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Abstract
Attitudes have been a research subject for years. For example, Ytsma analysed the attitudes of children towards Frisian and Dutch in 1990. However, attitudes of teacher training students have not been subject for research that often, while at the same time researchers state that institutions like schools can influence language attitudes (Baker, 1992: p. 110). Therefore, the focus of this study was on the attitudes of teacher training students in Leeuwarden, the Netherlands, towards Frisian and Dutch. A combination of an indirect method (Matched-Guise Technique) and direct method (questionnaire) has been used to measure the attitudes. This research showed that students rated Dutch better than Frisian on status dimensions like perceived wealth, but it showed no difference between Frisian and Dutch on social dimensions, like friendliness. A reason for this is a positive correlation between the scores for Frisian and Dutch on these social factors. Next to that, the level of Frisian influenced the results. The students with a high level of Frisian rated Frisian higher on social dimensions like friendliness and status dimensions like perceived wealth, than students with a low level of Frisian. There was no difference between the students for Dutch on the same dimensions. The language that students spoke at home also influenced the results. Bilingual Frisian-Dutch students rated Frisian higher on the status dimension than students who only spoke Dutch at home. The last question that this research wanted to answer was whether or not a difference in teacher training would influence the attitudes. This study showed that the Pabo students rated Frisian higher on the status dimension than Aolb students. There was no influence of teacher training for Dutch.
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1. Introduction

Fryslân is getting a lot of attention this year, especially the capital city of Ljouwert (Leeuwarden), because it is the cultural capital of Europe. The languages spoken in the province are one of the things that have been put in the spotlight. Two of the languages spoken in the province are Dutch and Frisian. Frisian is recognized as one of the official languages in the Netherlands. Outside the province, it is barely spoken (Wet gebruik Friese taal, 2014). The Frisian language normally does not get much attention from the general public, but researchers in the field of linguistics and/or minority languages have paid attention to it for a long time. The language itself, the attitudes towards the language and the education system in the province have been examined multiple times before, for example by Gorter (2005), Ytsma (1990, 2007), Swarte (2011), De Vries and Arocena-Egaña (2012), Hilton and Gooskens (2013) and Oldehinkel (2017).

However, the language is not taught much in primary education, especially in the cities (Gorter, 2005: pp. 62-65). Frisian is spoken more and is thus also thought more in schools in the countryside (Provincie Fryslân, 2018b). Sadly enough, some schools in rural areas have to close because there are not enough pupils enrolled to keep the school open (Provincie Fryslân, 2015). This situation led to the current thesis. The researcher was wondering what the attitudes of teacher training students are, because they are the educators that must teach the children Frisian. The attitudes towards Frisian have been examined very often. However, the results are not all that recent anymore and the attitudes of the newer generation of teachers in the province have only been examined once (Ytsma, 2007; Swarte, 2011; Hilton and Gooskens, 2013). Therefore, the current research will investigate these attitudes. The next section will provide background information about language attitudes in general, Fryslân and Frisian and language attitudes towards Frisian. This section will be concluded with the research question. After that, the method will be explained in section 3. The analysis of the research and the results will follow in section 4. Section 5 will then discuss these results and section 6 will conclude this thesis. The complete test used in this study can be found in Appendix one.
2. Theoretical background

2.1 Frisian
This paragraph will provide some background information about the Frisian language and the different forms of education that is given in Frisian.

2.1.1 Frisian language
The official language in the Netherlands is Dutch, however in the province of Fryslân (Friesland in Dutch) there is a second language spoken: Frisian. Frisian is officially recognized as second official language in the Netherlands (Oldehinkel, 2017: pp. 3-5; Ytsma, 2007: p. 144). In addition, Frisian is also protected by the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (Oldehinkel, 2017: p. 5). There are various kinds of Frisian: the Frisian spoken in Fryslân (West-Frisian) and the Frisian spoken in Germany (North- and East-Frisian) (Oldehinkel, 2017: p. 3; Hilton and Gooskens, 2013: p. 139). This paper only deals with the West-Frisian variety, hereafter called Frisian.

Frisian is spoken in the province Fryslân. This is a province in the north of the Netherlands with around 646,000 inhabitants according to the most recent numbers¹ (Provincie Fryslân, 2018a). The majority of the inhabitants live in the capital Ljouwert (Leeuwarden in Dutch), with 91,000 inhabitants. Including Ljouwert, there are only twelve cities with more than 10,000 inhabitants. This indicates that there are a lot of small towns situated in this province (Provincie Fryslân, 2018a).

According to the latest survey from the province of Fryslân 93.7% of the people living in Fryslân can understand Frisian good (Provincie Fryslân, 2015). 66.6% can speak Frisian good to well and 51.8% can read the language well. However, only 14.5% of the inhabitants can write Frisian well (Provincie Fryslân, 2015).

Recently, the Fryske akademy conducted research on the Frisian language. They found that in 2016, the number of speakers which say they can read and write in Frisian is a little higher than in the year 2015 (Klinkenberg, 2017: p. 11). However, this report only showed some of the first results of a big questionnaire that has been carried out in Fryslân in 2016 and 2017. The definitive results are expected to be presented in 2018². So far, it seemed that the level of understanding the Frisian language well would stay the same and that level of speaking, reading and writing might have increased slightly (Klinkenberg, 2017: p. 11).

---
¹ The most recent numbers are from 2017, this because the numbers are made available at the end of the year.
² This is the expected date that the Fryske Akademy gives on their website: https://www.fryske-akademy.nl/nl/nieuws-agenda/nieuwsbericht/news/detail/geen-echte-taalstrijd-meer-in-fryslan/
2.1.2 Education
Since Frisian is an official language in the province of Fryslân, the language should also be taught in schools (Gorter, 2005: p. 62; Wet op het primair onderwijs, 2018; Wet op het voortgezet onderwijs, 2018). In 1993, the Dutch government set language goals which had to be reached when pupils left school in Fryslân. These goals contained the level of speaking, understanding, reading and writing Frisian. However, these goals were mostly not achieved (Van Ruijven, Ytsma and Gorter, 2008: p. 11). The Fryske Akademy, together with the Cedin and its precursors – the authority that helped schools with the implementation of Frisian – were very disappointed by the results that the language goals for Frisian were achieved so little. They then started a new education model inspired by the Catalan and Bask model, which they called Trijetalige Skoalle (Trilingual school in Frisian). The aim of this project was to reach the language goals for Frisian, Dutch and English set by the Dutch government (Van Ruijven et al., 2008: p. 12).

The project started in 1997 and included in the end seven trilingual schools and ten control schools who did not follow the trilingual route. The latter schools participated to see if the level of Dutch did not lower in the trilingual model (Van Ruijven et al., 2008: p. 14).

Trilingual education meant in this model that in the first six years of primary education, the instruction language was 50% Dutch and 50% Frisian. From grade seven onwards, English was also introduced, similar to “normal” Dutch primary schools. The distribution of languages in grade seven and eight was 40% Dutch, 40% Frisian and 20% English (Van Ruijven et al., 2008: p. 14). Dutch primary education has eight grades, where pupils start in grade one when they are 4 years old.

The trend was to teach Frisian only as a subject, because it is obligatory to teach it. In grades 7 and 8, English was included as an obligatory subject. This means that pupils got Frisian or English for 30 to 45 minutes a week (Gorter, 2005: p. 62). The control schools in the research of Van Ruijven et al. (2008) followed this pattern.

Van Ruijven et al. (2008) examined the results from (national) tests performed by the children in trilingual schools and the control schools. Van Ruijven et al. (2008) then compared these results with the national results for Dutch and the overall provincial results for Frisian. The national results were measured using the Cito-test.

