INGE GENEE AND CHRISTIE NEMETH UNIVERSITY OF LETHBRIDGE
With contributions from Maede Ejaredar, Julie Greidanus, Iris Kleinbub and Shelley Stigter

The Dutch language in Southern Alberta: An investigation into patterns of minority language shift

"If you're going to be a good Canadian,
you speak what Canada speaks."
(Dutch immigrant from Battleford,
cited in Broadfoot 1986:125-6)

"We're in Canada now, and their future is here.
Dutch has no purpose."
(Dutch immigrant from Lethbridge,
in answer to the question whether she would
have sent her children to a Dutch-language
school if it had been available;
survey questionnaire, Spring 2004)

Abstract

This paper is a first report on the status and current position of the Dutch language in Southern Alberta, focusing on the city of Lethbridge and surrounding area. Data from the 2001 Census and from a pilot survey conducted in 2004 show very high rates of intergenerational language loss in the Dutch immigrant population, with the language often being lost as a medium of daily communication *within* the first generation. Differences in attitudes and behaviours between earlier and later immigrants offer some hope that the language may be transmitted to the second generation at a slightly higher rate among more recent immigrants than it was among immigrants from the immediate post-war period.

Introduction[1]

Dutch immigrants to Canada, and to other countries for that matter, are famous largely for their

unobtrusiveness. Many commentators observe that they tend to integrate exceedingly well into their host countries (e.g. Ganzevoort and Boekelman 1983, Ganzevoort 1988, Horn 1997, and Schryer 1998 on Dutch immigrants to Canada). So well indeed, that Michiel Horn describes himself as an "invisible immigrant" in the title of his memoir of growing up as a Dutch immigrant in British Columbia (Horn 1997). This famous easy assimilation of the Dutch into their host societies is reflected in virtually all aspects of their culture and customs, with the possible exception of religion among some Dutch Reformed groups (Bratt 1983; Brinks 1983; Schryer 1998; Sinnema 2005; Woods 2004). One aspect of this quick assimilation is the comparatively rapid loss of the language that they bring with them (De Bot and Clyne 1994; Daan 1987; Hulsen 2000; Klatter-Folmer and Kroon 1997; Pauwels 1986; Pendakur 1990). This generally confirms the well-known picture of fast and complete assimilation, at least for the main group of immigrants from the fifties.

In this paper we take a first look at the Dutch language in Southern Alberta, an area with a significant Dutch population, focusing mainly on the city of Lethbridge and the surrounding rural area. Southern Alberta is an interesting location for this investigation, because of the relatively longstanding continuous influx of Dutch people into the area. Parts of the area were settled by Dutch immigrants as early as the first decade of the 20th century (Sinnema 2005), providing us with a whole century's worth of unbroken influx of people from the Netherlands. Dutch immigrants were traditionally mostly farmers and farm labourers, but recent immigrants also include people from different socio-economic backgrounds, although many of them still have an agricultural background (Lonmo 1999).

Section 1 provides an overview of the Dutch population in Southern Alberta and an estimation of their basic ethnolinguistic vitality based on census data and locally available anecdotal information. Section 2 presents data from a survey conducted in Lethbridge in the spring and summer of 2004. Section 3 contains a discussion of the main findings.

1. Dutch people and their language in Southern Alberta

1.1 Introduction and basic ethnolinguistic characteristics

Southern Alberta is a largely agricultural area with Lethbridge, Fort Macleod, Taber, Cardston and Medicine Hat as the major towns. For the purposes of this study, we focus on the three most southern Census Divisions (CD) that touch the American border to the South:[2]

- No.1. South East, bordering on US in South, Saskatchewan in East, CD No. 2 in West, CD No. 4 in North (20,516 sq km); includes Medicine Hat, Bow Island and Foremost.

- No. 2. South Central, bordering on US in South, CD No. 1 in East, CD No. 3 in West, CD No. 4 and 5 in North (17,654 sq km); includes Lethbridge, Stirling, Raymond, Milk River, Warner, Coaldale, Taber, Picture Butte, Barons, Nobleford, Vauxhall, Brooks and Bassano.

- Within CD No. 2 specifically: City of Lethbridge and Lethbridge County.[3]
- No. 3. South West, bordering on US in South, CD No. 2 in East, Crowsnest Pass and British Columbia in West, CD No. 5, 6 and 15 in North (13,866 sq km); includes Blood (Kainai) and Peigan (Piikani) Indian reserves, Cardston, Magrath, Pincher Creek, Fort Macleod, Granum, Claresholm, Stavely, and Nanton.[4]

Figures from the 2001 Census, given in Table 1.1, allow for a first estimation of the vitality of the Dutch community and its language in the province of Alberta as compared with the rest of Canada.

	Total Population	Dutch ethnic origin (single and multiple responses)	Dutch ethnic origin (single responses only)	"Ethnic dilution rate"[5]	Born in The Netherlands	Dutch mother tongue	Some knowledge of Dutch	Dutch spoken in the home				
								Total	*Only*	*Mostly*	*Equally*	*Regularly*
Canada	29,639,030	923,310 3.12%	316,220 1.06%	65.75%	117,690 0.4%	128,670 0.43%	157,870 0.53%	45,780 0.15%	3,700	8,010	3,260	30,810
Alberta	2,941,150	149,225 5.07%	50,990 1.73%	65.83%	17,385 0.59%	19,575 0.67%	23,760 0.81%	7,445 0.25%	575	1,530	465	4,885
CD No. 1	66,675	3,260 4.9%	1,030 1.54%	68.40%	360 0.54%	410 0.61%	445 0.67%	170 0.25%	15	55	15	85
CD No. 2	132,110	14,685 11.1%	7,620 5.77%	48.11%	2,235 1.7%	2,675 2.02%	3,310 2.5%	1,330 1%	145	235	90	860
CD No. 3[6]	31,555	2,880 9.13%	1,370 4.34%	52.43%	420 1.33%	620 1.96%	795 2.52%	280 0.89%	30	85	15	150
City of Lethbridge	66,275	5,910 8.9%	2,660 4.01%	54.99%	850 1.28%	865 1.3%	1,060 1.6%	285 0.43%	10	10	40	225
Lethbridge County[7]	9,900	3,425 34.6%	2,660 26.87%	22.34%	665 6.71%	1,030 10.4%	1,330 13.43%	710 7.17%	100	180	35	395

Table 1.1 Dutch Canadians: ethnic origin, country of birth, mother tongue, knowledge of Dutch and home language (Sources: Statistics Canada – 2001 Census, Catalogue Numbers 95F0489XCB2001001, 95F0488XCB2001001, 95F0495XCB2001001, 95F0333XCB01006, 95F0335XCB2001006, Statistics Canada Website, accessed Feb 6 2006). All percentages are of total population as given in the second column.

In 2001 almost 150,000 Albertans (5.07%) reported Dutch as one of their ethnic origins; almost 51,000, or about a third of those, reported Dutch as their only ethnic origin.

0.59% of Albertans (17,385) reported that they were born in The Netherlands. 1.14% of the total population of Alberta were born in Canada from two Dutch parents.[8] Many of these will be second

generation immigrants, whose parents both came from The Netherlands, emigrated after they were married, and had some or all of their children after their emigration. The figures do not allow us to distinguish between second generation and subsequent generation people of Dutch descent.

0.67% of the population of Alberta (19,575) reported Dutch as their mother tongue[9]. Only 630 of those reported Dutch along with another language as mother tongue – this most likely refers to people who grew up speaking both Dutch and English, and points to low rates of childhood bilingualism in this group, confirming reports in the literature on Dutch immigrants that when Dutch families switch to English, they tend to make a clean break and stop speaking Dutch altogether.

