of both components. First, it will outline the results of the phonetic analysis of the speech in the interviews, the results of the qualitative questions and the expert analysis of the interviews. Finally, the outcomes of the survey will be presented.

5.1 Part 1: Interviews

The analysis of the interviews that were conducted with 20 residents of Dronten focused on a number of variables. Of each variable, 10 tokens were selected for analysis. This section will discuss all variables in turn.

(g)

In the analysis of the variable (g), attention was paid to a number of features. First of all, presence of voice was taken into consideration. Also, place of articulation was considered. Three different realizations were recognized, which were velar, palatal and uvular. Lastly, in the case of a uvular realization, the presence of rasp was looked at as well. In the northern part of the Netherlands, the so-called 'hard (g)' is most frequent. Hard (g) is often realized without voicing and in a uvular manner, sometimes with rasp. In the southern part of the Netherlands, 'soft (g)' is used most often, which is voiced and velar or palatal. Rasp does not occur with these realizations.

Table 5.1 presents an overview of the results of the variable (g):

Table 5.1. Results of variable (g).

Phonological position	**Voicing**	**Rasp**	**Place of articulation**	**Number of occurrences (N = 200)**	**Number of speakers (N = 20)**
Word-initial	+ Voice	-	Velar	0	0
	- Voice	+ Rasp	Uvular	8	3
		- Rasp	Uvular	117	19
Word-medial	+ Voice	-	Velar	2	1
	- Voice	+ Rasp	Uvular	8	2
		- Rasp	Uvular	65	17

In Table 5.1, the first column shows the phonological position of the occurrence of (g). The 'voicing', 'rasp', and 'place of articulation' columns provide information about the phonetic features. Since 10 tokens per variable were selected in every interview, this counts up to 200 occurrences in total. The 'number of occurrences' column, then, shows how often this realization of (g) occurred in the recordings. The final column reveals the number of speakers who have used this particular realization.

As can be seen in Table 5.1, the vast majority of occurrences of (g) are voiceless uvular realizations, while only one speaker realized (g) as a voiceless velar stop. However, this only happened in two occurrences. This speaker originally came from the province of Brabant, in the south of the Netherlands. This could explain the way this speaker realized (g). However, in the other eight instances, this speaker did use a voiceless variant. It could be the case that this speaker is aware that voiced velar (g) is not common in Dronten Dutch. Additionally, rasp does not seem to have a prominent place in the speech of the recorded speakers. Only three speakers realized (g) with rasp in some, but not all, occurrences.

(r)

The realization of (r) is subject to a high level of variability in Dutch (see for instance Sebregts 2015). Variability occurs in place as well as manner of articulation, and varies highly between speakers and within speakers. Therefore, this section will first present the results of several features of (r) in initial and intervocalic position. Several characteristics will be taken into account. The first characteristic is the place of articulation (i.e. alveolar or uvular). The second characteristic is the manner of articulation (i.e. fricative, tap or trill). Also, force of articulation was looked at. According to Smakman (2006), force of articulation is an important element to consider. He argued that it might be less relevant to consider place and manner of articulation if (r) is realized without much force, since it may be harder to hear where it is realized in the mouth.

Table 5.2 below shows the distribution of the different realizations of (r) in onset position. Note, however, that the tokens of (r) of three speakers were realized without much force and were soft to such a degree, that it was not possible to hear how these tokens were realized. Therefore, these are not included in Table 5.2.

Table 5.2. Results of variable (r) in onset position.

Place of articulation	**Manner of articulation**	**Force**	**Number of occurrences (N =170)**	**Number of speakers (N = 17)**
Alveolar	Trill	+ Force	37	5
		- Force	0	0
	Tap	+ Force	43	5
		- Force	30	3
Uvular	Fricative	+ Force	0	0
		- Force	55	6
	Trill	+ Force	0	0
		- Force	5	1

Table 5.2 shows that the alveolar tap and uvular fricative realization of (r) occur most frequently in the speech of the recorded speakers. Also, the alveolar trill realization is quite frequent, especially in the speech of two speakers born in Friesland and of one speaker born in Twente. Speakers who were born in Dronten mostly used the uvular fricative realization. As noted before, three speakers from Dronten pronounced (r) is such a soft manner that it was not possible to determine place and manner of articulation. When looking at the pronunciation of (r) as soft or not soft, it can be remarked that twelve speakers realized (r) in a soft way, whereas eight speakers did not. Of the twelve 'soft' speakers, seven were born and raised in Dronten. Finally, it turns out that most speakers are quite consistent in the way they produce (r) either in the front or the back of the mouth, as Smakman (2006) observed as well. Some speakers do

sometimes switch from an alveolar trill realization to an alveolar tap; however, they do not interchange this with uvular realizations.

Table 5.3 below shows the results concerning (r) in coda position:

Table 5.3. Results of variable (r) in coda position.

As can be noted in Table 5.3, the first column presents a distinction between prominent and non-prominent realizations of (r) in coda position. As can be understood from Table 5.3, (r) in this position was oftentimes not prominent. Only a few speakers used alveolar realizations of (r) in this position, and all of these speakers were originally from Friesland or the eastern part of the Netherlands. Speakers who were born in Dronten did not use prominent realizations of (r) in coda position.

Devoicing of (v) and (z)

Concerning the consonants (v) and (z), voicing was the main focus. Also, phonological position was taken into consideration. Table 5.4 below shows the

Prominence	**Realization**	**Number of occurrences (N = 200)**	**Number of speakers (N = 20)**
Prominent	Alveolar tap	2	1
	Alveolar trill	25	4
	Alveolar approximant	16	4
Non-prominent	-	157	11

results of the variable (v):

Table 5.4. Results of variable (v).