The Cito (Centraal Instituut voor Toetsontwikkeling, or central institute for developing tests) develops tests that can be used to measure the cognitive level of pupils for different subjects. The Cito has a specific set of tests, which are taken during the course of the elementary education to measure the development of a pupil. One of these tests is made at the end of primary education.

Van Ruijven et al. found that from grade five to eight, the pupils in the trilingual schools scored better for technical reading and spelling in Frisian than pupils in control.
schools. They also scored better than the results of other schools in the province of Fryslân in regards to Frisian technical reading (Van Ruijven et al., 2008: pp. 47-51).

Van Ruijven et al. did not find any differences in scores for Dutch between the pupils in trilingual and control schools. However, in comparison with the national scores for Dutch, both the pupils in trilingual and control schools score lower on spelling. Additionally, there are more pupils in the lowest category for technical reading in grade eight. This means that there is a lower level of Dutch in the trilingual schools in comparison to the national scores. This is also the case for the Frisian control schools (Van Ruijven et al., 2008: pp. 51-52).

After this experiment ended, the seven participating schools received a certificate which stated that they were official trilingual schools. The schools then formed a network of Trilingual Schools, which now has 70 schools as members. Not all 70 schools have the trilingual certificate however. When a school becomes a member of the network, it has three years to achieve the certificate and move to phase two. In this phase, schools are audited to see if they still meet the goals of the trilingual education. The goals that are controlled are the languages used in school. So 50% Dutch and 50% Frisian as language of instruction in the first years, and later on 40% Dutch, 40% Frisian and 20% English. Most of these schools are located in small towns where Frisian is spoken by the majority of the inhabitants. The network now concentrates on implementing trilingual education in secondary education in Fryslân (De Vries and Arocena-Egaña, 2012: pp. 46-47).

In the current situation there are two kinds of primary education in Fryslân: regular primary education, where schools are obliged to give at least one hour of Frisian per week and trilingual education, which divides the education time equally between Dutch and Frisian. During secondary education, the schools are obliged to teach Frisian as a subject in the first and second year and it is voluntary to teach it in the higher levels of secondary education (Rijksoverheid, 2010).

In the Netherlands there are two kinds of teacher training programs for primary education: the Pabo and the Academic pabo (Aolb). The Pabo is a program offered at universities of applied sciences and gives the students a diploma with the ability to teach in primary schools. At the Pabo’s in Fryslân, students can choose to follow Frisian as a subject. When they do that, they get an extra qualification to teach Frisian at primary school level (Rijksoverheid, 2017; NHL Stenden hogeschool, 2018a). The Aolb is a program which has courses at universities and at universities of applied sciences. This provides the students with a diploma to teach at primary schools, with an additional BA in pedagogical science. The students of the Aolb program can become teachers, work as educational policy maker or they can advise schools on their language policies (NHL Stenden hogeschool, 2018b).
This paragraph explained how Frisian is situated in the Netherlands and Fryslân and how is dealt with Frisian in the education system. The following paragraph will go in detail about attitudes and earlier research towards attitudes.

2.2 Language attitudes
Before we can examine what the language attitudes of teacher training students are, we first must define what is meant by attitudes and how they can be examined. In 2.2.1 the definition of language attitudes will be set. 2.2.2 will explain the conditions for attitude change. 2.2.3 will discuss the methods that can be used to measure attitudes. Concluding, 2.2.4 will discuss earlier research towards attitudes toward Frisian

2.2.1 Definition
There are many researchers who studied language attitudes and this results in many different views towards attitudes. So, before we can start the examination of attitudes, a working definition must be found. According to Giles and Rakić (2014), people receive information about a speaker as soon as he or she starts speaking. This includes information about his or her personality, age and gender. The identity of a speaker lies in his or her voice and people can form all kinds of thoughts about the speaker with that voice (Giles and Rakić, 2014: p. 12). Attitudes in the opinion of Giles and Rakić, are thus formed when people listen to a voice.

Baker (1992) defines attitudes as “A person’s thoughts, processing system and feelings” (Baker, 1992: p. 11). Baker also states that attitudes are reaction to an object, person/institution or a dimension or judgement of an object, person or institution (Baker, 1992: p. 11). According to him, attitudes have three components: cognition, affective and action. Cognition deals with the thoughts and beliefs, whereas “the affective component concerns feelings towards the attitude object” (Baker, 1992: p. 12). The action component, also called conative component, deals with the action that can follow a certain attitude. For example, speaking Frisian when you have a positive feeling towards Frisian (Baker, 1992: pp. 12-13). In his book from 1988, Baker already stated that an attitude is something that can cause certain behaviour. However, attitudes not only cause behaviour, they can also be influenced by events in a person’s life (Baker, 1988: pp. 112-113). This will be discussed in detail in paragraph 2.2.2.

Attitudes and behaviour do not have to be the same: the research of LaPiere (1934, in: Baker, 1992 and Swarte, 2011) shows that people sometimes behave differently from their attitudes. He sent a Chinese couple to a number of restaurants in the United States and they were refused by one. After the couple visited all the restaurants, he asked the restaurants if they would refuse Chinese people and then 92% said they would. This shows that external
behaviour does not have to be the same as the attitude of people (Baker, 1992: p. 15). This also shows that people might think differently than what they say or how they act.

Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum (1967) state that there is a variety of attitude definitions, but according to them, there is some consensus between the different definitions. Most researchers, according to Osgood et al., agree that “attitudes are learned and implicit” (Osgood et al., 1967: p. 189). Osgood et al. want to show with this, that attitudes are the result of events or actions that take place in someone’s life. They say that the attitudes are not always shown, because they might be implicit at some time. Next to that, attitudes are predispositions towards an evaluative response (Osgood et al., 1967: p. 189). So according to Osgood et al. attitudes have an evaluative aspect and show the position of evaluation of a person (Osgood et al., 1967: pp. 189-190).

Agheyisi and Fishman (1970) summarize that attitudes consist of more components, as Baker also stated. In addition, “attitudes are learned from previous experience” (Agheyisi and Fishman, 1970: p. 139). They also state that attitudes do not necessarily have to correlate with the actual behavior (Agheyisi and Fishman, 1970: pp. 139-140). Thus, attitudes can be different if they are made explicit or if they stay implicit, much like the study of LaPiere described above. That study shows the difference between explicit (overt) attitudes and implicit (covert) attitudes. When people are faced with the Chinese couple in a restaurant, they serve them. These are the overt attitudes. However, when asked over the phone whether or not Chinese people would be served, the same restaurants state that they will not serve them (Agheyisi and Fishman, 1970: p. 139; Swarte, 2011: pp. 5-6). These are the covert attitudes of which people are not always aware of as Osgood et al. (1967) and Agheyisi and Fishman (1970) also state. However, attitudes are an important indicator of the health of a (minority) language (Baker, 1992: p. 9). If people hold more positive, explicit attitudes, the language might have a better health, than when the attitudes are negative or implicit.

As described above, there are different definitions about attitudes. In this research the following definition will be used: Attitudes are a reaction or predisposition towards an object, person or institution based on earlier experiences. These attitudes can be overt or covert. This definition is based on Baker (1988, 1992) and Osgood et al. (1967).

2.2.2 Attitude change

Attitudes can change over time, for example because your opinions change. Baker (1992) says that attitudes have four functions and that a change in one of those functions can lead to an attitude change (Baker, 1992: pp. 99-101). The first function is the instrumental function, this deals with the rewards you can get. For example, if your language is acknowledged as an official language, your attitude towards this language may change. The second function is the ego defensive function: you want to feel secured. For example, if you get embarrassed
speaking another language than what the majority speaks around you, your attitudes towards your language can change. Value-expressive is the third function. This deals with personal values. If you value Frisian culture highly, your attitude may be congruent with that value. However, this also works the other way around. If you do not value certain elements of your culture, your attitude towards the language might become negative. The last function is the knowledge function. Attitudes are based on understanding of people and events, so when you gain knowledge from a minority language or culture, it can influence your attitude towards that language (Baker, 1992: pp. 99-101).