In all of Alberta only 0.25% of the population report speaking Dutch at home on at least a regular basis; of these, 575 report speaking "only Dutch", 1,530 speak "mostly Dutch", 465 "equally" (probably with English as the other language) and the vast majority of almost 4,885 people, or two thirds of the total, report speaking Dutch "regularly".

Alberta has a slightly larger share of people of Dutch descent than the rest of the country. In all of Canada, 3.1% of the population claim at least partial Dutch ethnic origin (cp. 5.07% for Alberta); 1.06 % of the population report Dutch as their only ethnic origin (cp. 1.73% for Alberta).

Alberta also has a larger share of the population born in The Netherlands than the rest of Canada does. Almost 0.4% of Canadians reported that they were born in The Netherlands (cp. 0.59% for Alberta). Almost 0.67% of all Canadians were born in Canada from two Dutch parents (cp. 1.14% for Alberta).[10]

This is also reflected in the figures for mother tongue and home language. 0.43% of the Canadian population report Dutch as their mother tongue (cp. 0.67% for Alberta). Only 0.15% of all Canadians report speaking Dutch at home at least regularly (cp. 0.25% for Alberta).

Some interesting things appear when we focus on the Census Divisions in the border region of Southern Alberta that are the main subject of this paper. The figures in Table 1.1 show that if Alberta has more Dutch people than the rest of Canada, the border region of Southern Alberta has more Dutch people than the rest of Alberta. However, the numbers are not evenly spread out.

In CD No. 1, the area bordering on Saskatchewan, all the percentages are in fact slightly lower than for the rest of Alberta, as can be read from the table. However, the percentage of people who speak Dutch at home is the same as for Alberta, pointing to a slightly higher rate of language retention in the home for Dutch people in this area compared to other Albertans of Dutch descent.

In both CD No. 2 and CD No. 3 the percentages are much higher than for the rest of Alberta.

In CD No. 2, which includes the city of Lethbridge, no less than 11.1% of the population claim at least partial Dutch ethnic origin, and 5.77% claim single Dutch ethnic origin. 4.08% of the popu-

lation are Canadian-born with two Dutch parents; compare this with 0.67% for all of Canada and 1.14% for Alberta. Dutch ethnicity is also less "diluted" here than in other parts of Canada, as can be seen by comparing the number of people who claim Dutch ethnic origin with the number of people who claim *single* Dutch ethnic origin. In Canada, Alberta, and CD No. 1 the latter is always about a third of the former, which means that two thirds of people who claim Dutch ethnic origin are of mixed ancestry. However, in CD No. 2 this figure is less than half, (48.11%). Whether this points to more recent immigration of married couples from The Netherlands or to more endogamous marriage patterns cannot be deduced from the statistics.

CD No. 3 is a very rural area which includes two Indian reserves and the town of Fort Macleod. I have excluded the population from the Peigan and Blood reserves (nos. 147 and 148) from the analysis. Once this is done the figures are very close to those for CD No. 2. 9.13% of the non-reserve population claims Dutch ethnic origin, with 4.34% claiming single Dutch ethnic origin. 3.01% of the non-reserve population is Canadian-born with two Dutch parents. Dutch ethnicity is almost as "undiluted" as in CD No. 2, with slightly more than half (52.43%) of the Dutch population being of mixed ancestry.

Focusing on the city of Lethbridge and the surrounding area, it becomes even more obvious that Dutch immigrants are still much more agricultural and rural than urban. The differences between the City of Lethbridge and Lethbridge County are striking, as are the differences between them and the rest of CD No. 2, in which they are located.

In terms of percentages, the City of Lethbridge is in fact quite comparable to CD No. 3 when we look at the number of people who report Dutch ancestry, both single and double, and the number of people born in The Netherlands. 2.73% of the population are Canadian-born with two Dutch parents, compared to 3.01% of CD No. 3. A more obvious difference appears, however, when looking at the language-related figures. Only 1.3% of the city population claim Dutch as a mother tongue, as opposed to 1.96% of the non-reserve population of CD No. 3. 1.6% of the city population claim to know some Dutch, compared to 2.52% in CD No. 3. And, finally, only 0.43% of the city population speak Dutch at home on a regular basis, compared to 0.89% of the population of CD No. 3.

If we compare the City of Lethbridge to the rest of CD No. 2, we see that all percentages relating to ethnicity are slightly lower, while those relating to knowledge and use of Dutch are noticeably lower. In general this suggests that Dutchness, in so far as it can be measured by language use, is less well-represented in the city than in the surrounding area, although still significantly better than in Alberta as a whole. The "dilution" measure is slightly higher than that for both CD. Nos. 2 and 3: 54.99% of the Dutch ancestry population of Lethbridge have mixed ancestry.

It is in Lethbridge County, the large, rural area mostly to the North and East of the city, that we find the highest concentration of Dutch ethnicity. It is a little hard to speak of a real ethnic enclave, given that we are still only speaking of about a third of the population, and given the rural character of the area: if your next door neighbour lives a couple of miles away, can you still speak of an en-

clave? This obviously has to be thought of in very different terms from the concept of an urban ethnic enclave, where one often finds clearly demarcated ethnic neighbourhoods. A whopping 34.6% of the population of Lethbridge County claim Dutch heritage, with 26.87% claiming single Dutch ethnic origin. This gives an extremely low "dilution" rate of only 22.34%. Thus 77.66% of the Dutch population in Lethbridge County have single Dutch ethnic origin. This can of course reflect two different things: either there is a lot of very recent immigration from The Netherlands into this area, which would explain why almost everybody who has Dutch ancestry in fact has two Dutch parents, or it may reflect more endogamous marriage patterns.[11]

An interesting comparison with the city appears if we calculate the number of Canadian-born people of Dutch descent in this area. Both the city and the county have 2,660 people claiming single Dutch origin. Of course, since the city population is almost 9 times larger than the county population, the density of Dutch people is much higher in the county. What is also interesting is that fully 20.15% of the population of Lethbridge County is Canadian-born with two Dutch parents, compared to only 2.73% of the city population.

All of this confirms what becomes clear pretty quickly to visitors or recent arrivals in the border region of Southern Alberta: there are lots of Dutch people in the area. This basic fact of life has been picked up by local merchants as well: the most important typically Dutch goods can be had not only at the specialized local Dutch store, but also at most of the other supermarkets: you may have to look for *hagelslag* ('chocolate sprinkles') in the baking section, or for *ontbijtkoek* ('breakfast cake'), *roggebrood* ('rye bread') and Dutch-processed cocoa powder in the section called "European foods", but it is all there, including Gouda cheese in a choice of mild, medium, aged, smoked, spiced, or organic, and a rich choice of other specialty Dutch cheeses. The German-specialty meat store and even the Asian market have also realized that it is a good idea to stock Dutch soups, sausages, cheeses, Indonesian condiments and the ubiquitous *hagelslag*.

The phonebook has large sections of clearly Dutch names, which are of course most easily found by looking under De and Van. These names come in many different spelling variations, betraying the general confusion in the English-speaking world about the nature of these two-part names; so for instance we find *Deboer, DeBoer, De Boer*, and *deBoer,* as well as *de Groot, DeGroot, deGroot*, and *De Groot*;[12] and we find *Vanee* besides *Van Ee* and *Van schothorst, Van Schothorst* and *Vanschothorst*;[13] combining *Van* and *De* (or *Den* or *Der*) leads to combinations such as *Vanden Broek, VandenBroek, vanden Broek* and *Van Den Broek*.[14]

One has to be careful not to use Dutch as a secret language to gossip about the passengers on the bus, because there is always going to be someone who understands it. The first author has also had to learn the hard way that it is not a good idea to conduct racy conversations with one's husband on the phone in Dutch while sitting in the local airport lounge...