Phonological position	**Voicing**	**Number of occurrences (N = 200)**	**Number of speakers (N = 20)**
Word-initial	Devoiced	134	18
	Voiced	15	5
Word-medial	Devoiced	43	18
	Voiced	8	5

As can be seen in Table 5.4, there is a strong tendency to devoice (v). However, five speakers also used voiced (v) in their speech. Something that was noteworthy was that, besides interspeaker variation, there was considerable intraspeaker variation as well. This means that speakers use devoiced (v) as well as voiced (v) in their speech. Besides that, speakers that used voiced (v) more consistently were those that were not born and raised in Dronten, and grew up outside the Randstad area, e.g. Twente and Brabant.

Table 5.5 below, then, shows the results for the variable (z):

Table 5.5. Results of variable (z).

Phonological position	**Voicing**	**Number of occurrences (N = 200)**	**Number of speakers (N = 20)**
Word-initial	Devoiced	90	18
	Voiced	51	11
Word-medial	Devoiced	38	14
	Voiced	21	8

As becomes clear from Table 5.5, the distribution of the different realizations of (z) is more diffuse than the distribution of the previous variable. Also, more intraspeaker variation can be observed, as speakers realized (z) both as voiced and devoiced. What is more, it seems that speakers from the two groups use both variants interchangeably. All in all, it can be said that there is a slightly stronger tendency to devoice (z) than to use the voiced variant, although this picture is much less clear compared to the devoicing of (v).

Diphthongization of (ee), (oo), (eu)

Regarding these variables, no remarkable findings were found in most of the data. Only one speaker had a tendency to diphthongize (ee) and (oo). This speaker was born and raised in urban area of The Hague. This could explain why this speaker still tended to diphthongize (ee) and (oo). No occurrences of diphthongized (eu) were found in any of the recordings.

Lowering of the first element (ei), (au), (ei)

In these three diphthongs, the first element can be lowered. Therefore, that was the main focus in the investigation of these variables. Concerning (ui), none of the speakers lowered the first element of this diphthong. The same was true for the variable (au). However, one speaker consistently lowered the first element of (au). This was the same speaker who also diphthongized (ee) and (oo). On the other hand, more variation in the (ei) variable was found. Consider Table 5.6 below for the results of this variable:

Table 5.6. Results of variable (ei).

Realization	**Number of occurrences**	**Number of speakers**

	(N = 200)	**(N = 20)**
Lowered first element	140	17
Non-lowered first element	60	13

As Table 5.6 clearly shows, there were more occurrences of (ei) with a lowered first element than there were without this. In fact, 70% of all occurrences of (ei) contained a lowered first element. Based on these findings, it might be interesting to take a closer look at intra- and interspeaker variation. In order to find out which speakers realized (ei) with a lowered first element, Table 5.7 presents an overview of the distribution of the realization per speaker of Group 1 (first-generation speakers):

Table 5.7. Results of variable (ei) per speaker in Group 1.

Speaker	**Lowered first element (ei)**	**No lowering first element (ei)**
Speaker 1 (Twente, M)	0	10
Speaker 2 (The Hague, F)	10	0
Speaker 3 (Friesland, F)	10	0
Speaker 4 (The Hague, F)	10	0
Speaker 5 (Brabant, M)	9	1
Speaker 6 (Overijssel, F)	6	4
Speaker 7 (Utrecht, F)	7	3
Speaker 8 (Twente, F)	0	10
Speaker 9 (Friesland, M)	10	0
Speaker 10 (Zeeland, F)	3	7

What becomes clear from Table 5.7 above is that the lowering of the first element is most common in speakers who grew up in the Randstad area (The Hague, Utrecht), and speakers from Friesland. However, speakers who grew up in other parts outside the Randstad area do not seem to lower the first element of (ei) as often as the other speakers. Table 5.8 below shows the distribution of the results of variable (ei) in Group 2 (second-generation speakers):

Table 5.8. Results of variable (ei) per speaker in Group 2.

Speaker	**Lowered first element (ei)**	**No lowering first element (ei)**
Speaker 11 (Dronten, M)	10	0
Speaker 12 (Dronten, F)	10	0
Speaker 13 (Dronten, F)	7	3
Speaker 14 (Dronten, F)	7	3
Speaker 15 (Dronten, F)	6	4

Speaker 16 (Dronten, F)	7	3
Speaker 17 (Dronten, F)	9	1
Speaker 18 (Dronten, F)	9	1
Speaker 19 (Dronten, M)	0	10
Speaker 20 (Dronten, F)	10	0

As Table 5.8 shows, the tendency to lower the first element of (ei) is quite strong in second-generation speakers, except for Speaker 19. Therefore, based on the data of Table 5.7 and Table 5.8, it can be said that speakers from the Randstad area (including Dronten) have a tendency to lower the first element of (ei), whereas speakers from outside the Randstad do not. One exception to this are the speakers from Friesland, where lowering of the first element of (ei) is part of their dialect.

Analysis of qualitative questions

The second part of the interviews consisted of qualitative questions about the variety of Dutch that is spoken in Dronten. The following section will present the results of these questions separately.

Is there a Dronten accent, and if so, what are the characteristics?

None of the speakers believed that there was a Dronten accent. However, they were able to characterize this variety of Dutch. Table 5.9 below presents an overview of these characteristics, in which the answers are summarized into four broad themes:

Table 5.9. Characteristics of Dronten Dutch.

Characteristic	**Number of speakers**
Mixed	9
Normal/Standard	8
Accent from the East or North	3
Older people have accent	2

As can be seen in Table 5.9, most speakers mentioned the mixed character of Dronten Dutch. With this they meant that there are many different accents to be heard, since immigrants brought along their own accents of Dutch to Dronten. In this way, accents from all parts of the Netherlands can be heard in Dronten. Further, nine speakers noticed that there was nothing special about the way Dutch is spoken in Dronten, or that it was ‘normal’ or ‘standard’. Also, three

speakers noticed that there are many people in Dronten that speak with an accent from the northern or eastern part of the country. Interestingly, the speakers who commented on this were originally from the western part of the Netherlands. Two speakers pointed out that older people oftentimes still speak with a regional accent, whereas younger people who were born and raised in Dronten do not.