Other things can also have an influence on attitudes. For example, Baker (1992) names amongst other things: age, dramatic experiences, community, parents and peers (pp. 106-113). The number of minority and majority language speakers in a community can influence attitudes. For example, if a big group of majority language speakers come to a certain area, the value of the minority language can decrease or people can feel insecure speaking their minority language. The attitudes to the minority language in this case can change due to the decrease in value or the insecurity people feel (Baker, 1992: p. 107).

Parents can influence the language attitudes of their children as well. For example, if parents are strongly pro-Frisian, the children can rebel against their parents and develop a negative attitude towards Frisian. However, most of the time the attitude of the children follow those of their parents according to Baker (1992). This does not necessarily mean that the attitudes of the children are caused by the attitudes of their parents (Baker, 1992: p. 109). For example, the peer group can also influence the attitudes. Thus, the environment of both the parents and children also influences the attitudes. For example, peer groups mostly share experiences. These experiences can change the attitudes someone has, when the attitudes do not completely fit within the experience or peer group (Baker, 1992: p. 109).

Lambert and Tucker (1972) add to that that the attitudes towards the language that must be learnt do matter. The parental attitudes can play an important role in the language-learning process of the children (p. 15). However, the usage of a language also plays a role. Whether or not a language is used in certain institutions such as schools or by the government can add value to a language. This way the attitudes towards that language can increase and decrease when the usage of that language changes. For example, if the language is used more in schools, the attitudes and values towards this language can improve (Baker, 1992: p. 110). Baker also stated that “Of all the institutions that may be linked with attitude change, school is often regarded as the most influential.” (Baker, 1992: p. 110). Thus, the attitude and value that a school gives to a language can have a big influence on the pupils (and their parents) who are enrolled in that school.
Concluding, we can say that there are multiple events that can change attitudes: change over time, parental influence, whether the language is used in school or other institutions and the influence of friends and peers.

2.2.3 Methods to measure attitudes
Besides a vast range of definitions, there is also a great variety of methods that can be used to examine or measure attitudes. This paragraph will go into detail on some of them. First of all, Baker (1992) lists a number of methods that can be used to measure attitudes. He names among other methods, the Likert scale, the Semantic Differential Technique, interviews, case studies and the matched guise technique (Baker, 1992: p. 17). According to him, one of the most popular methods is “to produce an attitude scale composed of statements” (Baker, 1992: p. 17).

The measurement of attitudes will never be totally valid, according to Baker, since

“(1) People may respond to an attitude test in a way that makes them appear more prestigious, more good than is real. […] (2) People may be affected in their response to an attitude test by the researcher and the perceived purpose of the research.” (Baker, 1992: p. 19).

The attitude scales Baker talks about consist of evaluations of statements. Osgood et al. (1967) state that since attitudes are evaluative, the scales should have strong contradictions “like good-bad, optimistic-pessimistic” (Osgood et al., 1967: p. 191). To maintain consistency in scoring, the negative factor normally gets 1 point and the positive factor 5 or 7 points (Osgood et al., 1967: p. 191). We must keep in mind though that these scales do not measure the reactions that people might get in real situations, because people might react differently in different situations (Osgood et al., 1967: p. 195, 198-199).

Sommer and Sommer (1997) state that rating scales are commonly used for attitude or behavioural research (p. 151). A scale that can be used is, for example, a Likert-type scale. This is a scale which runs from strongly disagree to strongly agree and the participants are asked to rate statements who are pro or contra the research subject on this scale (Sommer and Sommer, 1997: pp. 154-156). However, semantic differential scales might not work with children, because they might find it too difficult to assess the difference between the points on the scale (Sommer and Sommer, 1997: pp. 157-160).

Agheyisi and Fishman discover in their study, that questionnaires are mostly used when people want to study attitudes. Other popular methods include the matched-guise technique and the commitment measures (Agheyisi and Fishman, 1970: p. 144). The commitment measure is used to see the willingness from the participants to certain
statements. This commitment is then seen as part of the attitude towards a certain language. An example of a question which measures commitment is: Would you agree to speak more Spanish (Agheyisi and Fishman, 1970: p. 144).

A Matched-Guise Test (henceforth, MGT) is a test where the participants are asked to rate speakers on different traits. The participants hear recordings in different languages. These recordings are made with speakers that can speak two or more languages fluently as a native speaker. The participants do not know that they hear the same speaker in different languages, but they assume that they hear and rate different speakers. Since the speaker is the same, voice quality is excluded as a manipulating measuring variable. So, since only the language is different in this experiment, it is assumed that the ratings reflect the attitudes towards the language in the test (Agheyisi and Fishman, 1970: p. 146).

Zahn and Hopper (1985) investigated the dependent variables used in the MGT until that moment and tried to make a model with standard variables. Their intention was that with a standard model, the different kinds of research could be more easily compared (Zahn and Hopper, 1985: pp. 113-116). The model is based on different factors that represent dimensions which came back in almost all earlier research. Each factor or dimension can be tested with different items which represent traits of people. For example, the factor or dimension superiority can be measured with the traits educated-uneducated, rich-poor and fluent-disfluent (Zahn and Hopper, 1985: pp. 117-121).

In a questionnaire, the participants are asked to answer open and/or closed questions. Open questions are used to give the participants the opportunity to react in every way they want. However, this might not give the complete attitude participants have, because they might find it too much work to write everything they want to say down or they misunderstand a question. The closed questions in a questionnaire are mostly comprised of a 5- or 7-point scale as mentioned earlier in this paragraph (Agheyisi and Fishman, 1970: p. 148).

Cargile, Giles, Ryan, and Bradac (1994) divided some of the methods named above in three different categories: content analysis, direct methods and indirect methods (Cargile et al., 1994: pp. 212-213). Content analysis include methods like (participant) observations and analysis of governmental policies and literature. The analysis of governmental policies is mostly used to compare the attitudes towards two or more languages. Methods that are included in content analysis cannot be used to measure all kinds of attitudes, because they only measure the action component of attitudes (Cargile et al., 1994: p. 112).

Techniques from the direct methods-category are used to measure overt attitudes towards one or more languages or dialects. Methods like a questionnaire or an interview belong to this category (Cargile et al., 1994: pp. 112-113). Methods like the MGT, when it does not contain questions about the language spoken, fall in the category of indirect methods.
These measure the more covert attitudes. The indirect methods are said to be less influenced by social desirable answers than direct methods, because the participant does not know that he is providing his attitude to a language (Cargile et al., 1994: p. 113).

An example of the use of the MGT, is the research that Loureiro-Rodriguez, Boggess and Goldsmith did in 2013. They investigated the attitudes towards Galician from adolescents in the age of 16 to 20. They used a MGT to see what kind of covert attitudes there were towards different forms of Galician. They complemented the MGT with direct questions, because the MGT had been criticized for not having a reliable linguistic measuring variable (Loureiro-Rodriguez et al., 2013: pp. 141-143). With an extra test complementing the MGT, Loureiro-Rodriguez et al. (2013) wanted to create more reliable outcomes.

Loureiro-Rodriguez et al. found that Standard Galician was rated higher in the urban school than in the rural school. This was surprising, because the rural school taught 70% of its courses in Standard Galician. They explain this result by the fact that Standard Galician was the linguistic variety spoken most in the urban area and that way, got associated with new speakers of Galician. The test also showed that the children in the urban school rated Spanish higher on social values than either Standard Galician or non-standard Galician. Loureiro-Rodriguez et al. ended with a remarkable finding: there was a contradiction in how the participants perceived the female recordings. These were perceived more capable and appealing than the male recordings (Loureiro-Rodriguez et al., 2013: pp. 148-150).