1.2 Measures of language loss

This section paints a clearer picture of the amount of language shift in the Dutch community. Section 1.2.1 presents figures on ancestral, intragenerational and intergenerational language loss based on the census data presented in the previous section, which provide a broad pattern of language shift in the Dutch community. Section 1.2.2 attempts to provide a more detailed picture of what happens to the language on Canadian soil, by focusing on Canadian-born native speakers of Dutch. Section 1.2.3 presents detailed generational data on mother tongue that help show how many young children are learning Dutch as their first language. Section 1.2.4 adds some local anecdotal evidence that largely confirms the observed trends.

1.2.1 Broad patterns of language shift

The figures given in Table 1.1 allow for a rough first measure of language loss in the Dutch community, by calculating three measures, as shown in Table 1.2.

Measure 1 is the number of people who report Dutch as their mother tongue as a percentage of those who report Dutch ethnic origin; 1a is the figure for all people with Dutch ethnicity, 1b only for the ones who report single Dutch ethnicity. This measures ancestral shift and shows high rates of language loss in Canada among people of Dutch ancestry: depending on the place, between 69.93% and 87.43% of all people with Dutch ancestry do not speak Dutch as their mother tongue, and between 54.74% and 67.48% of people with single Dutch origin do not speak Dutch as their mother tongue.

But mother tongue does not in and of itself say very much about the future prospects of a language. What matters is whether the language is transmitted to subsequent generations. Such transmission happens naturally mostly in the home environment. Therefore, the amount of Dutch spoken in the home shows us how many people are potentially transmitting the language to the next generation.

Measure 2 provides us with various ways of approaching this intergenerational transmission. Again, there are two numbers: 2a is the number of people who report speaking Dutch at home as a percentage of those who report Dutch as their mother tongue,. This tells us two things: it measures intragenerational shift, in that it tells us how many people have, within their own lifetime, shifted away from speaking Dutch – after all, if Dutch is your mother tongue but you now report speaking no Dutch at home, then that means that another language, presumably English or French, has become your home language. It also measures potential transfer of the language to the next generation. Measure 2b gives us the percentage of people with two Dutch parents who still speak Dutch at home. Both these measures again point to high rates of language loss. 50.28% - 67.01% of the people who have Dutch as their mother tongue do not speak Dutch at home at all; the only exception is to be found in Lethbridge County, where the rate of loss as measured in this way is only 31.07%. And 73.31% - 89.29% of people reporting single Dutch ethnic origin report not speaking any Dutch at home; on this measure the percentage for Lethbridge County is also lower than for the other areas, but not by

as much as on measure 2a.

When we examine the figures for home language use in more detail, however, we see that the vast majority of the people who report speaking Dutch at home actually also speak English (or perhaps in some areas in Canada also French, or other languages). This is important, because the home environment determines to a large extent the quality of the language transmission: a child who speaks English everywhere but at home, will not learn very good Dutch if it hears a lot of English even in the home. Such situations often lead to the child understanding Dutch quite well, but not actually speaking it: they will be addressed by their parents in a mixture of Dutch and English, but answer back mostly in English. Measure 3 therefore gives an indication of the quality and rate of potential intergenerational transfer, by focusing on those people who report speaking Dutch in the home *only* or *mostly*. Three measures are calculated: 3a is the number of people who report speaking Dutch *only* or *mostly*, divided by those who report speaking any Dutch in the home; 3b is the number of people who report speaking Dutch at home *only* or *mostly* divided by the number of people with Dutch as a mother tongue; and 3c is the number of people who report speaking Dutch at home *only* or *mostly*, divided by the number of people who report single Dutch ethnic origin. This measures the potential strength of intergenerational transfer, in that it gives a measure of how much Dutch the next generation will be exposed to: only children exposed to a significant amount of Dutch in the home situation will have any kind of an opportunity to develop reasonable proficiency.

These figures show us that of the people who report speaking Dutch at home at least regularly, far fewer than half (between 25.58% and 41.07%) speak it only or mostly. The figure of 7.18% for the City of Lethbridge seems particularly worrisome, but perhaps we should be careful not to attach too much weight to very small numbers, which are in addition rounded to the nearest 5. The percentages for Lethbridge County and CD No. 1 and 3 are much higher than the others, but again the numbers on which they are based are quite small.

Of the people who report Dutch as their mother tongue at best a little more than a quarter (27.18% for Lethbridge County) speak Dutch at home predominantly (percentages for Canada and Alberta are around a tenth of the population, and for CDs No. 1, 2 and 3 a little higher, between 14.21% and 18.55%). And finally, of the people who report single Dutch ethnic origin, only between 3.70% and 10.53% speak predominantly Dutch at home. The figure of 0.75% for the City of Lethbridge is so disheartening that we would like to be able to discount it on account of the low numbers it is based on, but even ignoring that figure, the picture is pretty bleak.

	Measure 1a:[15] *Ancestral shift* Dutch mother tongue as a percentage of Dutch ethnic origin (single and multiple responses)	Measure 1b: *Ancestral shift* Dutch mother tongue as a percentage of single Dutch ethnic origin	Measure 2a:[16] *Intragenerational and potential intergenerational shift* Dutch home language as a percentage of Dutch mother tongue	Measure 2b: *Intragenerational and potential intergenerational shift* Dutch home language as a percentage of single Dutch ethnic origin	Measure 3a:[17] *Quality of potential intergenerational transfer* Predominant (*Only + Mostly*) Dutch home language as a percentage of Dutch home language	Measure 3b: *Rate of potential intergenerational transfer* Predominant (*Only + Mostly*) Dutch home language as a percentage of Dutch mother tongue	Measure 3c: *Rate of potential intergenerational transfer* Predominant (*Only + Mostly*) Dutch home language as a percentage of single Dutch ethnic origin
Canada	12.74% * loss of 87.26%	40.07% * loss of 59.93%	35.58% * loss of 64.42%	17.32% * loss of 82.68%	25.58% * loss of 74.42%	9.1% * loss of 90.9%	3.7% * loss of 96.3%
Alberta	13.12% * loss of 86.88%	38.39% * loss of 61.61%	38.03% * loss of 61.97%	14.6% * loss of 85.4%	28.27% * loss of 71.73%	10.75% * loss of 89.25%	4.13% * loss of 95.87%
CD No. 1	12.58% * loss of 87.43%	39.81% * loss of 60.19%	41.46% * loss of 58.54%	16.5% * loss of 83.5%	41.18% * loss of 58.82%	17.07% * loss of 82.93%	6.8% * loss of 93.2%
CD No. 2	18.22% * loss of 81.78%	35.1% * loss of 64.9%	49.72% * loss of 50.28%	17.45% * loss of 82.55%	28.57% * loss of 71.43%	14.21% * loss of 85.79%	4.99% * loss of 95.01%
CD No. 3	21.53% * loss of 78.47%	45.26% * loss of 54.74%	45.16% * loss of 54.84%	20.44% * loss of 79.56%	41.07% * loss of 58.93%	18.55% * loss of 81.45%	8.39% * loss of 91.41%
City of Lethbridge	14.64% * loss of 85.36%	32.52% * loss of 67.48%	32.95% * loss of 67.01%	10.71% * loss of 89.29%	7.18% * loss of 92.82%	2.31% * loss of 97.69%	0.75% * loss of 99.25%
Lethbridge County	30.07% * loss of 69.93%	38.72% * loss of 61.28%	68.93% * loss of 31.07%	26.69% * loss of 73.31%	39.44% * loss of 60.56%	27.18% * loss of 72.82%	10.53% * loss of 89.47%

Table 1.2 Measures of language loss: ancestral, intragenerational and potential intergenerational shift (based on Table 1.1)

1.2.2 Canadian-born Dutch mother tongue speakers

The data presented in Table 1.2 do not permit us to distinguish between people born in The Netherlands, who naturally mostly have single Dutch ancestry, and people of Dutch ancestry born in Canada. If a heritage language is to have any chance of being maintained at all, it needs to be spoken and transmitted beyond the first generation immigrants, or it will die out with the second generation. Table 1.3 therefore attempts to separate Canadian-born speakers from those born in The Netherlands, to get a better idea of how much Dutch is spoken among Dutch people in Canada beyond the first generation.