To what extent does the variety of Dutch spoken in Dronten resemble Standard Dutch?
Regarding this question, 18 out of 20 speakers agreed that Dronten Dutch resembles the standard language to a high extent. For instance, one speaker said: 'In Dronten, we all speak normal Dutch. You know, decent and proper Dutch'. However, most speakers noted that this is particularly true for younger Dronten-born inhabitants. One speaker did not consider this variety to be standard because of the mix of different accents. Finally, one speaker did not have an opinion on this subject.

Is there a difference in the way children who were born in Dronten speak and the way their parents do?
Almost all speakers (19 out of 20) observed a difference in the way of speaking between children who were born in Dronten and their parents who were born elsewhere. What was noted was that the children did not speak with any regional accent at all, even though their parents usually do. For instance, one speaker said: 'Our children do not speak Frisian, and you cannot tell that their parents are Frisian. They speak standard Dutch'. Only one speaker did not observe this difference between generations.

Do people adjust the way they speak when they move to Dronten?
The answers to this question can be categorized into three categories. Almost half of the speakers (9 out of 20) noticed that people who move to Dronten do indeed adjust the way speak. In this case, adjusting means that they lose their accents and start to speak more standard Dutch. Three speakers mentioned that people have to adjust, in order to be accepted in the new community. The other eight speakers did not identify such a change in the way people speak.

Do people in Dronten speak differently from people who live elsewhere?
Thirteen speakers did not think that the variety of Dutch that is spoken in Dronten differs to a high extent to those that are spoken in other parts of the country. However, seven speakers did observe a difference, and they noted that other places have regional accents, while Dronten does not. One speaker

observed for example that 'in Groningen, they speak Gronings and in Twente they speak Twents, but in Dronten we do not have this'.

Do you adjust the way you speak to the person you speak with?
Six speakers said that they do adjust the way they speak to their interlocutor, and they do this mainly with family or with people who speak the same accent. Clearly, then, these six speakers were not born in Dronten. One speaker put it this way: 'As soon as I meet people from Friesland, I speak Frisian'. The other fourteen speakers did not notice that they adjusted their speech depending on their interlocutors. Most of these speakers were born in Dronten, and said: 'I cannot speak in another way' or 'I do not speak a dialect'.

Can people tell where you are from based solely on the way you speak?
Only the speakers who were born in Dronten answered this question, and all of them agreed that this is not the case. They said that 'This has never happened to me' and 'I never heard anyone saying that to me'.

Did you adjust your speech when you moved to Dronten?
This question was posed only to speakers who were not born in Dronten. Four speakers replied that they had adjusted their speech when they moved to Dronten. When they were asked in what way they changed their way of speaking, they replied that they had lost their accents and tried to speak more standard. The other six speakers told that they did not alter their manner of speaking, mostly because they felt they already spoke Standard Dutch.

Expert analysis
For the third part of the analysis of the recorded spontaneous speech, seven Dutch language experts were asked to listen to clips of the speech of twenty speakers. The following section describes the findings of the experts. First of all, the experts were requested to rate the speech in terms of standardness on a 5 point Likert scale, in which 1 was the opposite of standard, and 5 was highly standard. Also, they were asked to assess where the speaker was most likely born, and if there were any striking features in their speech. Table 5.10 provides an overview of the results:

Table 5.10. Results of expert analysis.

Speaker	**(mean score)**	
Speaker 1 (Utrecht)	4.2	Twente, South-Holland
Speaker 2 (Zeeland)	4.2	West-Friesland, South-Holland
Speaker 3 (Twente)	4.2	Randstad, Veluwe
Speaker 4 (Friesland)	3.6	Friesland, Northern
Speaker 5 (Friesland)	3.0	South-Holland, North Holland
Speaker 6 (Twente)	4.0	Eastern part of the Netherlands

Speaker 7 (The Hague)	5.0	Randstad
Speaker 8 (The Hague)	4.0	Western part of the Netherlands
Speaker 9 (Brabant)	4.5	Randstad
Speaker 10 (Overijssel)	4.5	Western part of the Netherlands
Speaker 11 (Dronten)	4.4	Flevoland
Speaker 12 (Dronten)	4.2	Randstad
Speaker 13 (Dronten)	4.4	Randstad
Speaker 14 (Dronten)	3.8	West-Friesland, Gelderland
Speaker 15 (Dronten)	4.2	Flevoland, Randstad
Speaker 16 (Dronten)	4.0	Western part of the Netherlands
Speaker 17 (Dronten)	4.5	Western part of the Netherlands
Speaker 18 (Dronten)	5.0	West/central
Speaker 19 (Dronten)	5.0	Western part of the Netherlands
Speaker 20 (Dronten)	4.0	Randstad

As can be seen in Table 5.10 above, standardness was rated relatively high, except for two speakers from Friesland and for one speaker who was born in Dronten (Speaker 14). This can be explained by the fact that Speaker 14, who was born in Dronten, was relatively old, and perhaps more importantly, a farmer. Therefore, his way of speaking was different from the speech of other speakers from Dronten. Further, it becomes clear from Table 4.10 that a high degree of standardness of associated with the Randstad area, or the western part of the Netherlands in general.

5.2 Part 2: Survey

This section will present the results of each question in the survey separately.

Question 1: dialect or not?

In this question, respondents were asked if people in Dronten speak a distinct dialect. The majority of the respondents (96%) answered that there is no dialect at all, whereas only 4% of the respondents considered that there is a dialect, but that it is not strong. Not one respondent thought that there was a heavy dialect. One interesting comment was made in this question. One respondent observed that 'only farmers' speak with a heavy dialect, separating this group from other Dronten residents.

Question 2: accent, dialect, or both?