An example of a questionnaire is the research Lasagabaster did in 2005. This was an examination of the attitudes towards Basque, Spanish and English, the three main languages in the Basque school system (Lasagabaster, 2005: p. 26). Lasagabaster wanted to see what kind of measurement is best for multilingual students by not testing them the same as monolingual people’s attitudes are tested. He tested undergraduate students from the University of the Basque Country, so all participants were above 18 years old. Lasagabaster provided them with a questionnaire, which he adapted from Baker (1992) and he made the questions more suitable for the multilingual situation in the Basque country. For example, he added all three languages in the questions together and he did not separate them in the questionnaire (Lasagabaster, 2005: pp. 30-31). The participants had to rate these statements on a five-point Likert scale.

The students had a positive attitude towards multilingualism and they did not want to have a dominant language in the Basque country. However, there was a difference between the group with Spanish as mother tongue and the group with Basque as mother tongue: the Basque group had a positive attitude towards Basque being the dominant language, whereas the Spanish group did not feel a necessity to have Spanish as a dominant language in the Basque country (Lasagabaster, 2005: pp. 38-39). The other conclusion Lasagabaster made,
was that the multilingual design of the questionnaire did not diminish the influence of the mother tongue of speakers on their language attitudes (Lasagabaster, 2005: pp. 39-40).

Another example of a questionnaire is the study of Huguet and Llurda (2001). They looked at attitudes of bilingual children. They examined the attitudes of Catalan-Spanish bilinguals in the age of 13 and 14 years old, because attitudes “start to appear at the age of 10 and are clarified and consolidated during adolescence” (Huguet and Llurda, 2011: p. 271). Huguet and Llurda compared two different groups of Catalan-Spanish bilinguals: those living in Catalonia, where Catalan is an official language and those living in Aragon, where Catalan is not an official language (Huguet and Llurda, 2001: pp. 271-272).

Overall, the children had a favourable attitude towards both Spanish and Catalan. However, the Catalan children were more positive (85% favourable) than the Aragon children (only 50% favourable) towards Catalan. But, if the bilingual child was Spanish dominant, he or she had a more positive attitude towards Spanish than the Catalan dominant child. This only occurred when the children lived in Catalonia. When they lived in Aragon, the Catalan dominant children had a more positive attitude towards Catalan than the Spanish dominant children (Huguet and Llurda, 2001: pp. 273-275). Thus, this research showed that bilingualism can influence the attitudes of children.

In this paragraph some methods for examining attitudes have been described and examples of the use of these methods have been given. The next paragraph will discuss earlier research towards attitudes towards Frisian.

2.2.4 Attitudes towards Frisian

Now we have discussed what an attitude is and how to measure it, this paragraph will discuss earlier research towards language attitudes. It will focus on attitudes towards Frisian. This paragraph will provide some final information before the current research is explained in paragraph 2.3.

The attitudes towards Frisian have been examined many times before (Ytsma, 2007: p. 150). For example, Ytsma studied it more than once. In 2007 he wrote about the attitudes towards Frisian. In this research, Ytsma looked at the attitude of students who were in their first year of teacher training, the mean age being almost 19 years old. This research was done in 2004 and Ytsma used a questionnaire that was also used by the other researchers working on the book Multilingualism in European Bilingual Contexts: Language Use and Attitudes. This questionnaire consisted of three parts with direct questions towards language use and attitudes, based on Baker (1992).

The results showed that most students used Dutch for communicating in school context and that they used Frisian at home. They also thought that Frisian was not quite necessary for school projects, but that it was important for getting a job and living in Fryslân
(Ytsma, 2007: pp. 153-157). When looked at the attitudes, negative attitudes towards all three languages involved in this study (Dutch, English and Frisian) were exceptional. However, for English most students were neutral whereas most students held positive attitudes towards Dutch and Frisian (Ytsma, 2007: p. 157). Students with Frisian as mother tongue had more positive attitudes towards Frisian than bilingual students and students with a Dutch mother tongue. It was just the other way around for Dutch: there the students with Dutch as mother tongue and the bilingual students were more positive than the students with a Frisian mother tongue (Ytsma, 2007: p. 158).

One of the first measurements of the attitudes of children towards Frisian is also from Ytsma (1990). Ytsma used an indirect method (MGT) and a more direct method (a small questionnaire with a Likert-scale) to measure what the attitudes were of the children and if age, language background and gender had an influence on the attitudes (Ytsma, 1990: pp. 172-173). There were 142 pupils involved from grade 5 (around 9 years old) and grade 8 (around 12 years old). In the direct measurement (the Likert-scale), the Dutch pupils had a more negative attitude towards Frisian than the Frisian pupils (Ytsma, 1990: p. 175). However, the attitudes of the Frisian pupils became more negative, since the ratings from the pupils in grade 8 were more negative than those from the Frisian pupils in grade 5. The attitudes of the Dutch pupils remained almost the same. The attitude of the boys also almost remained the same, but the attitude of the girls became more negative when they got older (Ytsma, 1990: p. 175).

The indirect measures showed that the children in both grades showed no difference between Frisian and Dutch on solidarity, but they rated Dutch and Frisian different on status. Dutch gets a higher status than Frisian (Ytsma, 1990: p. 177). Gender also played a role here, because boys rated Frisian lower on status than the girls in the experiment (Ytsma, 1990: p. 179). Ytsma also mentions that the MGT might not show big differences between the different languages since children might not yet have developed a covert attitude to speakers of a language (Ytsma, 1990: p. 180).

A more recent research to attitudes towards Frisian came from Swarte (2011), who used two different methods to see if those caused different results. She looked at attitudes of adults, both parents from children at trilingual schools and students and parents from children at monolingual schools. Swarte made an online test which consisted of two parts. The first part was an MGT, to use an indirect method, and the second part consisted of questions, to use a direct method.

Swarte found that there was no difference between parents from children at trilingual schools and the other adults (2011, p. 86). She also found that the attitudes of the adults have become slightly more positive towards Frisian than they were in the research of Jonkman (1990, in Swarte, 2011) and Ytsma (1990), but that the attitudes towards learning Frisian
were relatively negative (Swarte, 2011: p. 86). However, the different testing methods influenced the attitudes to a certain extent: the covert attitudes (tested by the MGT) were a bit more positive than the overt attitudes that were measured by the direct questions (Swarte, 2011: p. 81).

The most recent research discussed in this paragraph is the last one from Hilton and Gooskens. In 2013 they did a large research towards covertly and overtly held attitudes towards Frisian. They selected participants in the age 16 to 18 in five schools in the Netherlands, including two schools in the province of Fryslân. They used an MGT to measure the covert attitudes and some direct questions to rate the overt attitudes. Their MGT was based on the framework of Zahn and Hopper (1985) (Hilton and Gooskens, 2013: pp. 146-148).

Hilton and Gooskens found that the Frisian-speaking students had a more positive attitude towards Frisian than the Dutch-speaking students. Next to that, Dutch-speaking participants living in Fryslân rated Frisian as sounding poorer than Dutch-speaking participants living outside of Fryslân did. Concluding, the direct questions showed that the Dutch-speaking students rated Frisian lower than the Frisian-speaking students, confirming the results of the MGT (Hilton and Gooskens, 2013: pp. 151-154). In contrast to Swartes research, this time different methods did not lead to different attitudes. A reason for this might be the age of the participants.