Assuming that everyone who emigrates from The Netherlands speaks Dutch, we can calculate the number of Canadian-born native speakers of Dutch by subtracting the number of people born in The Netherlands from the number of people with Dutch as a mother tongue. This is represented in the second column in Table 1.3. In the next two columns this number is represented as a percentage of the total population with single Dutch origin, and as a percentage of the total population with Dutch mother tongue.

	Canadian-born native speakers of Dutch[18]	Canadian-born native speakers of Dutch as a percentage of people with single Dutch ethnic origin[19]	Canadian-born native speakers of Dutch as a percentage of all native speakers of Dutch[20]
Canada	10,980	3.74%	8.53%
Alberta	2,190	4.29%	11.19%
CD No. 1	50	4.85%	12.2%
CD No. 2	440	5.78%	16.45%
CD No. 3	200	14.6%	32.26%
City of Lethbridge	15	0.56%	1.73%
Lethbridge County	365	13.72%	35.44%

Table 1.3 Measures of language loss beyond the first generation: Canadian-born native speakers of Dutch (based on Table 1.1)

These figures are rather dismal. What they show is that the vast majority of people who have Dutch as their mother tongue have learned it in The Netherlands. This implies that only very few second and subsequent generation Dutch-Canadians learn Dutch as their first language. Due to the possibility of rounding errors the figures for CD No. 1 and for the City of Lethbridge are perhaps less meaningful. However, even if we take those out of consideration, we see in the third column that only between 3.74% and 5.78% of people with two Dutch parents learn Dutch as their first language. Lethbridge County spikes higher, but still not more than 13.72%. The last column shows us that the vast majority of native speakers of Dutch were born in The Netherlands, not in Canada. It is only the Canadian-born ones that will tell us anything about the possible future of the language beyond the first generation. CD No. 3 and Lethbridge County have higher spikes, but still not more than about a third of all native speakers of Dutch in those areas are Canadian-born.

1.2.3 Age group patterns

The previous section showed us that most people with Dutch as a mother tongue are born in The Netherlands, and that very few people with Dutch as their first language are Canadian-born. Another way of approaching the future prospects of a minority language is by looking at age-related patterns in the population: if a language is only spoken as a mother tongue by older people and not by any children, then that obviously means it is going to die out when the older people pass away. Table 1.4 gives three measures in percentage form (in shaded columns). The first measure (first shaded column) gives the percentage of the total population for each given entity that report Dutch as their mother tongue.

The second measure (second shaded column) gives the percentage of the population aged 1-4 with Dutch as a mother tongue. Since this is the population of children in the pre-school years, this gives a good picture of what actually goes on in the home. The third measure (third shaded column) gives the percentage of the population aged 65 and over with Dutch as a mother tongue.

	Total population	Dutch mother tongue	Prcentage of total population with Dutch mother tongue	Total population aged 1-4	Total population aged 1-4 with Dutch mother tongue	Prcentage of total population aged 1-4 with Dutch mother tongue	Total population aged 65 and over	Population aged 65 and over with Dutch mother tongue	Prcentage of total population aged 65 and over with Dutch mother tongue
Canada	29,639,030	128,670	0.43%	1,701,480	930	0.05%	3,624,350	45,970	1.27%
Alberta	2,941,150	19,575	0.67%	187,075	220	0.11%	284,340	5,770	2.03%
CD No. 1	66,675	410	0.61%	4,160	25	0.60%	8,990	105	1.17%
CD No. 2	132,110	2,675	2.02%	9,265	60	0.65%	15,465	790	5.11%
CD No. 3	31,555	620	1.96%	2,715	15	0.55%	4,975	140	2.81%
City of Lethbridge	66,275	865	1.3%	3,900	0	0.00%	9,315	390	4.19%
Lethbridge County	9,900	1,030	10.4%	890	55	6.18%	765	135	17.65%

Table 1.4 Measures of language loss beyond the first generation: native speakers of Dutch by age groups (Source: Statistics Canada – 2001 Census, Catalogue Number 95F0333XCB2001006, Statistics Canada Website, accessed March 4, 2006).

These figures clearly show that Dutch as a mother tongue is predominantly to be found in the older generation. In all of Canada 0.43% of the population have Dutch as a mother tongue – but only 0.05% of preschool children do, contrasting with 1.27% of the population 65 and over. The worst score is for the City of Lethbridge, where there are no preschool children with Dutch as a mother tongue at all. Even in Lethbridge County, where no less than 10.4% of the population reports Dutch as a mother tongue, only 6.18% of the preschoolers speak Dutch as their first language as opposed to 17.65% of the over-65 group. These low rates of native speakers of Dutch among the preschool generation mean, of course, that most people are not transmitting the language to the next generation in the home context.

1.2.4 Anecdotal evidence

All this evidence suggests that people of Dutch descent do not attach much importance to the transmission of their language and are happy to replace it with English. This is also confirmed by anecdotal

evidence gathered in Lethbridge in the period 1997-2006. Medicine Hat and Lethbridge have local Dutch Canadian Clubs. The language used at activities organized by the Dutch Canadian Club of Lethbridge and District is English. Maintaining the Dutch language is not one of its goals as listed in its statutes and bylaws. The Club's dwindling membership of about 120 people consists largely of first generation immigrants from the early group. Recent immigrants seem to have no interest in joining or in attending its activities, perhaps with the sole exception of the annual Sinterklaas celebration on December 5th – but Sinterklaas has to speak English and almost no one knows the traditional songs. A typical pattern at Board meetings of the Dutch Club is that the small talk before and after the actual meeting, which is usually held in the home of one of the Board members, is conducted in a mixture of English and Dutch which is probably better characterized as English with a lot of Dutch words inserted, while the meeting proper is conducted entirely in English. Agendas and minutes are also in English, as is the bimonthly Newsletter, with the exception of its title: *Van de Hak op de Tak*. Given that the Club's members are virtually all first generation immigrants who can speak and understand Dutch quite well, this emphasis on speaking English seems unnecessary. But given that many of these now elderly couples can be observed speaking English even with one another, it certainly fits the pattern.

As mentioned above, a particularly strong sign of early language loss is the fact that many first generation Dutch couples speak English amongst themselves, thinking that this is what good immigrants must do. Broadfoot (1986:125-6) records the following from the mouth of a Dutch immigrant in Battleford:

> "They had a man then who was called the Watkins Man, and he'd go around to all the farms in his little car and sell things. (...) The minute he came in the door he started talking Dutch to me and he said, "So good to talk Dutch with a lady," and I thought, oh, this is funny. Why would he say that. I was young then, and this was my first house, and I was a little scared, and with two little kids there, but I stood up to him and I said, "We speak English in this house." You know, that man got mad. He said he spoke six languages and when he visited farms, he always talked to the lady in her language, and I said, "That's fine for some, but not for me. We are learning to be good Canadians and I don't think it is the right thing to do, to talk in a foreign language." (...) But he said I was denying my children their heritage. (...) I said, "No, Holland is over with, done with. I am in Canada now and so my husband and me, what we speak is English, and when the children go to school, then they will speak English too and not be laughed at." A lot of people thought I was wrong about this, but I was right. If you're going to be a good Canadian, you speak what Canada speaks."[21]

A frequently heard answer given by the second generation to the question: "Do you speak Dutch?" is: "I was born here", which is clearly intended to be interpreted as "No". As far as we know no regular Dutch language classes for children are offered in the area, despite the fact that there are a number of (mostly private Christian) schools with predominantly Dutch populations. Lethbridge Community College offers evening classes for adults, but they are often cancelled due to lack of enrolment.