This second question offered more explanation about the difference between accent and dialect, and then the respondents were asked to classify the variety of Dutch that is spoken in Dronten as either an accent, a dialect, both, or neither

accent nor dialect. The results were comparable to the first question. Again, the majority of the respondents (74%) claimed that there is neither an accent nor a dialect spoken in Dronten. 20% of the respondents thought there were only differences to be found in pronunciation, and therefore they chose the option of 'only accent'. The answers to this question, along with those from the first question, seem to present a picture that there is not a distinct Dronten accent or dialect. Further, respondents had the opportunity to add comments to this question. Three respondents did so, and these comments were rather interesting. All three comments noted that the variety of Dutch spoken in Dronten is a mix of different regional accents and dialects, and therefore there is no such thing as a true 'Dronten' variety.

Question 3: adjusting language

The third question of the survey asked if the respondents adjust the way they speak when they encounter people from another part of the country. 71% of the respondents said that they do not accommodate their speech to the person they are talking to. This high percentage could be explained by that fact that many respondents were very young, and therefore most likely did not speak a distinct dialect. In fact, the comments that were made in this question affirm this, as can be seen in the following quotes: 'No, because I speak Standard Dutch' and 'No, I speak the way I am used to. I think it is Standard Dutch'. From the 29% of the respondents who mentioned that they do adjust their speech to their interlocutor, it became clear from the comments that these were people who spoke a regional accent or dialect. For example one respondent wrote: 'That goes automatically. When speaking to your family, you easily fall back on your old accent'. Another respondent said the following: 'When I speak to people from Brabant, I start to speak that way again. That is because I have lived there for many years'.

Question 4: older vs. younger residents of Dronten

In this question, respondents were asked if they observed a difference in speech between older people who have lived in Dronten for a long time, and younger people who have grown up there. More than half (57%) of the respondents saw such a difference, whereas 43% of the respondents did not notice this. From the respondents who answered 'yes' to this question, a similar pattern to the previous questions can be observed. Consider for instance this comment: 'Yes, people from the different provinces often still speak a dialect. This is noticeable even after a long time. In younger people, you do not hear this as often'. Another respondent commented: 'Older inhabitants often still speak the dialect from where they were born. Young people from Dronten speak Standard Dutch'.

Question 5: qualities of Dronten Dutch

This question asked the respondents what they thought of the variety of Dutch spoken in Dutch in terms of different qualities. Table 5.11 below summarizes the findings of this question:

Table 5.11. Qualities of Dronten Dutch. 1 = not at all, 5 = very much so.

Quality	**Mean score**
Beautiful	3.8
Standard	4.3
Rural	2.8
Posh	2.6
Vulgar	2.3
Mixed	3.2

Table 5.11 shows the mean scores of the different characteristics. In the online survey, respondents were asked to fill in a five-point Likert scale, in which 1 = not at all, and 5 = very much so. As can be seen in Table 5.11, the quality 'standard' is rated particularly high. Also, the quality 'beautiful' has a relatively high score. 'Rural', 'posh', and 'vulgar' scored particularly low. Lastly, the quality 'mixed' did not score very high or very low.

Difference Dronten and place where respondent grew up

The respondents who indicated that they were not born and raised in Dronten were asked to answer an additional question. This question asked if they noticed that, when they arrived in Dronten, people speak in a different way there than in the area where they grew up. The answers can be summarized in the following Table 5.12:

Table 5.12. Differences Dutch in Dronten and elsewhere.

Difference	**Percentage**
No difference	43.8%
Neutral, standard	25.0%
Mixed	21.9%
More friendly	3.1%
More rural	3.1%
Less rural	3.1%

As can be seen in Table 5.12, the majority of the respondents did not notice a difference or anything remarkable in the Dronten variety of Dutch. Another observation was that in Dronten, many distinct accents are spoken, and it is therefore some kind of mixed variety. Also, 25% of the respondents recognized that Dronten Dutch is very similar to Standard Dutch and that it is regionally neutral, or as one of the respondents put it: 'remarkably neutral ABN[1]'.

6 Discussion

The current research looked into new dialect formation in the new town of Dronten, the Netherlands. In order to examine this, three research questions were formulated. The first part of this section will revisit the research questions and compare the outcomes of the current study to previous literature. Then, an attempt is made to put the findings of this study in a broader perspective.

6.1 First research question: characteristics of Dronten Dutch

This research question can be divided into two components, namely the phonetic characteristics and a definition of Dronten Dutch. Therefore, this section will discuss both components separately.

Phonetic characteristics

The first component investigated which phonetic characteristics could be found in this particular variety of Dutch. In order to do so, spontaneous speech was recorded of twenty inhabitants of Dronten. In a number of variables, interesting tendencies could be observed. First of all, the speakers in this sample were

1 Algemeen Beschaafd Nederlands, 'General Civilized Dutch', a common way of referring to Standard Dutch.

inclined to devoice the voiced fricative (v) and, to a lesser extent, (z), as Tables 5.4 and 5.5 in the previous chapter showed. The tendency to devoice (v) is in line with what Scholtmeijer (1992) found. Note, however, that most speakers who tended to devoice (v) grew up in Dronten or in the urban area of the Randstad. Yet, this phenomenon does not seem to occur only in the Dronten variety of Dutch. Van de Velde et al. (1996), amongst others, noted that the tendency to devoice voiced fricatives has been observed for over 60 years in Standard Dutch in the Netherlands. Further, a hierarchy can be observed in devoicing of voiced fricatives, where (v) is more likely to be devoiced than (z). This is in agreement with was found in the current research.

Second of all, it was observed that in 70% of all occurrences of the diphthong (ei), the first element was lowered to some extent. This, again, seems to be in agreement with Scholtmeijer's (1992) results. Similar to the devoicing of (v) and (z), this appears to be not confined to the city of Dronten, as Scholtmeijer (1992) already noted. Lowering of the first element of (ei) has been mentioned earlier in other studies to be a relatively recent adaption in Standard Dutch (see for instance Stroop 1998, Smakman 2006). Further, this phenomenon seems to be associated with the capital of the Netherlands, Amsterdam.