After summarizing this earlier research towards language attitudes, we can say that a questionnaire and/or MGT are often used to examine attitudes. When looking at Frisian, it is mostly rated lower on status than Dutch and mother tongue plays a role in the attitudes: participants with Frisian as mother tongue rate Frisian higher than those with a Dutch mother tongue. In the next paragraph, the current research questions and hypotheses will be shown, based on the theories discussed here.

2.3 Current study
The literature shows different results toward Frisian and other minority languages. Some minority languages are rated high, like Catalan (Huguet and Llurda, 2001) and Basque (Lasagabaster, 2005), whereas others like Frisian (Ytsma, 2007) and Galician (Loureiro-Rodriguez et al., 2013) are rated lower on certain points than the majority language in an area. Above that, Baker (1992) stated that language attitudes are likely to be influenced by education.

Since education can influence the attitudes of children, it is good to examine the attitudes of teachers towards the languages that the children learn in school. In Fryslân, that is Dutch and Frisian (and later on, English). Therefore, this research focusses on the attitudes
of students who will become the next generation of teachers in the upcoming four years. This research only takes Dutch and Frisian into account.

The main question is: What kind of attitudes do teacher training students have towards Frisian and Dutch?

The sub-questions asked are:
1) Is there a difference in the attitudes of students from the Pabo and the Aolb?
2) Is there a difference in the attitudes of students who speak Frisian at home and students who speak Dutch at home?
3) Is there a difference in the attitudes of students who have a high level of Frisian and students who have a low level of Frisian?

The corresponding hypotheses are:

Main: The expected attitude from the teacher training students is that they have a positive attitude towards both Dutch and Frisian, like the students had in the research from Ytsma (2007). A positive attitude towards both languages has also been shown before by Ytsma (1990) and Swarte (2011).

Sub-question 1: I expect that the students from the Pabo have a more positive attitude towards Frisian than the students from the Aolb, because Frisian plays a big role in the primary schools in the province of Fryslân, where the Pabo students will have contact with. The Aolb students have less connection with Fryslân, because they also have university courses that do not connect to the province.

Sub-question 2: The students who speak Frisian at home are expected to have a more positive attitude towards Frisian than to Dutch, whereas students who speak Dutch at home will have a more positive attitude towards Dutch than to Frisian. This has been shown before in Ytsma (2007) and Hilton and Gooskens (2013).

Sub-question 3: My expectation is that students with a high level of Frisian will have a more positive attitude towards Frisian than students with a low level of Frisian, because earlier research has shown that a high level of Frisian positively influences the attitudes towards both Frisian and Dutch (Swarte, 2011).
3. Methodology
This section describes which method is used to examine the attitudes of the teacher training students. To measure the attitudes, a combination of a Matched Guise Test (MGT) and direct questions has been used. The research design used, had the languages Frisian and Dutch, proficiency in Frisian, study and home language as independent variables and the scores on the MGT and direct questions as dependent variables.

3.1 will give information about the tests used for this research. After that, paragraph 3.2 will go in to detail about the participants of the test. Concluding, 3.3 will give information about the procedures and the analysis that was used.

3.1 Participants
To elicit the attitudes of the students towards Frisian, a combination of an indirect and direct method was used. The indirect method was a Matched-Guise Test (MGT) which contained of six sound clips with six questions each. The direct method was a list with ten direct questions that the participants had to answer on a 5-points Likert-scale. The MGT will be explained in paragraph 3.1.1 and the questionnaire will be explained in paragraph 3.1.2.

The test was made using the program Qualtrics, because this way the fragments could be uploaded easily and the test could be simply sent to the participants by e-mail.

3.1.1 Matched Guise test
The first part of the test was a MGT. The MGT was chosen, because a lot of earlier research on attitudes and in particular on attitudes towards Frisian, was done with a MGT (e.g. Swarte, 2011; Hilton and Gooskens, 2013; Loureiro-Rodriguez, Boggess and Goldsmith, 2013). Furthermore, the MGT offered a way to elicit the unconscious attitudes of the participants towards Frisian, as explained in the theory section.

The MGT existed of six fragments (two in Dutch, two in Frisian and two English fragments) that the participants had to listen to. These fragments dealt with a neutral subject, because this way the participants would not make the decisions based on their attitude towards the subject but based on their attitudes to the speaker. All six fragments told the same story about the weather in the Netherlands. The Dutch version will be showed below, with the translations in Frisian and English.

**Dutch text:**
Begin maart was het erg koud. Het werd zelfs min tien. Toen ook de grachten waren bevroren, gingen veel mensen in Amsterdam schaatsen op de gracht. De media uit Engeland, Duitsland en zelfs Amerika lieten dat zien op de tv. Ik ben ook wezen schaatsen. Het was dan wel koud, maar zo vaak krijg je niet de kans om op de gracht te schaatsen. Wel keek ik goed uit of het ijs dik genoeg was, want anders zak je er zo

---

**Frisian text:**
Dit was begonnen in maart, het was erg koud. Het werd zelfs min tien. Toen de grachten waren bevroren, gingen veel mensen in Amsterdam schaatsen op de gracht. De media uit Engeland, Duitsland en zelfs Amerika lieten dat zien op de tv. Ik ben ook wezen schaatsen. Het was dan wel koud, maar zo vaak krijg je niet de kans om op de gracht te schaatsen. Wel keek ik goed uit of het ijs dik genoeg was, want anders zak je er zo
doorheen. Gelukkig was het ijs behoorlijk dik geworden. Na een week werd het weer warmer, waardoor we niet meer konden schaatsen. Gelukkig hebben we wel een foto als bewijs.

**Frisian text:**³

*Begjin maart wie it hiel kâld. It waard sels min tsien. Doe’t ek de grêften beferzen wienen, gienen in soad minsken yn Amsterdam te reedriden op ‘e grêft. De media út Ingelân, Dûtslân en sels Amearika lieten dat sjen op ‘e telefyzie. Ik haw ek reedriden. It wie dan wol kâld, mar sa faak krije je net de kâns om op ‘e grêft te riden. Ik seach wol goed út oft it iis tsjok genôch wie, want oars sakje je der sa trochhinne. Lokkich wie it iis behoarlik tsjok wurden. Nei in wike waard it wer waarmer en dêrtroch koenen wy net mear reedride. Lokkich hawwe wy wol in foto as bewiis.*

**English translation:**

In the beginning of March, it was very cold. The temperature even reached minus 10 degrees Celsius. When also the canals were frozen, a lot of people in Amsterdam started to skate on them. The English, German and even American media showed it on television. I also went ice skating. It was maybe cold, but you don’t get a chance to skate on the canals that often. I did look very carefully to see if the ice would hold me, because you can sink through it very easily. Luckily the ice became very thick. After a week, the temperature began to rise, so that we could no longer skate. Luckily, we have a picture as proof.

The recordings were made by three women, from now on speaker A, B and C, who were recorded in an office to avoid background noise. Unfortunately, there still is some background noise, but it is apparent in all fragments. Speaker A, who is a bilingual Frisian-Dutch speaker, indicated that she was fluent in both languages, but that she had an accent when she spoke Dutch. However, this is not a big problem, because most people in Fryslân are used to hear people speaking Dutch with an accent (Swarte, 2011: p. 32).