The first author has on multiple occasions received negative reactions - from Dutch people - to the fact that she speaks Dutch with her children.. Her Canadian husband receives surprised stares when people discover he speaks fluent Dutch – it has made him somewhat of a celebrity in the local Dutch

Club. Religious denominations consisting largely of people of Dutch descent hold services entirely in English, with very few exceptions. Of the 25 people we interviewed for the pilot study reported on in the next section, only two indicated a preference for Dutch as the interview language.

1.3 Conclusion

Summarizing this section, the position of the Dutch language in Southern Alberta, as in the rest of Canada, appears to be weak. Speakers are predominantly first immigration immigrants, and very little of the language is transmitted to the next generation. Even first generation immigrants live their lives largely in English, including much of their contact with people from their own ethnic background.

2. The Survey

The census gives us quantitative information about where people come from, which languages they speak and how much they speak them. A picture appears of very rapid language loss among Dutch people, where the language is often lost as a medium of daily communication within the first generation and is not transmitted to the second generation. A slower process of language loss usually spanning three generations is described for many other immigrant groups. In this section we report the results from a survey designed to get a more detailed picture of the relevant attitudes toward language and its importance that might begin to explain why Dutch immigrants give up their language so easily.

The survey asked questions about many different aspects of language proficiency, use and attitudes. Its design is based on that used by Yağmur (1997) for the study of Turkish language attrition in Sydney, Australia and by Hulsen (2000) for the study of Dutch language attrition in New Zealand. Part 1 contains questions about relevant attributes such as gender, age, year of arrival, age at arrival, mother tongue, marital status, education, and religion, and questions about language exposure and language use choice, such as which language is used more in which type of situation or with which kind of conversation partner (section 2.1). Part 1 also contains some questions probing people's relevant attitudes toward the Dutch and English languages (section 2.2.1). Part 2 is a Proficiency Self-rating test, in which people are asked to estimate their own proficiency in Dutch. Since we are here not interested in first language attrition in the individual speaker, but in societal patterns of language shift, data from this section of the survey have not been used in the present study. Part 3 is based on the Subjective Ethnolinguistic Vitality Questionnaires developed initially by Bourhis, Giles & Rosenthal (1981), as adapted by Yağmur (1997) and Hulsen (2000). The questions in this part tap into people's feelings about their strength as an ethnolinguistic group (sections 2.2.2 and 2.2.3).

We conducted questionnaire-based interviews with a total of 21 participants.[22] All participants included in this analysis are first-generation immigrants whose first language and that of their spouse is Dutch, and who immigrated as adults (17 years or older). Participants had immigrated to Canada between 1948 and 1996. They were divided into two groups: 'early immigrants', who arrived in the big post-war immigration wave in the late forties and fifties, and 'late immigrants', who arrived from the mid-seventies to the mid nineties. People in the early group generally came as young adults, with ages ranging between 17 and 33. They were all born before the Second World War, with birth dates between 1919 and 1938. People in the late group generally came in middle age, with ages ranging be-

tween 32 and 49. The majority of them are baby boomers, with birth dates between 1952 and 1963; three of them were born earlier, between 1928 and 1938. 10 of the participants were from the early group and 11 from the late group, as can be seen from Table 2.1.

	'early group'	'late group'	TOTAL
Year of immigration	1948-1959	1976-1997	
Number of informants	10	11	21
Female	*5*	*6*	*11*
Male	*5*	*5*	*10*
Average age at arrival	24.5	38.6	

Table 2.1 Informants in pilot study, March-August 2004

Most informants were found by asking people present at a dinner party organized by the Dutch Canadian Club of Lethbridge and District in February of 2004 to put their name and phone number on a list if they were interested in being interviewed. Thirty-five names were collected in this manner, but not everyone was available in our time period (March-April 2004) or lived close enough, and not everyone fit our basic criteria for this stage of the project. Obviously this non-random informant selection process restricts the generalizability of the results rather severely: it is common knowledge that whole subsections of the Dutch descent community do not join the Dutch Canadian Club for religious or other reasons, that the club has a hard time attracting new young recent immigrants, and that it is generally seen as an old folks' club for first generation immigrants from the immediate postwar period – none of their Canadian-born children have joined the Club themselves. Distance is a factor too: many agricultural immigrants simply live too far away to be able to regularly attend Club activities. The sample is therefore perhaps skewed towards the urban population where, as we have seen, loss of Dutch is greater. A few additional participants were found through personal contacts and were interviewed in August.

Interviews were conducted in English or Dutch, depending on the preference of the informant – only two informants indicated a preference for Dutch, both from the late group (immigration years 1976 and 1989). While the interviews could be done in about a half hour if necessary, most informants were quite talkative and/or asked for clarifications on certain questions, so that most interviews ended up taking about an hour. Most interviews were conducted in informants' homes, and a few were conducted by phone.

Because this was a pilot survey and the number of participants was fairly small, no quantitative analysis of the data has been attempted. Instead, a number of questions have been selected from the larger database which give an initial picture of some trends in language attitudes and behaviour in first generation immigrants and allow us to begin to pinpoint possible relevant differences between early and late immigrants. The data on behaviour are presented in section 2.1, and those on attitude in section 2.2.

(In reporting the survey results, detailed tabulations have been omitted for reasons of space. Data tables may be obtained by contacting the first author at inge.genee@uleth.ca.)

2.1 Behaviour

A number of questions asked participants about their language behaviour, to get an idea of how much Dutch vs. English is used by the participants in their daily lives and which factors determine which language is used.

2.1.1 Exposure to Dutch language reading, writing, viewing and listening

A first set of questions asked how much people read, watch, write in or listen to Dutch language publications and programming.. The answers show us that exposure to Dutch language publications and programming is generally low in both groups. It most often takes the form of reading books and magazines: about half of all respondents report that they read Dutch "often" or "all the time". The figures for writing Dutch are lower: 8 people report writing in Dutch "often" or "all the time". In each case the numbers are slightly higher in the late group than in the early group, which is not surprising.

The figures for exposure to Dutch language radio and TV programming, videos and music are much lower. Only three people report listening to Dutch language radio programs "often" or "all the time", one person reports listening to Dutch music "often" (no one reports "all the time") and two people watch Dutch language video or TV programs "all the time",

The only case where a fairly clear difference between the early and late groups appears is in the figures for Dutch language radio programming. All people in the early group report that they "never" or "rarely" listen to Dutch radio, while four people in the late groups report that they do so "sometimes", "often" or "all the time". This probaby partially reflects a higher rate of access to the internet in the late group, which consists of generally younger people. However, the most important fact here too is that almost three quarters of all participants, 15 in total, report that they never listen to Dutch language radio at all.

2.1.2 Language use depending on location

A second set of questions asked which language people used depending on where they are.The answers show us that Dutch is more prevalent in the home context than anywhere else: outside people's own homes and those of their family, English is mostly used.

English is the only or predominant language at work and church for both groups. .

When asked about home language, a very clear difference appears between the early and the late group. The majority of the early group speaks only or predominantly English at home, while the majority of the late group speaks only or predominantly Dutch at home. Of course, the figures do not tell us why this would be: have the people in the late group simply not been in Canada long enough to make the switch to speaking English in the home, or are their attitudes and circumstances different

and will they in fact maintain Dutch as their home language?

A similar difference is found when looking at language used when visiting family. Again, the early group uses only or predominantly English, while the late group uses only or predominantly Dutch. This may of course reflect the greater integration of the early group into Canadian society: their family will now include their adult children's homes, where they presumably speak English with in-laws and grandchildren. In the case of the late group, their family will include relatives still in The Netherlands and siblings who, like themselves, came recently.