Last of all, the current research found a high level of variation in the pronunciation of the variable (r), particularly in onset position. What was most noteworthy in the recorded speech was that speakers who were born in Dronten realized (r) without a lot of force, and therefore it was hard to determine place or manner of articulation in some cases. This applied to a lesser extent to speakers who grew up elsewhere in the country. In these speakers, there was more force in articulation, which made (r) a more salient feature. Both alveolar and uvular realizations were found, something that Scholtmeijer (1992) also identified. In coda position, (r) was most often non-prominent. This category covers several realizations, such as vocalized (r) and zero realization. Again, non-prominent (r) in coda position is not exclusively found in the Dronten variety of Dutch. Smakman (2006) and Sebregts (2015) both observed a rapid spreading of (r) vocalization in coda position in Standard Dutch as well.

Definition of Dronten Dutch

The second component of this research question focused on the definition of Dronten Dutch. In order to gain more insight into this issue, questions about the Dronten dialect were asked in the interviews and the online survey. In the interviews, two questions were aimed at answering this component of the current research question. First, speakers were asked if there was a Dronten dialect and what its characteristics were. None of them thought there was a specific Dronten dialect. When they were asked what characterized the variety of Dutch spoken in Dronten, 9 of the 20 speakers noticed that in Dronten, there is a considerable mix of different regional accents and dialects. This observation may refer to the diffused linguistic situation in the first generation of Dronten

inhabitants. Further, 8 of the 20 speakers considered that there was nothing special about the language variety of Dronten, or regarded it to be standard. Smakman (2012) made a similar observation in a study that looked into characteristics that defined standard language. One quality that was associated with standard language was generalness, or blandness. This seems to be similar to what was found in the current research. Also, correctness was linked to standard language (Smakman, 2012), a quality that was mentioned in the interviews of the current study as well. A number of respondents referred to 'speaking properly' and 'speaking decently' when they were asked what the variety of Dutch sounded like in Dronten.

Another question in the interviews focused on the definition of Dronten Dutch. Second generation speakers were asked if other people could tell where they were from solely based on the way they speak. None of speakers said that they had ever experienced this. Once again, this appears to confirm that there are no specific phonetic characteristics that are typical of the variety of Dutch that is spoken in Dronten. This observation can be classified as 'non-regionality', an idea first put forward by Jespersen (1925). According to him, the standard language can be defined as a regionally neutral language variety. Smakman (2012) also noted that non-regionality is associated with standard language. In his study, non-regionality was the main characteristic of the standard language among Dutch respondents. This seems to be in line with what was found in the interviews conducted in the current research.

Finally, the online survey also looked into the issue of defining Dronten Dutch. When asked if there was such a thing as a Dronten accent or dialect, a large majority of the respondents said there was none, again pointing at the characteristic of generalness or blandness. When looking more closely at the characteristics that were associated with this variety, it became clear that Dronten Dutch was considered to be highly standard, and it was not identified as rural, posh, or vulgar. Also, the variety of Dutch that is spoken in Dronten was regarded as relatively beautiful. Perceived beauty is another characteristic that is frequently linked to standard language (Trudgill & Giles 1978; Smakman 2006; Smakman 2012).

Taking the analysis of the phonetic variables, the analysis of the qualitative questions as well as the online survey into account, it seems safe to say that the Dronten variety of Dutch tends to be associated with regionally neutral and standard speech.

6.2 Second research question: time scale of new dialect formation

The second research question focused on the time scale of new dialect formation, asking if there was a linguistic difference between the first and the second generation of speakers. In order to answer this question, the group of speakers that was recorded was split into two groups. Speakers in one group were born in Dronten, while their parents were not. Therefore, this group was a sample of

second-generation speakers. Speakers in the other group grew up in another area of the country and for that reason they were considered to be first-generation speakers. The analysis of phonetic variables showed greater variability in first-generation speakers than in the speech of the second generation, for instance the articulation of (r) in coda position. First-generation speakers were more inclined to realize (r) in this position in a prominent manner (e.g. as alveolar trill or alveolar tap). In second-generation speakers, prominent (r) realizations in coda position were not encountered. Also, force of articulation of (r) was higher in first-generation speakers, especially those that were born outside the Randstad area. Speakers who were born in Dronten, and speakers from the Randstad, oftentimes pronounced (r) with little force. Sometimes they did so to the point where it became hard to determine place and manner of articulation of (r).

Data that were obtained via the qualitative questions in the interviews shed more light on this matter. All speakers were asked if children who were born in Dronten speak differently from their parents. 19 out of 20 speakers admitted that they observed this in their daily lives. More specifically, the speakers responded that in the first generation, it is relatively easy to recognize their original regional accent, whereas this cannot be said for the second generation. The outcomes of the online survey confirm this observation. In the survey, the majority of the respondents recognized a clear difference between the speech of first- and second-generation speakers.

A possible explanation for this observation may be found in the literature regarding diffusion and focusing (Le Page, 1980). Focusing applies to a community that is linguistically homogenous, i.e. little linguistic variation. Diffusion is the opposite of focusing. Diffusion refers to a community that is linguistically heterogeneous, i.e. where there is a lot of linguistic variation. The process of focusing is the loss of linguistic diffusion and going towards a more focused situation. Looking at the results of the current study, it may be said that focusing is already taking place in the second generation. While there is still considerable variation observed in the first generation, second-generation speakers seem to have formed a more focused and homogeneous language variety. As in all new towns, the linguistic situation was extremely diffused at first, and it is becoming more and more focused as time goes by.

The data for the new town of Dronten seem to suggest that the second generation is already close to being focused, and therefore the time scale of focusing appears to be similar to the situation in Milton Keynes, as described by Kerswill & Williams (2000). The question that might arise then is why there is such rapid focusing in Dronten. According to Kerswill & Williams (2000), the proportion of children to adults plays an important role in promoting rapid focusing. Since children are considered to be the main agents in the process of focusing, a high number of children relative the number of adults can promote focusing, especially in the first number of years after settlement. It seems most

likely that children take the different adults models as their input, and then start to form more focused variants. These more focused variants are new and in this way, a different and more focused way of speaking from their parents is established. In the case of Dronten, the child-adult ratio was not balanced, with more children than adults, especially in the first years after settlement. Also, most initial in-migrants were of childbearing age, so that many children were born in the new town of Dronten. Since there were many children in the first few years after settlement, rapid focusing could take place.