Speaker A was 42 years old and lived in Leeuwarden. She was born in Beetsterzwaag and had left the province of Fryslân for a few years. Speaker B was 21 years old and she recorded the Dutch and English fragments. She lived in Leeuwarden and was born in Winterswijk. Dutch is her mother tongue and she learned English when she was 10. Speaker C was 18 years old and recorded an English fragment. She lived in Leeuwarden and was born in Haarlem. She also learned English on the age of 10. The English recordings had a slight Dutch accent, however, this is quite normal when you hear English in the Netherlands. The

³This translation was made by Truus de Vries, because the author is not fluent in Frisian herself.
accent was not a problem, because only the fragments recorded by speaker A were used for analysis. The fragments from speakers B and C were used as distracting fragments. The recordings were made using the app Voice Recorder (Android version). This is an Android app. The duration of the fragments was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>33 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Frisian</td>
<td>34 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>37 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>40 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>42 seconds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: The duration of the fragments in seconds.*

There was not a big difference in duration between the three speakers, at least not between the same languages. The English fragment exists of a few more words than the Dutch and Frisian one, so those recordings take a little longer than the other two languages. The fragments were placed in two orders, order two was the mirrored version of order one. The reason for this is that the attention from the participants might decrease towards the end of an experiment. There were also no two fragments of the same speaker after each other, because then the participants might notice that the fragments were of the same speaker. The orders were randomly assigned by Qualtrics to the students.

**Order one:**
1. Speaker B: Dutch
2. Speaker A: Frisian
3. Speaker C: English
4. Speaker A: Dutch
5. Speaker B: English
6. Speaker A: Frisian

**Order two:**
1. Speaker A: Frisian
2. Speaker B: English
3. Speaker A: Dutch
4. Speaker C: English
5. Speaker A: Frisian
6. Speaker B: Dutch
Only fragments 2 and 4 from order one and fragments 3 and 5 from order two were used in the analysis. The other fragments were used as distracting fragments.

The participants could listen to each fragment as often as they wanted, as long as the participants were on the page of that fragment. There was no option to go back to a previous fragment in the test. All the fragments were on different pages, so after they filled in the question about fragment 1 and they clicked on the next-button, they could not go back to listen to fragment 1 again.

After the participants listened to each fragment, they were asked to rate the speaker on six personality traits that belonged to three dimensions: Attractiveness (traits: friendliness and likeability), Status (traits: perceived wealth and intelligence) and Integrity (traits: honesty and helpfulness). These dimensions and traits are based on the research of Swarte (2011), who based these on Jonkman (1982, in: Swarte, 2011) and Ytsma (1990) and on the research of Lambert and Tucker (1972). The trait “likeability” was not chosen from Swarte, she used attractiveness instead. However, since the researcher was not sure if the students would understand the attractiveness trait, she chose “likeability” (aardig in Dutch) which was used before by Lambert and Tucker (1972) and Ytsma (1990). The research from Lambert and Tucker (1972) and Ytsma (1990) also focussed on children, that is the reason why the trait “likeability” was chosen instead of “attractiveness” (aantrekkelijkheid in Dutch). The traits from the same dimension were not placed after each other.

The traits were presented on a five-points semantic differential scale, like Swarte (2011, pp. 34-35) did, with 1 for the negative pole and 5 for the positive pole of the traits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not helpful</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not intelligent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dishonest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unkind</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When the participants had finished ranking the six fragments, they proceeded to the second part of the test, the questionnaire with direct questions about Frisian.

3.1.2 Questionnaire
The questionnaire existed of ten statements with a 5-points Likert-scale on which the participants could say how much they agreed or disagreed with the statement. The first four statements dealt with the use of Frisian by the participants and were used as distracting statements, the second six statements dealt with the position of Frisian:

1) Every pupil in secondary education should have Frisian as a subject.
2) It is good to speak Frisian in other classes than in the Frisian language classes.
3) I use Frisian often as language on WhatsApp, Instagram or Facebook.
4) Everyone living in Fryslân should be able to speak Frisian.
5) Someone who speaks Frisian is rich.
6) Someone who speaks Frisian is kind.
7) Someone who speaks Frisian is honest.
8) Someone who speaks Frisian is friendly.
9) Someone who speaks Frisian is intelligent.
10) Someone who speaks Frisian is helpful.

The participants had to rate these statements on a one to five Likert-scale. The scale ran from 1: totally disagree to 5: totally agree. 2 stood for disagree, 3 for neither disagree, nor agree and 4 represented agree. These statements and scale were based on Swarte (2011) and Ytsma (1990). They were used to see what the overt attitudes of the participants were and to see if the participants maybe had a difference between how they acted in real life (the overt attitudes) and how they subconsciously react (the covert attitudes, tested by the MGT). The first four statements were used as distracting elements for the questionnaire and these were not analysed.

When the participants finished the ten statements above, they were asked to fill in some background questions. These included questions about their age, gender, languages spoken at home and with friends, self-reported level of Frisian understanding, speaking, reading and writing and which kind of teacher training they did.

After these background questions the test was finished and the participants could send it by clicking on the button. They also had room to ask any questions before sending their answers. In total the whole test lasted approximately 16 minutes. The complete test can be found in appendix one.
3.2 Participants
Since this report did research on the attitudes of teacher training students, these students had to be found. Furthermore, there should be groups that were enrolled in the Pabo and in the Aolb, because then we could compare the two groups. Therefore, the NHL university of applied sciences and Stenden university of applied sciences were asked if they could send the test to their students from the Pabo and Aolb. This way the participants could make the test at a time that suited them the best and they could not be influenced by the appearance of the researcher. The students could make the test from the 7th of May, 2018 till the 19th of May, 2018.

In the end, 41 students completed the test. The results of four participants were removed, because their age was relatively high compared to the other 37 participants (27, 28, 47 and 50 years old). The results of the remaining 37 participants have been analysed. The age of the participants ranged from 17 to 24, with a mean age of 20 years and 9 months. There were seven males participating, the other 30 participants were females.

Order 1 of the MGT was filled in by 15 students, the other 22 got the test with order 2 of the MGT. The participants all studied at the University of Applied sciences: 7 participants did the Aolb and 23 were enrolled in the Pabo program. The other 7 students followed the teacher training to become a Frisian teacher in secondary education or a minor Frisian. These students will form the other-category for sub-question one: the influence of the study.

The participants were also asked what language(s) they spoke at home: 13 participants spoke Dutch, 8 Frisian, 12 both Dutch and Frisian and 4 participants spoke English and Dutch. To determine the level of Frisian, the students rated their level of understanding, speaking, reading and writing Frisian on a scale from “not/bad” to “very good”. The students with a high level of Frisian are those who rated themselves good/very good on all levels, and those who rated themselves good/very good on understanding, speaking and reading Frisian and reasonable on Frisian writing. The other students form the group with a low level of Frisian. 17 students have a high level and 20 students a low level of Frisian.

3.3 Procedures and analysis
The test was made in the program Qualtrics and spread through e-mail. The participants received small instructions, which can be found in Appendix 1. These instructions were in such a way that the participants did not fully get the intentions of the research. The direct questions were placed after the MGT, to ensure that the participants were not thinking of their attitudes before they were asked about them.

The participants could only go forward in this test, there was no option to go back to the questions, fragments or sections they already answered. This to make sure that the answers could not be influenced by the second thoughts participants might have had during the test.
The participants were told that they were going to participate in a test which would use sound fragments and other questions to investigate the role of languages in the educational field. The participants could stop at any time during the test and the results were anonymized afterwards.

In Qualtrics, a link was made and this was sent to the students by their teachers. The instruction was provided both in the e-mail and in the test itself, the instructions were the same in the e-mail and test. There was also a progression bar visible in the screen, so the participants could see their progress during the test. The participants could choose when they made the test themselves. Thus, the test conditions were not the same for everyone.

After all participants answered the questions, the results were downloaded and cleared from any personal information. Then the results were put into different Excel files and analysed using Rstudio (R Core Team, 2017), the psych-package in R (Revelle, 2018) and the car-package in R (Fox and Weisberg, 2011). The scores from the MGT and questionnaire were numbered, where a 1 stood for the “totally disagree”-stance or the left point of the trait. A 5 was given to the furthest right point of the trait or the “totally agree” answers. For example, “unfriendly” was rated 1 and a point in the middle was given a 3. “friendly” was rated 5 points.