When asked which language is used in friends' homes, almost everyone remarked that it depended on which friends, Dutch or Canadian. This accounts for the majority of the respondents answering "half and half", which in many cases actually means: mostly Dutch in the homes of Dutch friends and English in the homes of Canadian friends.

2.1.3 Language use depending on conversation partner

A third set of questions asked which language people use depending on who they are talking to.. Again the answers show us that the use of Dutch is restricted to immediate family, with clear generational differences. Dutch is maintained most strongly in conversations with parents, spouses and siblings. English creeps in in conversations with children and takes over in conversations outside of the home.

All respondents in both groups speak Dutch with their parents, which makes sense given that they are all first-generation immigrants – most of their parents in fact live in The Netherlands. . The majority of people in both groups also speak Dutch with their siblings – again this will include siblings still living in The Netherlands.

The majority of people report "half and half" when speaking with friends, which reflects the fact that English is usually spoken with English-speaking friends and Dutch with Dutch-speaking friends. Acquaintances, neighbours and colleagues are predominantly addressed in English. .

Differences between the early and late groups appear again in the home situation: the early group reports predominantly speaking English with spouses and children, while the late groups predominantly speaks Dutch with spouses and a mix of Dutch and English with their children. . This is probably indicative of the process by which people ultimately switch to speaking English in the home: initially they speak Dutch with both spouse and children, then later they mix in more and more English with their children while still speaking Dutch with their spouse, until they finally speak Dutch with their spouse only, at which point it becomes easier to switch to English as the home language.

2.1.4 Language use by various conversation partners

The next set of questions asks which language is usually spoken to our participants by the people they talk to. As may be expected, these figures largely mirror those in the preceding section. The only noticeable difference is to be found in the answers to the question of which language is usually

spoken by the repondents' children. In the previous section we saw that the early group speaks exclusively English to their children, while the late group varies from "half and half" to "only Dutch". In the early group, all children speak English to their parents, pointing to completely monolingual English communication between parents and children. However, in the late group there is more of a spread amongst the children: respondents report four cases of children speaking only or predominantly English to them, while no one reports speaking only or predominantly English to their children. If these self-judgements are correct, this again points to patterns of mixed Dutch-English communication between parents and children in this group, with the children initiating more English than the parents. This is of course a typical pattern, and again confirms the impression that children bring the majority language into the minority-language-speaking household by picking it up in school and in the neighbourhood.

2.1.5 Conclusion

From the data presented in this section a picture emerges of Dutch as a language of the home and immediate family, with English encroaching on the home situation via the second generation children. In the early group, which has been in Canada for a half century, this has led to English as the dominant language in all situations, including at home, at relatives' homes, and in communication with spouses and children. In the late group, which has been in Canada for a much shorter period, Dutch is still the dominant language in the home and in communication with spouses, but English encroaches on this dominance via the second generation: parents speak a mix of Dutch and English with their children, and the children speak more English than the parents.

2.2 Attitudes

A second group of questions asked people about their attitudes, feelings and opinions regarding the Dutch and English languages and their importance in various aspects of their lives.

2.2.1 Practical and personal importance of Dutch

A first set of questions asked people how important Dutch is to them for various purposes: to make friends, to make money, to study, to find a job, to get a better education, to have a say in society, to raise children, to be accepted in the Dutch community, to speak to Dutch friends, to be accepted by Canadians, to speak to colleagues, to travel, to conduct trade, and to practice religion. These questions are intended to get a picture of the importance of the Dutch language in various aspects of people's daily lives. Perhaps not surprisingly, the answers to most of these questions were mostly "not important at all" or "not very important", with very little difference between the groups. Nevertheless, a few trends are worth pointing out.

Interestingly, almost half the informants indicated that the Dutch language is "not important at all" to be accepted in the Dutch community. Only 4 people indicated that it was "very important or "rather important", with the rest being in between. This ties in with Woods' (2004:8) comment that the Dutch language is not a "core value" for the Dutch community. This finding is also confirmed by the data relating to religion, which indicate that 18 people find the Dutch language "not important at

all" or "not very important" to practice religion. In combination with the fact that, with the exception of only two people who indicated being non-religious, almost everyone indicated that religion was very important to them, this indicates a lack of a significant link between language and religion in the Dutch community.

It may seem surprising that 9 people indicated Dutch is fairly, rather or very important for them to travel . However, this can be explained by the fact that many people regularly travel to The Netherlands, where it is obviously important to be able to speak Dutch. Many respondents made comments to the effect that it depends on where you travel to.

Differences between the early and late groups were found in answers to the questions about the importance of the Dutch language in raising children and in speaking to Dutch friends. The majority of the early group said that Dutch was "not important at all" or "not very important" for raising children, while most of the late group indicated that Dutch is "fairly important" or "very important". Similarly, while both groups' answers to the question about the importance of Dutch for speaking to Dutch friends ranged across the whole spectrum, 6 people from the late group indicated it is "very important", against only 2 in the early group .

The most striking difference appeared in the answers to the question "How important is the Dutch language to you personally?" Most of the people in the early group indicated low importance, while no less than 8 people in the late group said it was "very important".

2.2.2 Prestige of Dutch as an ethnic group

The questions discussed in this and the next section are grounded in Ethnolinguistic Vitality theory as developed by Giles, Bourhis and Taylor (1977). Variables related to Status, Demographics and Institutional Support make up the relative strength of ethnolinguistic groups, which can then be characterized as having low, medium or high vitality. However, the degree to which a group maintains its language and other specific ethno-cultural traits cannot directly be predicted from its vitality rating: sometimes groups with low vitality maintain their language, while groups with relatively high vitality lose it. Bourhis et al (1981) hypothesized that it is not a group's *objective, measurable* vitality that predicts language maintenance, but rather the perceptions of its members with regard to this vitality: its *Subjective* Ethnolinguistic Vitality (SEV). Objective ethnolinguistic vitality variables can usually be measured with census data and other statistical information. Bourhis et al (1981) proposed that SEV variables can be measured with a questionnaire. Specific questions tap into people's perceptions of the status of their group and their language, of the demographic strength of the group, and of the institutional support available for the group and its language. The results are usually reported grouped into these three categories Status, Demographics and Institutional Support (e.g. Yağmur 1997, Hulsen 2000), but we have chosen to report separately on perceptions relating to the Dutch as an ethnic group and perceptions relating to the Dutch language. This seems warranted given that the literature shows an almost complete dissociation among Dutch people between language and ethnicity (e.g. Daan 1987, Hulsen 2000, Wood 2004). Thus it seems useful to separate perceptions about the language from those relating to other aspects of their cultural and ethnic strength.

This section reports on perceptions relating to strength as an ethnic group, while the next section (2.2.3) reports on perceptions relating to language.

The questions reported on in this section asked people about the perceived prestige and relative strength of various ethnic groups in their area. These questions indirectly point to people's feelings and opinions about the vitality of their own group vis-à-vis other groups. Such feelings and opinions may impact on people's language behaviours: obviously, if you think your ethnic group has no respect, no prestige and no power in the wider society in which you are trying to integrate, you may be less likely to attempt to maintain distinctive customs and behaviours, including your language..

Dutch people clearly feel that, as a group, they do well economically: they think that people of Dutch descent have quite a lot of control over economic and business matters, and that they are comparatively wealthy, with the late group having a slightly more positive outlook than even the early group.. This positive economic picture translates into a perception of fairly high prestige and reasonable representation in local cultural events: although respondents' feelings about how highly regarded or well-represented they are as a group cover the full range, most hover around the middle or a little above. Pride in historical and cultural achievements is also fairly high, with the late group perceiving even more pride than the early group

When asked how this translates into how strong and active people feel they are as a group, most answers cluster in the middle, but when asked to make a prediction about the strength of their group for the future people's perceptions are a little less positive.