Another factor that may have promoted rapid focusing is that there were possibilities to form a new social network among children and young people, for instance in schooling. This seems to be true for the case of Dronten. As mentioned before, there were many young children who all attended the same school in the first few years after settlement in Dronten. It seems probable that this could have contributed to rapid focusing.

6.3 Third research question: perceived standardness

The third question in this research was to determine the perceived degree of standardness of the Dronten variety of Dutch. This research question was based on a prediction that Scholtmeijer (1992) made almost 25 years ago. Based on the analysis of the speech of three speakers who were born in Dronten, he argued that it did not contain any regional dialectal features, and was therefore relatively close to Standard Dutch. In order to rate the level of standardness, several approaches were taken.

Firstly, the phonetic variables that were analysed in the recorded speech created a picture of the degree of standardness. Looking at the variables that were taken into consideration, and comparing these to those investigated in Smakman (2006), it seems likely that the recorded speech is standard in terms of phonetic variation. Considerable variation was only found in lowering the first element (ei), pronunciation of (r), particularly in onset position, and devoicing of (v) and (z). However, these three elements appear not be unique to the Dronten variety of Dutch, and are encountered more often in standard varieties of Dutch (see for instance Van de Velde et al. 1998; Smakman 2006; Sebregts 2015). What needs to be noted, however, is that this only applies to the speech of second-generation speakers, since first-generation speakers oftentimes still have a regional colouring in their speech.

Secondly, both the online survey and the qualitative questions in the interviews addressed the degree of standardness. In the online survey, respondents were asked if they considered the Dronten variety of Dutch to be standard or not. Around 85% of the respondents replied that they did consider this variety to be standard. Also, in the interviews the degree of standardness was discussed. 18 out of 20 speakers answered that Dronten Dutch resembled Standard Dutch to a high extent. Again, it was noted that this applied particularly to the second-generation speakers.

Lastly, in order to obtain a more professional view on this issue, Dutch language experts were asked to assess standardness of the speech of ten speakers. The expert analysis presented a similar picture as presented above. Standardness was rated relatively high, especially for the second-generation speakers. Taken together, one can observe that the different approaches and analyses present similar findings regarding standardness. Particularly, the variety of Dutch that is spoken by second-generation speakers can be considered to resemble Standard Dutch.

6.4 Possible explanations for standardness

As was discussed in the previous sections, focusing in Dronten seems to be taking place in the second generation of speakers, and it appears to be directed towards a more standard, regionally neutral way of speaking. The question that arises, then, is why it is going in that specific direction. The situation in Dronten does not stand on its own. A similar situation to that of Dronten can be found in the Dutch city of Haarlem, as described by Smakman (2003). In the Netherlands, there seems to be some kind of language myth that states that the Haarlem variety of Dutch resembles Standard Dutch to a high degree. It is unclear where this idea originated, although Winkler (1874) alluded to it. He wrote that people from different parts of the Netherlands moved to Haarlem, which made the language variety that was spoken there less marked. Also, he noted that the variety of Dutch that was spoken in Haarlem resembled the written language, which is often associated with a high degree of standardness. Although this language myth is still very much alive today, it remains unclear if the city language variety of Haarlem is in fact standard (Smakman, 2003).

Further, Bortoni (1991) observed a similar focusing process towards a more standard variety in the Brazilian capital of Brasília. A number of possible explanations can be proposed to clarify this issue. To start with, it may be linked to important cultural factors. In situations of language contact, less prestigious language variants tend to be replaced by more prestigious language varieties (e.g. Gal 1979, Gumperz 1982). 'Prestige' and 'standard' tend to be used interchangeably in many sociolinguistic studies. This may explain why regionally marked variants are disfavoured in the Dronten variety of Dutch, and why second-generation speakers have a preference for more neutral and unmarked forms.

Another explanation can be found in Siegel's (1985) work on the characteristics of the process of koineization. He argued that reduction and simplification are important aspects of koineization. In simplification, marked forms are oftentimes replaced by more unmarked forms, creating a new regionally unmarked language variety. This seems to be in line with the results of the current research.

Similar to reduction and simplification, regional dialect levelling may also be taking place in the city of Dronten. In regional dialect levelling, a decrease in

linguistic variation can be observed. This occurs in a situation where mutually intelligible dialects are spoken, as in the case of Dronten. Regional dialect levelling, then, may also play a role in the direction that the Dronten variety of Dutch seems to be going.

A final possible explanation for this issue may be found in the geographical location of Dronten. Dronten is situated between two areas that are dialectically different. It is situated between the western part of the Netherlands including the capital, Amsterdam, on the one hand, and the eastern part of the country (Overijssel, Veluwe) on the other. In Dronten itself, neither a western nor an eastern accent is dominant. This may promote the development of a regionally neutral language variety.

6.5 Further research

The current research was explorative in nature since no other investigations than Scholtmeijer (1992) have been carried out on this subject, to my knowledge. Therefore, it might be interesting for further studies to continue studying the new town of Dronten. For instance, it might be valuable to revisit the city of Dronten after a few decades to study the third generation of speakers. According to Trudgill (1986), focusing is only completed in the third generation. It may be worthwhile to examine how this can be applied to the situation in Dronten. Also, it can be observed by then if the currently observed direction towards Standard Dutch has been completed. In addition, further studies might look into other new towns in Flevoland, such as Lelystad or Zeewolde, to see to what extent these places are linguistically similar or dissimilar to Dronten.

