

## Tilburg University

### Migration and multilingualism in Western Europe

Extra, G.; Vallen, T.

*Published in:*  
Annual Review of Applied Linguistics

*Publication date:*  
1997

[Link to publication in Tilburg University Research Portal](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*  
Extra, G., & Vallen, T. (1997). Migration and multilingualism in Western Europe: A case study of the Netherlands. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 17, 151-169.

#### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

#### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

## **MIGRATION AND MULTILINGUALISM IN WESTERN EUROPE: A CASE STUDY OF THE NETHERLANDS**

**Gus Extra and Ton Vallen**

In this survey, the demographic and linguistic consequences of recent processes of migration and minorization in Western Europe are reviewed, and a case study of the Netherlands is presented to illustrate and detail the effects of these processes on an individual European Union country. After a discussion of demographic data and criteria in a European context, linguistic issues are addressed in terms of L1 and L2 studies on immigrant and ethnic minority groups. Major demographic trends in Dutch society and education derived from these cross-national perspectives is then outlined. Specific attention is given to research and policy in the domains of Dutch as a second language and ethnic minority languages within the context of primary education.

### **THE EUROPEAN CONTEXT**

#### **1. Demographic trends**

As a consequence of socio-economically or politically determined processes of immigration, the traditional patterns of language variation across Western Europe have changed considerably over the past decades. Many industrialized Western European countries have a growing number of immigrant populations which differ widely, both culturally and linguistically, from the mainstream indigenous population. In spite of increasingly stringent immigration policies in most European Union (EU) countries, the prognosis is that immigrant populations will continue to grow as a result of three factors: 1) the increasing number of asylum seekers, 2) the opening of the internal European borders, and 3) the political and economic developments in Central Europe, Eastern Europe, and other regions of the world. It has been estimated that in the year 2000, about one third of the population under the age of 35 in urbanized Western Europe will have an immigration background. Within the EU countries, four major immigrant groups can be distinguished:

- people from Mediterranean EU countries,
- people from Mediterranean non-EU countries,
- people from former colonial countries,
- political refugees (cf. Extra and Verhoeven 1993a).

The earliest pattern of migration was, in particular, economically motivated. In the case of Mediterranean groups, migration initially involved contract workers who expected—and were expected—to stay for a limited period of time. When the period of their stay gradually became longer, this pattern of economic migration was followed by a second, social migration pattern as their families joined them. Subsequently, a second generation was born in the immigrant countries while their parents often remained uncertain or ambivalent about whether to stay or to return. These demographic shifts over time have also been accompanied by shifts of denotation for the groups under consideration, that is, as migrant workers, immigrant families, and ethnic minorities respectively.

An overall decrease in indigenous populations can be observed in all EU countries over the last decade; at the same time, there has been an increase in the immigration figures. Although the free movement of migrants between EU member states is legally permitted and promoted, most immigrants in EU countries originate from non-EU countries. According to EuroStat (1996), in January 1993 the EU had a population of 368 million, 4.8 percent of whom (almost 18 million people) were not citizens of the country in which they lived.<sup>1</sup> The increase in the non-national population since 1985 is mainly due to non-EU nationals, whose numbers rose from 9 to 12 million between 1985 and 1992. The largest numbers of immigrants have been observed in France, Germany, and Great Britain. For various reasons, however, reliable demographic information on immigrant groups in EU countries is difficult to obtain. For some groups or countries, no updated information is available or no such data have ever been collected. Moreover, official statistics only concern immigrant groups with legal resident status. Another source of disparity is the different data collection systems being used, ranging from nationwide census data to more or less representative surveys. More importantly, however, the most widely used criteria for immigrant status, nationality and/or country of birth, have become far less valid over time because of an increasing trend toward naturalization and births within the countries of residence. In addition, most residents from former colonies already have the nationality of the country of immigration.

There are large differences among EU countries as regards the size and composition of immigrant groups. Owing to labor market mechanisms, immigrant groups are found mainly in northern industrialized EU countries, whereas their presence in Mediterranean countries like Greece, Italy, Portugal, and Spain is rather limited. Immigrant groups in the latter countries generally come from neighboring countries (e.g., the Italian and Turkish communities in Greece, the Spanish community in Portugal, or the Portuguese community in Spain). For Mediterranean groups, France and Germany are the major countries of immigration. Portuguese, Spanish, and Maghreb residents concentrate in France, whereas Italian, Greek, former Yugoslav, and Turkish residents concentrate in Germany. The largest

immigrant groups in EU countries are Turkish and Maghreb residents, the latter originating from Morocco, Algeria, or Tunisia. According to EuroStat (1996), and based on the nationality criterion, in 1993 the largest Turkish and Maghreb communities were found in Germany (almost 1.9 million) and France (almost 1.4 million) respectively. Within the EU, the Netherlands is in second place as country of immigration for Turkish and Moroccan residents.

Given the decreasing significance of nationality and birth-country criteria, collecting reliable information about the composition of immigrant population groups in EU countries is one of the most challenging tasks facing demographers. Complementary or alternative criteria have been suggested in various countries with a longer immigration history. In English-dominant countries such as the USA, Canada, and Australia, census questions have been used with respect to home language use and self-categorization (which ethnic group do you consider yourself to belong to?). In Table 1, the four criteria are discussed in terms of their major advantages and disadvantages.

As Table 1 makes clear, there is no single royal road to a solution of this issue. Different criteria may complement and strengthen each other. Given the decreasing significance of nationality and birth-country criteria in the European context, the combined criterion of self-categorization and home language use would be a potential long-term alternative.