2.2.3 Prestige of the Dutch language

Obviously, it is not only people's perceptions of their prestige as a group in socio-economic terms that will codetermine their language behaviours; their perceptions of the prestige attached to their language may also play a role.

Three questions directly asked about the perceived prestige of the Dutch language, in Southern Alberta, in Canada, and internationally respectively. No one chose the answer "very highly regarded". The majority of the answers are in the lower range, with perceived prestige being slightly higher for Southern Alberta and lowest internationally. Interestingly, the late group is particularly strong in expressing the opinion that Dutch has virtually no prestige either in Canada or internationally.

Four additional questions asked about the prevalence of Dutch as a community language in government, schools, churches and work places. The vast majority of respondents answered that Dutch is used not at all in government services and schools, and only occasionally in churches and work places. These indicate that respondents perceive a low rate of usefulness of the Dutch language outside of the private sphere, and low Institutional Support.

2.2.4 Conclusion

The data presented in this section paint a mixed picture that shows that Dutch people do not per-

ceive their language as an important part of their identity: it is perceived as having virtually no practical and emotional importance and low prestige. These low linguistic vitality perceptions do not stem from low perceptions about the prestige of Dutch immigrants as an ethnic group: Dutch people feel they do well economically and financially, are respected for their achievements and feel proud of them. One almost wants to conclude that the achievement that Dutch people are most proud of is in fact their ability to disappear as a separate group: they do not insist on hanging on to ethnic distinctions such as their language, do not ask for or expect support for their culture or language from the majority society, and do their best to become completely integrated members of their host society.

In the personal sphere, people from the late group attach more importance to the Dutch language for communicating with children and friends than people in the early group; the late group also indicated a very high emotional attachment to the Dutch language at a personal level. However, these attachments seem to be regarded as private matters that are of no concern to the rest of society and for which Dutch people do not expect much consideration from others.

3. General discussion

It does not look good for the future of the Dutch language in Canada. The data presented in this study suggest that Dutch is a matter largely of older first-generation immigrants, who not only do not seriously transmit the language to their children, but generally even give it up for themselves after a number of years. Rates of language loss are high by a number of different measures. Continued use of the language as a medium of daily communication will mostly depend on a continued influx of new immigrants from The Netherlands.

The census figures presented in section 1 also suggest that Dutch immigration is still largely a rural phenomenon, as least as far as south Southern Alberta is concerned, with many immigrants having an agricultural background. Dutch immigrants tend to settle in rural areas in clusters, where their ethnicity remains less diluted than in other areas. Rural Netherlanders are also seen to hold on to the language, at least in the home context, at higher rates than urban people. This is something that needs to be further investigated.

The survey data presented in section 2 are largely in line with the picture that emerges from the census data. They confirm the Dutch language as a non-integral part of Dutch ethnicity, in other words, the language is not a "core value". Further research will have to reveal whether Dutch people as a group do have any other core values and what those are. It is probably better to look in the direction of religion in this respect.

The survey data also confirm the characterization of Dutch as a language restricted largely to the home situation and to communication with family members of the same or older generations. In the early generation it has largely even lost this final domain: most people from the early group now speak English in virtually all circumstances, including at home and with their spouses. Oral spontaneous informal conversations are the most frequent contexts in which Dutch is used: very little reading, writing or formal Dutch language use takes place, which contributes to its status as a personal attribute with perhaps some emotional significance to the individual but with no further value.

The survey revealed some interesting and perhaps significant differences between early and late immigrants in terms of attitudes and behaviours: late immigrants find the language more important for themselves and their children and speak it more at home, with spouses, children and friends. An important question, which we cannot answer here, is whether these differences are just a matter of time (age grading), or whether they are perhaps more permanent. Much has changed in the time between the arrival of the people in the early group and the arrival of those in the late group. First of all, the idea that being bilingual is good for you did not really exist until the advent of official French/English bilingualism in the seventies; before that, parents were frequently counselled by school teachers to stop speaking a minority language as this was thought to hamper their children's academic development. We now know better, of course. Second, the people in the early group were generally younger when they arrived and less well-educated. Most of them spoke no English when they came (most indicated they began speaking English only after arriving in Canada) and struggled to integrate, which they did in an all-out manner, so their children would be well adapted. The people in the late group were generally older when they arrived and better educated. They already spoke English before they arrived (most indicated they learned English from age 12 or 13 in high school) and struggled much less to integrate and to find an economically viable place for themselves. Third, contact with family and friends in The Netherlands is much easier nowadays, be it in the form of flying back for visits, improved phone connections, mail, email, internet and in other ways. In a certain sense the break with the country of origin seems less absolute now than it was for people who came by boat and were unable to go back for a visit for many years. And finally, being Dutch is now no longer something one tries to hide, or at least not everyone does. Both children of the first author are exceedingly proud to have Dutch roots and spend much of their time at school sussing out the "real" Dutch people (in their definition: those who speak Dutch) from the "phony" ones (in their definition: those with Dutch names but who don't speak Dutch, which is of course the majority). Only time can tell if these changed circumstances will make any difference in the extent to which the second generation offspring of the late group will maintain fluency in the Dutch language and even transmit it to a third generation.

REFERENCES

Bot, K. de, Clyne, M., 1994. "A 16-year longitudinal study of language attrition in Dutch immigrants in Australia." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 15, 17-28.

Bourhis, R.Y., Giles, H., Rosenthal, D., 1981. "Notes on the construction of a 'Subjective Vitality Questionnaire' for ethnolinguistic groups." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 2, 145-155.

Bratt, J.D., 1983. "Dutch Calvinism in the United States in the 1920s: Americanization and self-definition." In: Ganzevoort and Boekelman 1983, 167-185.

Brinks, H.J., 1983. "Immigrant letters: the religious context of Dutch American ethnicity." In: Ganzevoort and Boekelman 1983, 131-146.

Broadfoot, B., 1986. *The immigrant years. From Europe and Britain to Canada 1945-1967.* Vancouver, Toronto: Douglas & McIntyre.

Daan, J., 1987. *Ik was te bissie... Nederlanders en hun taal in de Verenigde Staten*. Zutphen: Walburg Pers.

Ganzevoort, H., 1988. *A bittersweet land. The Dutch experience in Canada, 1890-1980*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.

Ganzevoort, H., Boekelman, M., 1983. *Dutch immigration to North America*. Toronto: Multicultural History Society of Ontario.

Giles, H., Bourhis, R.Y., Taylor, D.M., 1977. "Toward a theory of language in ethnic group relations." In: Giles, H. (ed.), *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations*, 307-348. London: Academic Press.

Horn, M., 1997. *Becoming Canadian. Memoirs of an invisible immigrant*. Toronto: U of Toronto Press.

Hulsen, M., 2000. *Language loss and language processing: Three generations of Dutch migrants in New Zealand*. PhD thesis, University of Nijmegen..

Klatter-Folmer, J., Kroon, S., 1997. *Dutch overseas. Studies in maintenance and loss of Dutch as an immigrant language*. Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.

Lonmo, C., 1999. "Farming is going Dutch." *Canadian agriculture at a glance. 1996 Census of Agriculture*. Statistics Canada Website: HYPERLINK "http://www.statcan.ca/english/kits/agric/dutch.htm" www.statcan.ca/english/kits/agric/dutch.htm (accessed March 3, 2006)

Pauwels, A., 1986. *Immigrant dialects and language maintenance in Australia. The cases of the Limburg and Swabian dialects*. Dordrecht, Providence: Foris.