After these results were loaded in Rstudio, a factor analysis was performed. The factor analysis tried to find factors on which multiple variables loaded and decreased in this way the number of dependent variables I had. It analysed the scores and gave a correlation score for each variable per factor. The factor on which the correlation score is the highest, is the factor on which the variable is counted. The Dutch and Frisian fragment were analysed separately, because in this way each participant would get a score for Dutch and a score for Frisian and then the languages could be compared.

After the dependent variables, the traits from the MGT and question 5 till 10 from the questionnaire, had been decreased to five factors, multiple t-tests, Anova’s and correlations were performed, where the α-level always was 0.05. It is very common in the field of linguistics to use this α-level. These analyses will be discussed in detail in the next section.

The independent variables in these tests were the languages Frisian and Dutch, the studies Pabo, Aolb and other, the home languages Dutch, Frisian and bilingual Frisian-Dutch and the level of Frisian. The dependent variables were the five factors from the factor analysis which will be discussed in paragraph 4.1.
4. Results
In this section, the analysations of the MGT and questionnaire will be presented. The statistical tests have been done in the program Rstudio (R Core Team, 2017).

4.1 Factor Analysis
First, a factor analysis was performed to see if the scores from the MGT and questions came from a common factor. A factor analysis was conducted on the 6 Frisian items from the MGt with a varimax rotation. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure showed that the sample was good for analysis: KMO = 0.80, which is above the critical limit of 0.5 (Field, 2013: pp. 684-685), and all six individual items had a MSA-score of 0.75 or higher, which is well above the acceptable limit of 0.50 (Field, 2013: pp. 681-685). An initial analysis was run to obtain the eigenvalues for each factor in the data. Two factors had a value above Kaiser’s criterion of 1 and in combination explained 75.1% of the variance. Table 2 shows the factor loadings after rotation. The items that cluster together on the same factor suggest that factor 1 represents the social dimension and factor 2 represents the status dimension. This can be seen in table 2, where the yellow marked scores form the factor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1 (social dimension)</th>
<th>Factor 2 (status dimension)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived wealth</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>0.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability</td>
<td>0.677</td>
<td>0.444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: Factor loadings Frisian items.*

A factor analysis was also conducted on the 6 Dutch items from the MGT with a varimax rotation. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure showed that the sample was good for analysis: KMO = 0.60, which is above the critical limit of 0.5 (Field, 2013: pp. 684-685). However, not all six individual items had a MSA-score of 0.5 or higher, which is the acceptable limit (Field, 2013: pp. 681-685). Only item 1, 3, 5 and 6 had a MSA-score of 0.5 or higher. Since the KMO measurement showed that the sample was good for analysis, the factor analysis was still run. An initial analysis was performed to obtain the eigenvalues for each factor in the data. Two factors had a value well above Kaiser’s criterion of 1 and in combination explained 66.8% of the variance. Table 3 shows the factor loadings after rotation. The items that cluster together on the same factor suggest that factor 1 represents a
social dimension and factor 2 represents a status dimension. This is the same as in the Frisian items. This can be seen in table 3, where the yellow marked scores form the factor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Factor 1 (social dimension)</th>
<th>Factor 2 (status dimension)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>0.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived wealth</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td>0.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>-0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>0.146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3: Factor loadings Dutch items.*

Concluding, a factor analysis was conducted on the 6 direct question items with a varimax rotation. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure showed that the sample was good for analysis: KMO = 0.91, which is above the critical limit of 0.5 (Field, 2013: pp. 684-685), and all six individual items had a MSA-score of 0.88 or higher. Which is well above the acceptable limit of 0.50 (Field, 2013: pp. 681-685). An initial analysis was run to obtain the eigenvalues for each factor in the data. One factor had a value well above Kaiser’s criterion of 1 and explained 84.8% of the variance. Table 4 shows the factor loadings after rotation. The items that cluster together on the same factor suggest that factor 1 represents likability of Frisian. This can be seen in table 4, where the scores are shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stelling</th>
<th>Factor 1 (likeability of Frisian)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.937</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4: Factor loadings questionnaire.*

After the factor analysis, the factor scores for every participant were calculated. Each participant got five scores: one for the social dimension in Frisian, one for the social dimension in Dutch, one for the status dimension in Frisian, one for the status dimension in Dutch and one for the likeability of Frisian. This, because the questionnaire only asked questions regarding Frisian. The scores were the sum of the traits that loaded on the factor. For example: the factor “social dimension Frisian” consisted of the traits friendliness,
helpfulness, honesty and likeability. So the score on the factor was the sum of the scores on these traits. The scores of each trait ranged from 1 to 5, so the score for a participant on the factor “social dimension Frisian” could range from four, when he rated each trait a 1, to twenty, when each trait was rated a 5. The scores on the factor “status dimension Frisian” could range from two to ten, because this factor only consisted of two traits: perceived wealth and intelligence. The social and status factors for Dutch could have the same range as those of Frisian. The mean scores, standard deviation and range of each factor can be seen in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social dimension Frisian (possible range 4-20)</td>
<td>16.32</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>12-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social dimension Dutch (possible range 4-20)</td>
<td>15.70</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status dimension Frisian (possible range 2-10)</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status dimension Dutch (possible range 2-10)</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability Frisian (possible range 6-30)</td>
<td>17.54</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>6-30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Descriptive statistics of the scores for the different factors.

4.2 Main question
The main question of this study was: What kind of attitudes do teacher training students have towards Frisian and Dutch? And the corresponding hypothesis was: The expected attitude from the teacher training students is that they have a positive attitude towards both Dutch and Frisian, like the students had in the research from Ytsma (2007). A positive attitude towards both languages has also been shown before by Ytsma (1990) and Swarte (2011).

A paired sample t-test showed that there was no significant difference between the scores on the social dimension for Frisian and the scores on the social dimension for Dutch: $t(36) = 1.72, p = 0.09$. After this, a correlation analysis was performed to see if the scores correlated. This analysis (Pearson’s R) showed that scores on the social dimension for Frisian and Dutch were significantly, positively related ($t(35) = 3.80, r = 0.540, p <0.01$). This strong relationship (Field, Miles and Field, 2012: pp. 58-59) suggests that if participants rate Frisian high on the social dimension, they also rate Dutch high on the social dimension. If Dutch is rated low on the social dimension, Frisian is also rated low. This correlation can also be seen in figure 1. The descriptive statistics are shown in table 5 above.

A paired sample t-test showed that on average, the participants rated the Dutch fragment higher on the status traits ($M = 7.43, SD = 1.04$) than the Frisian fragment ($M = 7.03, SD = 1.12$). This difference was significant: $t(36) = -2.26, p < 0.05$. This effect was of a
medium size: \( r = 0.35 \) (Field et al., 2012: pp. 58–59). This can also be seen in figure 2. The descriptive statistics are shown in table 5 above.

The relationship between the scores on the likeability dimension and the other dimensions has also been tested. This was to see if there was a relationship between the covert and overt attitudes of the participants. The descriptive statistics can be found in table 5 above. The results from the analysis can be found in table 6 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>( r )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social dimension for Frisian and likeability</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social dimension for Dutch and likeability</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status dimension for Frisian and likeability</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status dimension for Dutch and likeability</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6: Statistic scores from the correlation test between the likeability dimension and other dimensions.*

*Figure 1: Scatterplot showing the relationship between the scores on the social dimension for Frisian and Dutch.*
4.2 Sub-questions

4.2.1 Sub-question 1

The first sub-question of this study was: Is there a difference in the attitudes of students from the Pabo and the Aolb? The corresponding hypothesis was: I expect that the students from the Pabo have a more positive attitude towards Frisian than the students from the Aolb, because Frisian plays a big role in the primary schools in the province of Fryslân, where the Pabo students will have contact with. The Aolb students have less connection with Fryslân, because they also take university courses which do not connect them to the province.