## 2. Linguistic perspectives

As a consequence of processes of immigration and minorization, a number of new languages have come into contact in Western Europe. These new conditions of language contact have led to an increase in research on language contact that differs from traditional European studies with respect to both typological distance and the dynamic variability of the languages that are taken into account. First, in contrast to traditional European contact studies on Germanic or Romance languages, there is often a large typological distance between the languages of the countries of emigration and immigration. Turkish and Arabic, which are both spoken by millions of immigrants in Western Europe, do not belong to the Indo-European group of languages but to the Altaic and Hamo-Semitic language families respectively. Second, the language contact situation of immigrant minority groups is commonly very unstable and likely to change considerably over time, both within and between successive generations.

**Table 1:** Criteria for the definition and identification of population groups in a multicultural society (P/F/M = person/father/mother)

Criterion	Advantages	Disadvantages
Nationality (NAT) (P/F/M)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• objective</li> <li>• relatively easy to establish</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (intergenerational) erosion through naturalization or double NAT</li> <li>• NAT not always indicative of ethnicity/identity</li> <li>• some (e.g., ex-colonial) groups have NAT of immigration country</li> </ul>
Birth-country (BC) (P/F/M)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• objective</li> <li>• relatively easy to establish</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• intergenerational erosion through births in immigration country</li> <li>• BC not always indicative of ethnicity/identity</li> <li>• invariable/deterministic: does not take account of dynamics in society (in contrast to all other criteria)</li> </ul>
Self-categorization (SC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• touches the heart of the matter</li> <li>• emancipatory: SC takes account of person's own conception of ethnicity/identity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• subjective by definition: also determined by language/ethnicity of interviewer and by the spirit of times</li> <li>• multiple SC possible</li> <li>• historically charged, especially by World War II experiences</li> </ul>
Home language (HL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HL is most significant criterion of ethnicity in communication processes</li> <li>• HL data are cornerstones of government policy in areas such as public information or education</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• complex criterion: who speaks what language to whom and when?</li> <li>• language not always core value of ethnicity/identity</li> <li>• useless in one-person households</li> </ul>

Immigrant minority groups are typically confronted with the task of communicating in the dominant language of majority speakers in order to cope with daily life, and this language is often learned as a second language (L2). At the same time, language varieties of the countries of origin are often learned as a first language (L1) in the process of primary socialization, and they are used for in-group communication. These languages may also have an important or even core value as symbols of ethnic identity (cf. Smolicz 1992). From a linguistic point of view, however, immigrant minority groups are often viewed as 'L2 learners.' For various reasons, this conceptualization leads to a limited view of these immigrants' linguistic reality (cf. Extra and Verhoeven 1993b):

- Not all members of immigrant minority groups acquire the dominant language of majority speakers successfully; in fact, L2 acquisition may come to a halt and fossilize at a stage that is far removed from near-native competence.
- The L1 is commonly taken into account as a potential source of (un)successful transfer in L2 acquisition rather than as a language variety that deserves attention on its own intrinsic grounds.
- The concept of 'L2 learners' refers to individuals, whereas group membership is also an important explanatory factor in the language behavior of immigrant minorities.

Given the fact that many members of immigrant minority groups make variable use of dominant L2 varieties and dominated L1 varieties all their lives, sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic dimensions of both varieties should be taken into account.

The biased European focus on L2 acquisition and L2 use is an accurate reflection of the vast American literature on bilingualism. The number of American studies on the acquisition and use of Spanish (the most prominent minority language in the US) is extremely limited compared to the existing literature on the acquisition and use of L2 English. Another explanatory factor for this bias is the traditionally philological orientation of European research on 'non-Western' languages such as Turkish, Arabic, or South Asian languages. The fact that, in a European context, these languages are increasingly spoken 'here and now' has unfortunately not resulted in a significant modification of historically-oriented research priorities. The philologists' lack of scientific involvement most probably stems from a lack of affinity with suitable methods in sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic research. However, the commitment of experts in these languages is indispensable for the development of research on the first language varieties of immigrant minority groups.

Given the social and scientific emphasis on L2 acquisition and L2 use of immigrant minority groups in Europe, the following basic questions have received only scant attention:

- What immigrant language varieties are actually used in oral or written communication?
- Who are the interlocutors, and what are the social settings and the topics of communication?
- How are these language varieties acquired in a dominant L2 environment?
- What interactions in terms of code-switching and language transfer can be observed between dominant and dominated language varieties?
- What intergenerational processes of language shift can be observed over time?
- What language attitudes towards these issues are manifest within dominant and dominated groups?
- What crosslinguistic similarities and differences in each of these domains can be observed for different minority groups in one particular country and, alternately, for one particular minority group in different European countries?

Over the last decade, some changes have taken place across Europe to counterbalance this biased perspective on the language use of immigrant minority groups. A landmark in terms of both scope and size was the *Linguistic Minorities Project* (1985), more recently followed-up by a study by Alladina and Edwards (1991) on languages other than English in Great Britain. Similar studies have been published by Boyd (1985) on Sweden, Vermes (1988) on France, and Extra and Verhoeven (1993b) on the Netherlands.

#### A CASE STUDY OF THE NETHERLANDS

##### 1. Demographic trends in society and education

As in other industrialized Western European countries, the number of immigrants in the Netherlands at any time is strongly correlated with the country's relative cultural and economic prosperity (cf. Lucassen and Penninx 1985 for an historical overview). For the reasons mentioned in the first section, it is not easy to give a complete and reliable overview of the actual size of the many different groups in the Netherlands and to present a description of relevant longitudinal trends. As in all other Western European countries, a tradition of all-population censuses with respect to self-categorization or home language use does not exist, whereas the traditional criteria of nationality and country of birth are suffering from an increasing erosion over time, owing to naturalization and births in the country of residence. In addition, and typical for the Netherlands as compared with neighboring countries like Germany and Belgium, some immigrant groups have had Dutch nationality since birth. These groups include all Antilleans (more than 90,000), most of the Surinamese who came to the Netherlands in the last few decades from former Dutch colonies in the Caribbean (more than 260,000), and the so-called 'repatriates' from the former Dutch East Indies (the present Republic of Indonesia) who arrived in the Netherlands after Indonesia's independence (more than 280,000).