7 Conclusion

This thesis set out to look into the on-going process of new dialect formation in the new town of Dronten. It has attempted to do so by examining it from different angles, in order to form a complete picture of the current linguistic situation. This research has identified a number of interesting tendencies. First of all, although the language of the first generation of speakers is still rather diffused, focusing seems to be taking place in the second generation already. The second interesting finding was that the variety of Dutch spoken by second-generation speakers in Dronten seems to be regionally neutral. Phonetic analysis only revealed considerable variation in the pronunciation of (r), in lowering of the first element of (ei) and in devoicing of word-initial and word-medial (v) and (z). However, comparisons to earlier research on the phonology of Dutch show that the variation found in these variables is not unique for the Dronten variety of Dutch, but occur more and more often in other varieties of Dutch as well. In general, therefore, it seems that the Dutch that is spoken in Dronten is not developing in its own special way, but instead is following a similar pattern to Standard Dutch. Taken together, these findings enhance our understanding of the process of

koineization and new dialect formation. Further, the current study has confirmed findings by Scholtmeijer (1992) and Kerswill & Williams (2000). Despite its exploratory nature, this study has attempted to offer some insight into the linguistic situation of the new town of Dronten.

8 References

Bortoni, S. (1991). Dialect contact in Brasilia. *International journal of the sociology of language*, *89*(1), 47-60.

Britain, D. (1997). Dialect contact and phonological reallocation: "Canadian Raising" in the English Fens. *Language in Society*, *26*(1), 15-46.

Britain, D., & Trudgill, P. (1999). Migration, new-dialect formation and sociolinguistic refunctionalisation: reallocation as an outcome of dialect contact. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, *97*(2), 245-256.

Campbell-Kibler, K. (2007). Accent, (ING) and the social logic of listener perceptions. *American Speech, 82*, 32–64.

Eckert, P. (2008). Variation and the indexical field. *Journal of sociolinguistics, 12*(4), 453-476.

Gal, S. (1979). *Language shift: Social determinants of linguistic change in bilingual Austria*. New York: Academic Press.

Giles, H. & Coupland, N. (1991). *Language: Contexts and consequences*. Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982). Social network and language shift. In J.J. Gumperz, *Discourse Strategies*, 38-58. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hinskens, F. (1998). Dialect levelling: A two-dimensional process. *Folia Linguistica*, *32*(1-2), 35-52.

Jespersen, O. (1925). *Mankind, nation and individual from a linguistic point of view*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Kerswill, P., & Williams, A. (2000). Creating a new town koine: children and language change in Milton Keynes. *Language in society*, *29*(1), 65-115.

Kerswill, P. (2002). Koineization and accommodation. In J. K. Chambers, P. Trudgill & N. Schilling-Estes (eds.) *The handbook of language variation and change*, 669-702. Oxford: Blackwell.

Kerswill, P., & Williams, A. (2005). New towns and koineization: Linguistic and social correlates. *Linguistics*, *43*(5), 1023-1048.

Kerswill, P., & Trudgill, P. (2005). The birth of new dialects. *Dialect change: Convergence and divergence in European languages*, 196.

Kerswill, P. (2010). Contact and new varieties. In R. Hickey (Ed.) *The handbook of language contact,* 230-251. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Labov, W. (1963). The social motivation of a sound change. *Word*, *19*(3), 273-309.

Labov, W. (1966). *The Social Stratification of English in New York City.* Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Le Page, R. B. (1980). Projection, focusing, and diffusion or steps towards a sociolinguistic theory. *York Papers in Linguistics*, 9, 9-33.

Le Page, R. B., & Tabouret-Keller, A. (1985). *Acts of identity: Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Milroy, L. (1987*). Observing & Analysing Natural Language: A Critical Account of Sociolinguistic Method*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Milroy, L., & Milroy, J. (1992). Social network and social class: Toward an integrated sociolinguistic model. *Language in society*, *21*(1), 1-26.

Omdal, H. (1977). Høyangermålet – en ny dialekt. *Språklig Samling, 18*, 7–9.

Sandve, B. H. (1976). *Om talemålet i industristadene Odda og Tyssedal: Generasjonsskilnad og tilnærming mellom dei to målføra*. PhD thesis, Department of Nordic Languages and Literature, University of Bergen.

Sebregts, K. (2015). *The sociophonetics and phonology of Dutch r*. PhD Thesis. Utrecht: LOT.

Scholtmeijer, H. (1992). Het Nederlands van de IJsselmeerpolders. PhD Thesis. University of Leiden. Kampen: Mondiss.

Siegel, J. (1985). Koines and koineization. *Language in society*, *14*(3), 357-378.

Silverstein, M. (2003). Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language & Communication*, *23*(3), 193-229.

Smakman, D. (2003). Algemeen Beschaafd Haarlems. Gebruikskenmerken van het Standaardnederlands. In J. Stroop (Ed.) *Waar gaat het Nederlands naartoe? Panorama van een Taal*, 120-130. Amsterdam: Bert Bakker.

Smakman, D. (2006). *Standard Dutch in The Netherlands: A sociolinguistic and phonetic description*. PhD Thesis. Utrecht: LOT.

Smakman, D. (2012). The definition of the standard language: a survey in seven countries. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language,* 218, 25-58.

Stroop, J. P. A. (1998). *Poldernederlands; waardoor het ABN verdwijnt*. Amsterdam: Bert Bakker.

Trudgill, P. & Giles, H. (1978). Sociolinguistics and linguistic value judgements: correctness, adequacy and aesthetics. In F. Coppieters & D. Goyvaerts (eds.), *Functional studies in language and literature*, 167–190. Gent: Story-Scientia.

Trudgill, P. (1982). Linguistic accommodation: Sociolinguistic observations on a socio-psychological theory. In T. Fretheim & L. Hellan (eds.), *Papers from the Sixth Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics*, 284–297. Trondheim: Tapir.

Trudgill, P. (1986). *Dialects in contact*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Trudgill, P., Gordon, E., Lewis, G., & Maclagan, M. (2000). Determinism in new-dialect formation and the genesis of New Zealand English. *Journal of Linguistics*, *36*(2), 299-318.