Pendakur, R., 1990. *Speaking in tongues: Heritage language maintenance and transfer in Canada*. Ottawa: Policy and Research, Multiculturalism Sector, Multiculturalism and Citizenship.

Schryer, F.J., 1998. *The Netherlandic presence in Ontario. Pillars, class and Dutch ethnicity*. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfred Laurier University Press.

Sinnema, D.W., 2005. *The first Dutch settlement in Alberta. Letters from the pioneer years 1903-14*. Calgary: University of Calgary Press.

Woods, A., 2004. *Medium or message? Language and faith in ethnic churches*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Yağmur, K., 1997. *First language attrition among Turkish speakers in Sydney*. Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.

NOTES

[1] We are grateful to the Dutch people in and around Lethbridge who generously gave us of their time by participating in the survey. Early versions of this paper were presented to the CAANS conference in May 2004 and to the Faculty of Education Research Support Group in January and February 2006 and to the Department of Modern Languages in March 2006; we benefited from critical comments from the audiences on these occasions. Thanks are due especially to Mary Dyck, Thelma Gunn and Dawn McBride, and as always to the Document Delivery Service of the University of Lethbridge's library, for obtaining works from other libraries. Thanks also go to Kutlay Yağmur and Piet Van Avermaet for helpful suggestions and references in the early phases of the project. The research for this paper was supported in part by a grant from the University of Lethbridge's Internal SSHRC program and a Research start-up grant from the Office of the Dean of Arts and Science to the first author, and by a Province of Alberta STEP grant to the second author.

[2] "A census division is a group of neighbouring municipalities joined together for the purpose of regional planning and managing common services. Census divisions are intermediate geographic areas between the province level and the municipality." (HYPERLINK "http://geodepot.statcan.ca/Diss/Maps/ReferenceMaps/prov_pdf_e.cfm" http://geodepot.statcan.ca/Diss/Maps/ReferenceMaps/prov_pdf_e.cfm; accessed 17 March 2006). The province of Alberta is divided into 19 Census Divisions. A full investigation of the whole area more generally referred to as "Southern Alberta" would additionally include at least Census Divisions 4, 5 and 6 (which includes the city of Calgary), and the southern part of Division 15, which includes the Alberta part of the Rocky Mountains.

[3] Figures for Lethbridge County are for the rural area only and do not include the five small municipalities of Barons, Nobleford, Picture Butte, Coalhurst and Coaldale, which together have a population of 10,084 persons.

[4] Figures for CD No. 3 exclude the Peigan and Blood reserves. It is hard to get good figures for these reserves, as the relevant Statistics Canada tables are incomplete. Based on 95F0489XCB2001001 ("Profile of Citizenship, Immigration, Birthplace, Generation Status, Ethnic Origin, Visible Minorities and Aboriginal Peoples, for Canada, Provinces, Territories, Census Divisions and Census Subdivisions", 2001 Census) I subtracted a total of 5,345 (Peigan = 1,535; Blood = 3,810) from the total population of CD No. 3 which is given as 36,900. Note that the information available on Statistics Canada's website does not allow the separation of Hutterite colonies.

[5] This figure is calculated by subtracting the number of people who report single Dutch ethnic origin (4th column) from the total number of people reporting Dutch ethnic origin (3rd column) to arrive at the number of people of mixed ethnic origin, and dividing this number by the total number of people reporting Dutch ethnic origin (3rd column). It can be thought of as reflecting endogamous marriage patterns.

[6] Figures for CD. No. 3 exclude the population for the Blood and Peigan Indian reserves, estimated at a total of 5345. See note 4.

[7] Figures for Lethbridge County do not include Barons, Nobleford, Picture Butte, Coaldale and Coalhurst. See note 3.

[8] This figure is calculated by subtracting the number of people born in The Netherlands from the number of people with single Dutch ethnic origin and dividing the resulting number by the total population. This assumes that everyone who is born in The Netherlands has two Dutch parents, which seems a reasonable assumption in general, but it should be noted that there will of course be exceptions. This would include for instance the first author's oldest son, who was born in Amsterdam but has a Dutch mother and a Canadian father.

[9] In addition, 335 people reported Flemish, and 495 reported Frisian as their mother tongue. Comparable mother tongue figures for Canada as a whole: Flemish 6,015, Frisian 3,190. Very few people of Flemish descent will have reported their mother tongue as Dutch, since they refer to their language as Flemish.

[10] See note 4.

[11] Since the focus of this article is on language loss, I will not pursue this angle here. I suspect that it is related to the tenacity of a well-established Dutch Reformed community in this area, as well as to ongoing relatively high levels of recent immigration of like-minded people from The Netherlands. I hope to address the fascinating ethnic, religious and linguistic make-up of Lethbridge County in future research, in which the municipalities of Barons, Nobleford, Picture Butte, Coaldale and Coalhurst will also be taken into account.

[12] Similarly: de Graaf, de Heer, de Jager, de Jong(e), de Kok, de Koning, de Klerk, de Laet, de Lauw, de Maere, den Hoed, de Vos, de Vries, de Waal, de Walle, de Wit etc.

[13] Similarly: van Dy(c)k/van Dij(c)k, van Doorn, van Egmond, van Egteren, van Essen, van Esveld, van Gaal(en), van Ham, van Hees, van Hierden, etc.

[14] Similarly: van de Beek, van den Berg, van den Biggelaar, van den Brink, van den Heuvel, van den Hoek, van der Hulst, van der Kooi, van der Linden, van der Meer, van der Molen, van der Ploeg, van de Steeg, van der Wal, van der Wijde, van der Woude, van der Zee etc. Also interesting are combinations with van 't: Vant Land, Van'T Land, Van't Land (notice none of these last three spellings are correct).

[15] Ancestral shift is calculated as follows: 1a: the number of people reporting Dutch mother tongue (column 7) divided by the number of people reporting Dutch ethnic origin (single and multiple responses) (column 3), expressed as a percentage; 1b: the number of people reporting Dutch mother tongue (column 7) divided by the number of people reporting Dutch ethnic origin (single responses only) (column 4), expressed as a percentage.

[16] Intragenerational and potential intergenerational shift are calculated as follows: 2a: the number of people reporting Dutch home language (column 9) divided by the number of people reporting Dutch

mother tongue (column 7), expressed as a percentage; 2b: the number of people reporting Dutch home language (column 9) divided by the number of people reporting single Dutch ethnic origin (column 4), expressed as a percentage.

[17] Potential intergenerational transfer is calculated as follows: 3a: the number of people who report speaking Dutch in the home predominantly (*only + mostly*) (columns 10+11) divided by the number of people who report speaking Dutch at home at least regularly (column 9); 3b: the number of people who report speaking Dutch in the home predominantly (*only + mostly*) (columns 10+11) divided by the number of people who report Dutch mother tongue (column 7); 3c: the number of people who report speaking Dutch in the home predominantly (*only + mostly*) (columns 10+11) divided by the number of people who report single Dutch ethnic origin (column 4).

[18] The number of Canadian-born native speakers of Dutch is calculated by subtracting the number of people born in The Netherlands (column 6 in Table 1.1) from the total number of people reporting Dutch mother tongue (column 7 in Table 1.1).

[19] This is calculated by dividing the total number of Canadian-born native speakers of Dutch (column 1 in this table) by the total number of people who report single Dutch ethnic origin (column 4 in table 1.1), expressed as a percentage.

[20] This is calculated by dividing the total number of Canadian-born native speakers of Dutch (column 1 in this table) by the total number of people who report Dutch as their mother tongue (column 7 in table 1.1), expressed as a percentage.

[21] No date is given for this quote, but Broadfoot's book covers the period 1945-1967.

[22] Twenty-five surveys were administered. Four of those were excluded from the present analysis because participants either did not have Dutch-speaking spouses or were children when they arrived.