Bearing in mind the biased character of all available nationality statistics, some longitudinal trends in the size and growth of indigenous and non-indigenous population groups during the last decade can nevertheless be derived from recent

data published by the Dutch Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS 1995). In the period 1985–1994, about 25 percent of the population increase of the Netherlands (890,000 in total) was from immigrants, though they constitute less than 5 percent of the total population (15.5 million). Within the immigrant population, the strongest proportional growth arises from the Turkish, Moroccan, Surinamese, and (former) Yugoslav communities, as well as from people belonging to the CBS category ‘other non-European countries’ (mainly refugees). The latter group and the Turks and Moroccans also show the most substantial increase in terms of absolute figures.

The Dutch Ministry of the Interior has attempted to reduce the increasing erosion of statistical data on ethnic minority (EM) groups by proposing a different set of criteria in all municipal population statistics. Parliamentary support was ultimately given for the gradual introduction of a so-called combined birth-country criterion (birth-country of person, father, and mother; cf. Table 1). Obviously, this criterion only suffices for first and second generation groups, and it will therefore become increasingly difficult to identify EM groups over time. The most recent statistics to which this criterion has been applied date from 1992 and are presented in Table 2.

Aside from the data in Table 2, it should be noted that, from the more than 197,000 requests for asylum, about 57,000 were granted in the period 1985–1994 (CBS 1995). In addition, estimates of the number of illegal residents in the Netherlands vary between 50,000 and 150,000. Table 2 shows significant differences resulting from the application of different identification criteria. The combined birth-country criterion in the left column (BCPMF) shows a proportion of citizens of foreign origin of more than 15 percent (i.e., 2,364,383 out of 15,129,150 persons). When the absolute figures in the left column are substituted by an index value of 100, it becomes clear that the ‘Dutch’ group is overrepresented on the basis of the nationality criterion (NAT) and the BCP/BCM/BCF criteria, whereas all ‘non-Dutch’ groups are underrepresented on the basis of this criteria.

Not all the groups or all the members of the groups listed in Table 2 have been targeted by Dutch policy since the *Minderhedennota* (Minorities Policy Plan) of the Ministry of the Interior (1983). The recognized target groups are:

- inhabitants of the Netherlands who are of Moluccan, Surinamese, or Antillean origin;
- foreign workers, their families, and descendants originating from one of the eight Mediterranean countries with which bilateral labor contracts were concluded in the past (i.e., Portugal, Spain, Italy, former Yugoslavia, Greece, Turkey, Tunisia, and Morocco);
- political refugees;
- caravan dwellers and gypsies.



**Table 2:** Population of the Netherlands based on different identification criteria (BCPMF=combination of birth-country person, mother and father; NAT=nationality; BCP=birth-country person; BCM=birth-country mother; BCF=birth-country father) on January 1, 1992 (source Martens, Roijen and Veenman 1994)

Groups	Absolute figures		Index (column 1 = 100)		
	BCPMF	NAT	BCP	BCM	BCF
Dutch	12,764,767	113	108	104	105
Turks	240,810	89	66	96	99
Moroccans	195,536	84	67	95	99
Surinamese	262,839	8	65	87	86
Antilleans	90,650	-	71	69	63
Greeks	10,369	50	59	62	84
Italians	32,818	52	46	51	88
Former					
Yugoslavs	27,117	56	63	86	82
Portuguese	12,587	69	68	81	88
Spaniards	29,046	58	61	75	81
Cape Verdians	14,330	19	65	99	96
Tunisians	5,631	46	56	66	94
Chinese	39,762	17	61	91	97
Vietnamese	10,435	46	83	99	96
Other groups	1,392,435	18	47	69	58
Total non-Dutch	2,364,383	31	54	77	71
Total Netherlands	15,129,150	100	100	100	100

It is striking that the government merely lists population groups in terms of target groups for allocation of public resources and specific facilities rather than defining them or explaining why certain groups are targeted and others are not. Chinese and second-generation Surinamese and Antilleans, for instance, do not constitute main target groups. One possible reason for limiting the target groups to the aforementioned populations may be that the government tends to emphasize primarily socio-economic disadvantages, which obstructs the view of ethno-cultural characteristics and differences that are so important to many EM groups (Kroon and Vallen 1994). This focus is certainly the main reason for the far more substantial attention the government pays to research and educational innovations with respect to Dutch as a second language (DSL) than to activities in the field of acquisition and maintenance of home languages. In practice, the identification of target groups for the allocation of public resources shows a strong correlation with specific policy issues under consideration or even the policy maker concerned. As a result, there

may be remarkable differences at the national level across, and even within, ministries. To give an illustration of the latter, the Ministry of Education has made special school facilities available for instruction in DSL and in home languages; those EM children who are entitled to the former type of education do not qualify, by definition, for the latter.