Trudgill, P. (2004). *New-Dialect Formation: The Inevitability of Colonial Englishes*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Van de Velde, H., Gerritsen, M., & Van Hout, R. (1996). The devoicing of fricatives in Standard Dutch: A real-time study based on radio recordings. *Language Variation and Change*, *8*(2), 149-175.

Williams, A. & Kerswill, P. (1999). Dialect levelling: Continuity vs. change in Milton Keynes, Reading, and Hull. In P. Foulkes & G. Docherty (eds.), *Urban voices*, 141–62. London: Arnold.

Winkler, J. (1874). *Algemeen Nederduitsch en Friesch Dialecticon*. Den Haag: Martinus Nijhoff.

Appendices

Appendix A: regional origin of Dronten population

Regional origin of the population of Dronten in 1965, adopted from Scholtmeijer 1992: 15:

Regional origin	**Percentage**
Groningen	5%
Friesland	4.5%
Drenthe	3.4%
Overijssel	14.9%
Gelderland	7.9%
Utrecht	0.7%

Noord-Holland	6.7%
Zuid-Holland	4.7%
Zeeland	1.9%
Noord-Brabant	3.4%
Limburg	0.4%
Unknown/abroad	0.3%
Children: born in Dronten born in other polders	 7.2% 39%

Regional origin of the population of Dronten in 1984, adopted from Scholtmeijer 1992: 18:

Regional origin	**Percentage**
Groningen	2.0%
Friesland	2.2%
Drenthe	1.5%
Overijssel	6.3%
Gelderland	9.3%
Utrecht	3.2%
Noord-Holland	8.4%
Zuid-Holland	4.7%

Zeeland	0.6%
Noord-Brabant	1.5%
Limburg	3.5%
Foreign country	2.8%
Current municipality of residence	54.2%

Appendix B: detailed characteristics of speakers

Detailed characteristics of Group 1:

Speaker	Gender	Age	Occupation	Number of years in Dronten	Birthplace
1	F	55	Internship coordinator	36	Kampen (east)
2	M	65	Retired	26	Vriezenveen (east)
3	F	55	Social worker	20	Sneek (north)
4	F	55	Pharmacist	13	Hengelo (east)
5	M	82	Retired	52	Friesland (north)
6	F	59	None	33	The Hague (west)
7	M	48	Project manager	13	Den Bosch (south)
8	F	47	Financial assistant	14	Rijswijk (west)
9	F	61	Owner web shop	24	Utrecht (west)
10	F	56	Yoga instructor	44	Vierpolders (west)

Detailed characteristics of speakers in Group 2:

Speaker	Gender	Age	Occupation
1	F	23	Student
2	M	41	None
3	F	23	Student
4	F	20	Student
5	M	54	Farmer
6	F	24	Social worker
7	F	54	Civil servant
8	F	19	Student
9	F	32	Communications officer
10	F	21	Student

Appendix C: Survey

Beste deelnemer,

Deze enquête gaat over Dronten, en bestaat uit een aantal open en meerkeuzevragen. Bij het beantwoorden van deze vragen zijn er geen goede of foute antwoorden, het gaat uitsluitend om uw mening. Het beantwoorden van deze vragenlijst kost ongeveer 10 minuten.

Alle onderzoeksgegevens blijven volstrekt vertrouwelijk en worden anoniem verwerkt. De onderzoeksgegevens worden niet ter beschikking gesteld aan derden zonder uw uitdrukkelijke toestemming en alleen in anonieme gecodeerde vorm.

Mocht u nog vragen hebben, kunt u altijd contact opnemen met mij via: a.broekhuis93@gmail.com

Alvast hartelijk bedankt voor uw medewerking!

1. Wat is uw geslacht?

- o Man
- o Vrouw

2. Wat is uw leeftijd?

- o < 20
- o 20 – 30
- o 30 – 40
- o 40 – 50
- o 50 – 60
- o > 60

3. Waar bent u opgegroeid?

- o Gemeente Dronten
- o Ergens anders

4. Wat is uw huidige woonplaats?

_____

5. Wat is uw hoogst genoten opleiding?

- o MBO
- o HBO
- o WO
- o Anders, namelijk: _____

6. In welke plaats bent u opgegroeid?

_____

→ In het geval van de Gemeente Dronten, ga door naar vraag 11.

7. Hoe lang woont u al in Dronten? (in jaren)

_____

8. Wat was de reden dat u naar Dronten verhuisde?

_____

9. Heeft u de manier waarop u sprak aangepast toen u hier kwam wonen? Waar merkte u dat aan?

_____

10. Toen u hier kwam wonen, merkte u toen dat mensen hier anders praatten dan waar u bent opgegroeid? Wat viel u het meeste op?

_____

11. Wordt er in Dronten, naar uw mening, een dialect gesproken?

- o Een sterk dialect
- o Een dialect, maar niet sterk
- o Geen dialect
- o Anders: _____

12. Als iemand een accent heeft, merk je dat aan de uitspraak van bepaalde woorden. Een dialect heeft, naast een andere uitspraak, ook verschillen in zinsbouw en woordgebruik. Wat is het meest van toepassing op het Nederlands dat in Dronten gesproken wordt, vindt u?

- o Een accent
- o Een dialect

- o Beide
- o Geen van beide
- o Anders, namelijk: _____

13. Ik vind het Nederlands dat in Dronten gesproken wordt ...

	Absoluut niet	Niet	Neutraal	Wel	Absoluut wel
Mooi					
ABN/Standaard					
Boers					
Bekakt					
Plat					
Divers (meerdere accenten)					

Heeft u nog toevoegingen op deze vraag?

_____

14. Past u de manier waarop u praat aan aan de mensen met wie u spreekt, bijvoorbeeld als ze uit een ander deel van het land komen?

_____

15. Merkt u dat mensen die al lang in Dronten wonen, anders spreken dan mensen die hier pas kort wonen?

_____

Heel hartelijk bedankt voor het invullen van deze vragenlijst!