The demographic changes in Dutch society related to immigration have had important consequences for the ethnic composition of schools and for a wide range of specific arrangements and innovations in educational practice. Unfortunately, the Ministry of Education has not yet been able to provide valid figures about the number of EM pupils participating in compulsory (primary and secondary) education. According to overall figures dating from 1994, about 7.8 percent of the pupils in primary school have non-Dutch citizenship (CBS 1995). On the basis of the same criterion, it appears that in the 1992/1993 school year, on the national level, 69 percent of Dutch primary schools were attended by EM children. In most of these schools (51 percent), the proportion of EM children is less than 10 percent, and in only 4 percent of the schools is it 50 percent or higher. In the four largest Dutch cities (Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague, and Utrecht), however, these figures are strikingly different: The percentage of schools attended by EM children is 96 percent or higher and the proportion of schools in these cities where more than 50 percent of the children are of non-Dutch nationality is 44 percent, 37 percent, 28 percent, and 33 percent respectively. At present, about 50 percent of the first-year intake into primary education in these cities consists of EM children. (The figures are comparable or even higher in other large Western European cities; Kroon and Vallen 1994.)

## 2. Dutch as a second language

In this section, we restrict ourselves to the major trends and results of research on Dutch as a second language (DSL) carried out in the context of compulsory education (ages 5-17) since 1988 (cf. Appel 1986, Extra and Vallen 1988, Klatter-Folmer 1996 for previous work). Information about DSL policy and the results of other research and innovations in secondary education are presented in Spliethoff (1996).

The available evidence indicates that EM children enter Dutch primary schools with highly variable proficiencies in the L1 and the L2. Verhoeven, *et al.* (1990) report that Turkish and Moroccan children in the first three years of primary education (ages 4-7) have a higher proficiency in the L1 (Turkish and Moroccan-Arabic respectively) than in Dutch (L2), whereas Antillean children have a more balanced level in Papiamentu and Dutch. (Detailed information about the latter group is given in Narain 1995.) These findings are in line with Boogaard, *et al.* (1990), who also found lower L2 levels (as compared with L1 levels) for 6-year-old children belonging to several EM groups. In these studies, large group differences were found in productive and receptive vocabulary, both in the L1 and the L2. Lexical, syntactic, and textual abilities develop faster in L2 Dutch than in the L1. Nevertheless, the lexical and textual skills in L2 Dutch pupils remain substantially

lower than those of native Dutch pupils, which inevitably leads to comprehension problems in school subjects other than Dutch language lessons. For an operationalization of school language skills of EM children in the context of primary education, we refer to De Haan (1994). On the basis of the results of a number of studies on L2 vocabulary development (cf. Appel and Vermeer 1994; 1996), new vocabulary training programs and diagnostic tests have been developed. Verhoeven and Vermeer (1989; 1996) found evidence in their research that Turkish and Moroccan primary school pupils are more than two years behind their native Dutch schoolmates as far as Dutch language proficiency is concerned. The effectiveness of instructing EM children in primary education is in many cases reduced because teacher explanations in Dutch are not sufficiently modified.

Kerkhoff (1988), Hacquebord (1989), Uiterwijk (1994), and Klatter-Folmer (1996) all carried out studies on L2 development and L2 proficiency among older EM children. Kerkhoff focused on 11 to 14-year-old Dutch and EM children in grades 5-6 of primary education and reported lower Dutch scores for Turkish and Moroccan children on cloze, editing, and vocabulary tests. Hacquebord studied the Dutch text-comprehension development of Turkish and Dutch youngsters in the first 3 years of two different types of secondary schooling. The Turkish pupils had relatively low scores on local levels of text comprehension (vocabulary comprehension and grammar), but they made successful use of 'compensatory' strategies at the global text comprehension level. The latter was also found by Uiterwijk (1994) in his research on the Final Primary School Tests of the National Institute for Test Development, which are administered annually to more than 100,000 children. His research, which focused on test and item bias, showed that various groups of EM children had lower scores on Dutch language proficiency than native Dutch pupils; Turkish and Moroccan children had the lowest scores. Klatter-Folmer (1996) studied the educational position and achievement of Turkish children in the last years of primary education and the first years of secondary school. Her in-depth study focused primarily on the role of socio-cultural orientation, L1 and L2 proficiency, and educational characteristics in view of the educational success of these children. With respect to the L2 tests administered, she found results that were comparable to those reported by the other researchers noted above, but she gave alternative explanations for the test-score differences found within the Turkish group (see below). Kerkhoff, Uiterwijk, and Klatter-Folmer have also demonstrated that the L2 test scores of EM children are greatly influenced by the cultural-content dimensions of the texts and the items used in tests. In a recent study by Hajer (1996), which was carried out in a secondary education setting, it was not L2 proficiency as such that was the primary object of research but the role of the L2 in subjects like biology and mathematics. Hajer studied the interaction between teachers and pupils in these lessons in great detail and found that in many cases the teachers did not use opportunities for stimulating conceptual and L2 development.

There are two central questions under discussion in the Netherlands with respect to DSL in education: 1) Is specific or additional L2 instruction more or less effective for EM children than a well structured and integrated language instruction program for all children, and 2) what is the role of L2 proficiency in the overall

educational achievement of EM children? As far as the first issue is concerned, completely integrated instruction is, of course, impossible for immigrant children who have only recently arrived. The results of most of the research mentioned above suggest that integrated instruction will fail without substantial content-oriented, didactic, and organizational changes in classrooms (cf. Jaspaert 1996, Kroon and Vallen 1996, for an overview).

As in most other European countries where immigration is a common phenomenon, a great deal of research has been carried out in the Netherlands to determine the reasons for educational underachievement among EM children. Both large- and small-scale studies conducted within a variety of disciplines have identified a cluster of influential factors which can be labelled in terms of ethno-cultural background, migration history, socio-economic status (SES), L2 proficiency, and characteristics of society and education at large. Most research seems to identify SES (Kerkhoff 1988, Driessen 1990) and length of period of stay in the country of immigration (e.g., Mulder 1996) as the most important factors. However, contradictory results have emerged from the research carried out so far, and the hierarchy and interaction of the different factors remain unclear. Driessen (1990) highlights four reasons for these contradictory findings. First, the educational achievement of EM children may be influenced by permanent demographic changes in society and education. Second, there is a strong variation in the definition and selection of EM groups and in the composition of research samples. Third, the selection and operationalization of dependent and independent variables are carried out in different ways. Last, there are substantial differences and problems in the methods used for analysis. One major problem involves the interpretation of the important SES factor in relation to EM status. It has been pointed out, for instance, that while SES is a useful concept in the analysis of traditional Western, urban societies, its validity in a multicultural framework is doubtful (Vallen and Stijnen 1991).

With respect to the improvement of education for EM children, it is important to concentrate on variables which can be manipulated in the context of education or at home. This goal is, for instance, impossible with respect to factors like SES or migration history; neither the educational system nor individual teachers can manipulate these factors to any significant degree. In our view, language is a crucial factor in this respect because language (both L1 and L2) is a powerful medium for introducing EM children into the school system and for improving their school results. Another important factor in addition to L1/L2 proficiency is educational aspiration and support from the home environment (Klatter-Folmer 1996). On the basis of such research results, as well as the reports from recently developed home intervention programs in the Netherlands, it is becoming evident that those programs which focus on the stimulation of parent-child interaction in order to develop cognitive and language abilities have a positive effect on the educational career of EM children.

### 3. Ethnic minority languages

In contrast to the growing number of studies on DSL, less empirical research has been done on the status and use of ethnic minority (EM) languages in the Netherlands. This gap holds, in particular, for lesser used languages of relatively small communities. De Ruiter (1991) and Extra and Verhoeven (1993b) cover a variety of the most widely used EM languages in the Netherlands. The majority of research has gone into the status and use of Turkish and Arabic, these being the languages of the Turkish and Moroccan communities in the Netherlands. In most Turkish families, Turkish is the dominant home language. Other languages, Kurdish in particular, are also used, however (Boeschoten, *et al.* 1993). Morocco is a country with intricate patterns of language variation and language choice (De Ruiter 1989). Classical Arabic and Modern Standard Arabic, the languages of religion and the mass media respectively, are never learned as primary language varieties. Primary socialization commonly takes place in Moroccan Arabic or in one of three regionally distinct Berber varieties (Tashelhit, Tamazigt, or Tarifit). Whereas speakers of Berber generally acquire Moroccan Arabic as a *lingua franca*, Arabophone speakers tend not to learn Berber. Given the complex pattern of language variation in Morocco, however, it is a daily experience for many inhabitants to encounter, switch to, and borrow from different languages. At least part of this complex pattern is clearly represented in the Moroccan community in the Netherlands.

With respect to the status of the Turkish language in the Netherlands, studies have been done on the acquisition of Turkish by preschool or elementary school children (Aarssen 1996, Aarts 1994, Boeschoten 1990, Schaufeli 1991), on the vitality of Turkish in secondary schooling (Özgüzel 1994), and on processes of code-switching among first and second generation Turks (Backus 1996). With respect to (Moroccan) Arabic, research has focused on its status in primary education (Van de Wetering 1990), on code-switching (Nortier 1989), and on processes of language maintenance and language loss (El Aissati 1996). Moreover, language proficiency tests have been developed for Turkish and Arabic for use at the initial (Verhoeven, *et al.* 1995) and final stages (Aarts and De Ruiter 1995) of elementary education.

Apart from studies on Turkish and Arabic, few studies have dealt with lesser used EM languages in the Netherlands. Examples of such studies are Kook (1994) and Narain (1995) on Papiamentu, Charry, *et al.* (1983) and Van der Avoird (1995) on Surinamese languages, Tahitu (1989) and Rinsampessy (1992) on (Moluccan) Malay, and Tinnemans (1991) and Michielsens (1992) on Italian. Surinamese languages (in particular Sranan Tongo and Hindi/Hindustani), Papiamentu, and (Moluccan) Malay are primarily spoken as the home languages in the Surinamese, Antillean, and Moluccan communities in the Netherlands respectively.

As yet, no nationwide data have been collected on the home language use of EM children in Dutch schools. Broeder and Extra (1995) reported on the results of a home language survey among almost 35,000 primary school children in 5 medium-sized Dutch cities and presented data on the language vitality of the 10 most widely mentioned EM languages. In decreasing order of mention, these languages are

Turkish, Arabic, Berber, Papiamentu, English, Surinamese/Sranan, Chinese, Malay, Spanish, and Hindi. The study shows that there is strong variation in the vitality of EM languages in the Netherlands. This variation, both between and within different communities, needs further exploration from a cross-linguistic and cross-cultural perspective. Moreover, reliable data on home language use should be considered prerequisites for answering basic policy questions about home language instruction (HLI). Periodically collected data among school children would provide the basis for a dynamic language policy and for intergenerational trend studies on processes of language maintenance and language shift.

For various reasons, HLI policy is a complex issue for schools in the Netherlands. First of all, given the multicultural and multilingual composition of many primary schools, this task is not restricted to the implementation of bilingual programs but is extended to arranging multilingual education as well. Practical experience with, and empirical evidence on, education in a bilingual context can therefore only be transferred to a limited extent. Second, there is large variation in the type and degree of bilingualism among EM children, both within and across ethnic groups. Viewed from an intergenerational perspective, these differences have increased steadily over time, as language dominance patterns tend to shift towards Dutch. Third, embedding HLI for a variety of target groups in the school curriculum is no easy task. Some EM groups receive HLI in addition to the core curriculum, whereas other groups receive HLI instead of instruction in other subjects in the core curriculum. Finally, the feasibility of HLI is often questioned in cases where there is a relatively small demand by small-sized and/or widely scattered groups.

Developments in this much-debated domain of Dutch education should be evaluated within the context of an official policy perspective on EM children in terms of socio-economic and second-language 'deficits' rather than ethno-cultural differences. In the early seventies, the deficiencies of low SES children in all elementary schools were targeted by the Ministry of Education. Consequently, schools with many low-SES children received funding for additional teaching personnel. While the influx of EM children from low SES-families in Dutch schools increased sharply in the seventies and eighties, the minorities policy became exclusively associated with the struggle to eliminate educational deficiencies at the cost of ethno-cultural differences.

In 1992, the CALO report *Ceders in de tuin* ('Cedars in the garden'), an advisory report for the Dutch Ministry of Education, proposed a reconsideration of current concepts in educational policy with EM children. The CALO report argued for a change in the conceptualization of HLI from a deficit to a cultural perspective. The perspective chosen has vastly different consequences for the target groups, goals, target languages, and evaluations of HLI.

Since 1974, access to HLI in Dutch elementary schools has been granted to the following target groups: children who have at least one parent of Moluccan or Mediterranean origin (the latter originating from one of the eight Mediterranean countries mentioned in section 2.1) and children of at least one parent with a

recognized refugee status. The list is indicative of multiple policy restrictions. Firstly, it is meant to be exhaustive in terms of source countries and/or target groups. Secondly, it is meant as a temporary support, with a focus on first/second generation children of EM groups. Finally, the list takes a deficit perspective by excluding higher SES groups like the Chinese, and by excluding Antillean and Surinamese children who are more or less fluent speakers of Dutch as a result of the colonial status of Dutch in the respective source countries. Chinese children are explicitly excluded from HLI—the government's view is that the Chinese community in the Netherlands does not have an SES as low as the Mediterranean target groups (Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken 1983). The CALO (1992) proposal recommended that both the SES criterion and the generation criterion be disregarded; rather, HLI should be allowed for all children who make use of another language at home (in addition to or instead of Dutch) in contact with at least one of the parents.

The goals of HLI have traditionally been formulated in terms of dependence. In the current policy conception, HLI's main contribution is intended to bridge the gap between the home and school environment and promote second language learning and/or school success. In contrast, the CALO report (1992) argued for the primacy of intrinsic rather than dependent goals in both elementary and secondary schools. Yet only rarely has the primacy of intrinsic goals in terms of promoting first language proficiency been advocated. It is interesting to note that such intrinsic goals for HLI at the secondary level have been accepted earlier and more widely. The National Examination Board for Turkish and Arabic at secondary schools has defined the target proficiency level for these languages in great detail.

The choice of the target language variety for HLI has in the past led to the problematizing of programs in which the home languages of EM children diverge widely from the standard language of the source country. This issue holds, in particular, for Moroccan children who often speak a Berber variety at home. In cases of home language and standard language divergence, the CALO report (1992) proposed a conditional right of option for parents of elementary school children and for youngsters at secondary schools, derived from the principles of cultural self-orientation and freedom of choice. At this time, the only groups who are currently receiving non-standard language instruction are Moluccan children (who learn Moluccan Malay instead of Indonesian standard language) and Syrian-Orthodox children from Turkey (who may opt for Aramese instead of Turkish).

Evaluative studies of HLI programs for EM children suffer from a bias similar to that of many American studies on bilingual education in their focus on HLI effects on L2 learning and/or school achievement in other subjects. In this conception, progress in L1 proficiency is rarely thought of and measured as a criterion of school success generally. The empirical evidence for HLI effects on L2 learning and/or school achievement is rather ambiguous (cf. Appel 1984, Teunissen 1986, Driessen 1990), and there are very few empirical studies of HLI effects on L1 proficiency. Aarts, De Ruiter, and Verhoeven (1993) reported that Turkish instruction had a positive effect on the Turkish proficiency of Turkish elementary

school children in the Netherlands, whereas similar effects of Arabic instruction emerged to a lesser degree for Moroccan children (cf. Driessen 1990).

Current educational policy in the Netherlands can be characterized in terms of a growing tendency towards decentralization. Consequently, the responsibilities and tasks of the Ministry of Education, municipalities, and schools are being redistributed in an attempt to find a new balance. In the context of this decentralization tendency and in reaction to the CALO report (1992), the Ministry of Education recently published a policy document on HLI (Uitwerkingsnotitie 1995). The document acknowledged three basic elements:

1. Broad support for HLI as expressed by minority parents and minority organizations;
2. Responsibility by the government for the provision and quality of HLI;
3. Relevance granted to the home language criterion instead of SES or generation criteria in determining a child's entitlement to HLI.

These three elements were taken over from the CALO report (1992). A new element, however, is the focus on local educational policy. In the view of the ministry, municipalities should have responsibility for public information about HLI facilities, for HLI needs assessment, for a selective distribution of the local HLI budget across schools, for interscholastic cooperation on HLI for smaller language groups, and for the role of EM groups as actors rather than just target groups for the implementation of a municipal HLI policy. Finally, schools should retain responsibility for the recruitment and employment of qualified HLI teachers and for the quality of HLI.

Most recently, the Ministry of Education proposed changing the law regarding the implementation of this policy in elementary education. However, much remains unclear and uncertain about the newly assigned roles of the ministry, the municipalities, and the schools. Whereas the roles of the latter two are spelled out in great detail, the responsibilities of the ministry remain vague. Moreover, serious concerns have been expressed about the local budgets that will be made available and about the local expertise and commitment presently available for implementing the new law.

## NOTES

1. Comparative information on population figures in EU member states can be obtained from the Statistical Office of the EU in Luxemburg (EuroStat).



## UNANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aarssen, J. 1996. *Relating events in two languages. Acquisition of cohesive devices by Turkish-Dutch bilingual children at school age*. Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.
- Aarts, R. 1994. *Functionele geletterdheid van Turkse kinderen in Turkije en in Nederland*. [Functional literacy of Turkish children in Turkey and the Netherlands.] De Lier: Academisch Boeken Centrum.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and J. De Ruiter. 1995. *Toets Turkse Taal, Toets Arabische Taal*. [Turkish language test, Arabic language test.] Arnhem: CITO.
- \_\_\_\_\_, J. de Ruiter and L. Verhoeven. 1993. *Tweetaligheid en schoolsucces. Relevantie en opbrengst van etnische groepstalen in het basisonderwijs*. [Bilingualism and school success. Relevance and profit of ethnic minority languages in primary education.] Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.
- Alladina, S. and V. Edwards (eds.) 1991. *Multilingualism in the British Isles*. London: Longman. [2 Volumes.]
- Appel, R. 1984. *Immigrant children learning Dutch. Sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic aspects of second-language acquisition*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1986. *Minderheden: taal en onderwijs*. [Minorities: language and education.] Muiderberg: Coutinho.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and A. Vermeer. 1994. *Tweede-taalverwerving en tweede-taalonderwijs*. [Second language acquisition and second language instruction.] Bussum: Coutinho.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and A. Vermeer. 1996. Van oude methodes en verschillen die nog niet voorbij zijn: over NT1 en NT2 in het basisonderwijs. [First and second language instruction in primary education: Traditional viewpoints and persistent differences.] In S. Kroon and T. Vallen (eds.) *Het verschil voorbij. Onderwijs Nederlands als eerste en tweede taal in Nederland en Vlaanderen*. [Beyond the difference. Instruction of Dutch as a first and second language in the Netherlands and Flanders.] The Hague: Sdu Uitgeverij Koninginnegracht. 59–76.
- Backus, A. 1996. *Two in one. Bilingual speech of Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands*. Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.
- Boeschoten, H. 1990. *Acquisition of Turkish by immigrant children. A multiple case study of Turkish children in the Netherlands aged 4 to 6*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz.
- Boeschoten, R., et al. 1993. Turkish, Kurdish and other languages of Turkey. In G. Extra and L. Verhoeven (eds.) *Community languages in the Netherlands*. Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger. 109–142.
- Boogaard, M., et al. 1990. *De Nederlandse taalvaardigheid van allochtone en Nederlandse kleuters*. [Dutch language proficiency of non-native and native Dutch pre-schoolers.] Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Boyd, S. 1985. *Language survival. A study of language contact, language shift and language choice in Sweden*. Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg.
- Broeder, P. and G. Extra. 1995. *Minderheidsgroepen en minderheidstalen*. [Minority groups and minority languages.] The Hague: VNG Uitgeverij.

- CALO. 1992. *Ceders in de tuin*. [*Cedars in the garden*.] The Hague: Staatsuitgeverij.
- CBS. 1995. *Allochtonen in Nederland 1995*. [*Non-Dutch residents in the Netherlands 1995*.] Voorburg/Heerlen: Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek.
- Charry, E., et al. (eds.) 1983. *De talen van Suriname*. [*The languages of Surinam*.] Muiderberg: Coutinho.
- De Haan, D. 1994. *Deep Dutch. Towards an operationalization of school language skills*. Amsterdam: IFOTT.
- De Ruiter, J. 1989. *Young Moroccans in the Netherlands. An integral approach to their language situation and acquisition of Dutch*. Utrecht: University of Utrecht.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1991. *Talen in Nederland. Een beschrijving van de taalsituatie van negen etnische groepen*. [*Languages in the Netherlands. A description of the language situation of nine ethnic groups*.] Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff.
- Driessen, G. 1990. *De onderwijspositie van allochtone leerlingen. De rol van sociaal-economische en etnisch-culturele factoren met speciale aandacht voor het OETC*. [*The position of ethnic minority children in education. The role of socio-economic and ethno-cultural factors with special attention to home language instruction*.] Nijmegen: ITS.
- El Aissati, A. 1996. *Language loss among native speakers of Moroccan Arabic in the Netherlands*. Nijmegen: University of Nijmegen.
- EuroStat. 1996. *Statistics in focus. Population and social conditions 2*. Luxemburg: EuroStat.
- Extra, G. and T. Vallen. 1988. Language and ethnic minorities in the Netherlands. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. 73.85–110.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and L. Verhoeven (eds.) 1993a. *Immigrant languages in Europe*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (eds.) 1993b. *Community languages in the Netherlands*. Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Hacquebord, H. 1989. *Tekstbegrip van Turkse en Nederlandse leerlingen in het voortgezet onderwijs*. [*Text comprehension of Turkish and Dutch students in secondary education*.] Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Hajer, M. 1996. *Leren in een tweede taal*. [*Learning in a second language*.] Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff.
- Jaspaert, K. 1996. NT1 en NT2 in Nederland en Vlaanderen. [Dutch as a first and second language in Flanders and the Netherlands.] In S. Kroon and T. Vallen (eds.) *Het verschil voorbij. Onderwijs Nederlands als eerste en tweede taal in Nederland en Vlaanderen*. [*Beyond the difference. Instruction of Dutch as a first and second language in the Netherlands and Flanders*.] The Hague: Sdu Uitgeverij Koninginnegracht. 6–33.
- Kerkhoff, A. 1988. *Taalvaardigheid en schoolsucces*. [*Language proficiency and school success*.] Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Klatter-Folmer, J. 1996. *Turkse kinderen en hun schoolsucces*. [*Turkish children and their school success*.] Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.
- Kook, H. 1994. *Leren lezen en schrijven in een tweetalige context. Antilliaanse en Arubaanse kinderen in Nederland*. [*Learning to read and write in a bilingual context. Antillean and Aruban children in the Netherlands*.] Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.

- Kroon, S. and T. Vallen. 1994. Multilingualism and education: An overview of language and education policies for ethnic minorities in the Netherlands. *Current Issues in Language and Society*. 1.2.103–129.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (eds.) 1996. *Het verschil voorbij. Onderwijs Nederlands als eerste en tweede taal in Nederland en Vlaanderen*. [*Beyond the difference. Instruction of Dutch as a first and second language in the Netherlands and Flanders*.] The Hague: Sdu Uitgeverij Koninginnegracht.
- Linguistic Minorities Project. 1985. *The other languages of England*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Lucassen, L. and R. Penninx. 1985. *Nieuwkomers. Immigranten en hun nakomelingen in Nederland 1550–1985*. [*Newcomers. Immigrants and their descendants in the Netherlands 1550–1985*.] Amsterdam: Meulenhoff.
- Martens, E., J. Roijen and J. Veenman. 1994. *Minderheden in Nederland. Statistisch vademecum 1993/1994*. [*Minorities in the Netherlands. Statistical vademecum 1993/1994*.] Voorburg/Heerlen: Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek.
- Michielsens, M. 1992. *Italia mia. Televisie kijken in ballingschap*. [*Italia mia. Watching television in exile*.] Amersfoort/Leuven: Acco.
- Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken [Ministry of the Interior]. 1983. *Minderhedennota*. [*Minorities policy plan*.] The Hague: Staatsuitgeverij.
- Mulder, L. 1996. *Meer voorrang, minder achterstand? Het Onderwijsvoorrangsbeleid getoetst*. [*More priority, less deficiency? An evaluation of the education priority policy*.] Nijmegen: ITS.
- Narain, G. 1995. *Taaltalent in ontwikkeling*. [*Language talent in development*.] Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.
- Nortier, J. 1989. *Dutch and Moroccan Arabic in contact. Code switching among Moroccans in the Netherlands*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Özgüzel, S. 1994. *De vitaliteit van het Turks in Nederland*. [*The vitality of Turkish in the Netherlands*.] Tilburg: Tilburg University.
- Rinsampessy, E. 1992. *Saudara Bersaudara. Molukse identiteit in processen van culturele verandering*. [*Moluccan identity in processes of cultural change*.] Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Schaufeli, A. 1991. *Turkish in an immigrant setting. A comparative study of the first language of monolingual and bilingual Turkish children*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.
- Smolicz, J. 1992. Minority languages as core values of ethnic cultures: A study of maintenance and erosion of Polish, Welsh, and Chinese languages in Australia. In W. Fase, K. Jaspaert and S. Kroon (eds.) *Maintenance and loss of minority languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 277–305.
- Splithoff, F. (ed.) 1996. *Second language acquisition in Europe*. 's-Hertogenbosch: KPC.
- Tahitu, E. 1989. *Melaju Sini. Het Maleis van Molukse jongeren in Nederland*. [*Malay of Moluccan youngsters in the Netherlands*.] Leiden: University of Leiden.
- Teunissen, F. 1986. *Een school, twee talen*. [*One school, two languages*.] Utrecht: University of Utrecht.

- Tinnemans, W. 1991. *L'Italianità. De Italiaanse gemeenschap in Nederland.* [*The Italian community in the Netherlands.*] Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.
- Uiterwijk, H. 1994. *De bruikbaarheid van de Eindtoets Basisonderwijs voor allochtone leerlingen.* [*The utility of the Final Primary School Test for ethnic minority pupils.*] Arnhem: CITO.
- Uitwerkingsnotitie. 1995. *Uitwerkingsnotitie onderwijs in allochtone levende talen.* [*Report on home language instruction.*] Zoetermeer: Ministry of Education and Science.
- Vallen, T. and S. Stijnen. 1991. Ethnic minorities and ethnic minority languages in Dutch primary schools. *Language and Education*, 5.113–123.
- Van der Avoird, T. 1995. Taalgebruik van en taalverschuiving bij Hindoestanen in Nederland. [*Language use and language shift among Hindustanis in the Netherlands.*] In E. Huls & J. Klatter-Folmer (eds.) *Artikelen van de tweede sociolinguïstische conferentie.* [*Contributions to the second Dutch conference on sociolinguistics.*] Delft: Eburon. 21–36.
- Van de Wetering, S. 1990. *Het onderwijs in eigen taal en cultuur aan Marokkaanse kinderen in Nederland.* [*Instruction in first language and culture for Moroccan children in the Netherlands.*] Utrecht: University of Utrecht.
- Verhoeven, L. and A. Vermeer. 1989. *Diagnose van kindertaal.* [*Diagnosis of child language.*] Tilburg: Zwijsen.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1996. *Taalvaardigheid in de bovenbouw.* [*Language proficiency in the last years of elementary school.*] Tilburg: Tilburg University Press
- \_\_\_\_\_, et al. 1990. *Vroege tweetaligheid bij Turkse, Marokkaanse en Antilliaanse/Arubaanse kleuters.* [*Early bilingualism of Turkish, Moroccan and Antillean/Aruban pre-schoolers.*] Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, et al. 1995. *Toets tweetaligheid Turks/Marokkaans-Arabisch/Papiamentu en Nederlands.* [*Bilingual test of Turkish/Moroccan-Arabic/Papiamentu and Dutch.*] Arnhem: CITO.
- Vermes, G. (ed.) 1988. *Vingt-cinq communautés linguistiques de la France: les langues immigrées.* [*25 language communities in France: The immigrant languages.*] Paris: Editions l'Harmattan.