To answer sub question one, five hypotheses were tested:

- H1: There is no difference between the three student groups in the scores on the social dimension for Frisian.
- H2: There is no difference between the three student groups in the scores on the social dimension for Dutch.
- H3: There is no difference between the three student groups in the scores on the status dimension for Frisian.
- H4: There is no difference between the three student groups in the scores on the status dimension for Dutch.
- H5: There is no difference between the three student groups in the scores on the likeability for Frisian.
The alternative hypotheses are that there is a difference in scores between the students from different studies. For this test, the participants are split in three groups: Pabo students, AOLB students and other students.

4.2.1.1 Hypothesis 1
First the descriptive statistics have been measured. These can be found in table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>Pabo-group</th>
<th>Aolb-group</th>
<th>Other-group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>16.32</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>16.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Descriptive statistics of the scores for the social dimension of Frisian.

A one-way Anova showed that there was no significant difference between the Pabo-, Aolb- and Other-group on the social dimension of Frisian: $F(2,34) = 1.83, p = 0.18$.

4.2.1.2 Hypothesis 2
First the descriptive statistics have been measured. These can be found in table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>Pabo-group</th>
<th>Aolb-group</th>
<th>Other-group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>16.43</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Descriptive statistics of the scores for the social dimension of Dutch.

A one-way Anova showed that there was no significant difference between the Pabo-, Aolb- and Other-group on the social dimension of Dutch: $F(2,34) = 0.673, p = 0.52$.

4.2.1.3 Hypothesis 3
First the descriptive statistics have been measured. These can be found in table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>Pabo-group</th>
<th>Aolb-group</th>
<th>Other-group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Descriptive statistics of the scores for the status dimension of Frisian.

The preliminary Shapiro-Wilk normality test showed that the scores were not completely normally distributed. However, a one-way Anova was performed, but the results from this test are doubtful and should be tested again. This one-way Anova showed that there was a significant difference between the Pabo-, Aolb- and other group on the status dimension of
Frisian: $F(2, 34) = 7.307, p = 0.002$. A Tukey post-hoc test showed that there was a significant difference between the Aolb-group and the Pabo-group: $p = 0.003$. The Pabo-group rate Frisian significantly higher on the status dimension of Frisian ($M = 7.48, SD = 1.04$) than the Aolb-group ($M = 6, SD = 0.82$). There were no other significances found. This difference can also be seen in figure 3 below.

![Dispersion in scores](image)

**Figure 3**: Boxplot showing the dispersion in the scores of the participants for the status dimension of Frisian divided by study: Pabo (left side), Aolb (middle) and other studies (right side).

4.2.1.4 Hypothesis 4
First the descriptive statistics have been measured. These can be found in table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>Pabo-group</th>
<th>Aolb-group</th>
<th>Other-group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 10**: Descriptive statistics of the scores for the status dimension of Dutch.

A one-way Anova showed that there was no significant difference between the Pabo-, Aolb- and Other-group on the status dimension of Dutch: $F(2,34) = 2.956, p = 0.07$.

4.2.1.5 Hypothesis 5
First the descriptive statistics have been measured. These can be found in table 11.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>Pabo-group</th>
<th>Aolb-group</th>
<th>Other-group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>17.54</td>
<td>16.83</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>20.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Descriptive statistics of the scores for the likeability of Frisian.

A one-way Anova showed that there was no significant difference between the Pabo-, Aolb- and Other-group on the likeability of Frisian: $F(2,34) = 1.236$, $p = 0.30$.

4.2.2 Sub-question 2
The second sub-question asked in this research was: Is there a difference in the attitudes of students who speak Frisian at home and the students who speak Dutch at home? It was expected that the students who speak Frisian at home had a more positive attitude towards Frisian than the students who speak Dutch at home, because this was shown before by Ytsma (2007) and Hilton and Gooskens (2013). For this sub-question, three language groups were made: students with Dutch as home language, students with Frisian as home language and students with both Dutch and Frisian as home language. The four students who spoke another language than Dutch or Frisian at home are not included in this part of the test.

To answer sub question two, the following hypotheses were set.
- **H1**: There is no difference between the three language groups in the scores on the social dimension for Frisian.
- **H2**: There is no difference between the three language groups in the scores on the social dimension for Dutch.
- **H3**: There is no difference between the three language groups in the scores on the status dimension for Frisian.
- **H4**: There is no difference between the three language groups in the scores on the status dimension for Dutch.
- **H5**: There is no difference between the three language groups in the scores on the likeability for Frisian.

The alternative hypotheses are that there is a difference in scores between the students with different home languages.

4.2.2.1 Hypothesis 1
First the descriptive statistics have been measured. These can be found in table 12.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>Frisian-group</th>
<th>Dutch-group</th>
<th>Bilingual-group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>16.58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Descriptive statistics of the scores for the social dimension of Frisian.

A one-way Anova showed that there was no significant difference between the Frisian-, Dutch- and Bilingual-group for the social dimension of Frisian: $F(2,30) = 2.935, p = 0.07$.

4.2.2.2 Hypothesis 2
First the descriptive statistics have been measured. These can be found in table 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>Frisian-group</th>
<th>Dutch-group</th>
<th>Bilingual-group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>15.64</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>15.69</td>
<td>16.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Descriptive statistics of the scores for the social dimension of Dutch.

A one-way Anova showed that there was no significant difference between the Frisian-, Dutch- and Bilingual-group for the social dimension of Dutch: $F(2,30) = 1.434, p = 0.25$.

4.2.2.3 Hypothesis 3
First the descriptive statistics have been measured. These can be found in table 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>Frisian-group</th>
<th>Dutch-group</th>
<th>Bilingual-group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Descriptive statistics of the scores for the status dimension of Frisian.

The preliminary Shapiro-Wilk normality test showed that the scores were not completely normally distributed. However, a one-way Anova was performed, but the results from this test are doubtful and should be tested again. This one-way Anova showed that there was a significant difference between the Frisian-, Dutch- and Bilingual-group for the status dimension of Frisian: $F(2, 30) = 5.213, p = 0.01$. A Tukey post-hoc test showed that there was a significant difference between the Bilingual-group and the Dutch-group: $p = 0.008$. The Bilingual-group rate Frisian significantly higher on the status dimension of Frisian ($M = 7.75, SD = 0.97$) than the Dutch-group ($M = 6.54, SD = 0.97$). There were no other significances found. This can also be seen in figure 4 below.
### 4.2.2.4 Hypothesis 4

First the descriptive statistics have been measured. These can be found in table 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>Frisian-group</th>
<th>Dutch-group</th>
<th>Bilingual-group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 15: Descriptive statistics of the scores for the status dimension of Dutch.*

A one-way Anova showed that there was no significant difference between the Frisian-, Dutch- and Bilingual-group for the status dimension of Dutch: $F(2,30) = 0.935, p = 0.40$.

### 4.2.2.5 Hypothesis 5

First the descriptive statistics have been measured. These can be found in table 16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>Frisian-group</th>
<th>Dutch-group</th>
<th>Bilingual-group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>17.55</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td>17.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>6.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 16: Descriptive statistics of the scores for the likeability of Frisian.*
A one-way Anova showed that there was no significant difference between the Frisian-, Dutch- and Bilingual-group for the likeability of Frisian: $F(2,30) = 2.386, p = 0.11$.

4.2.3 Sub-question 3

The last sub-question asked during this research was: Is there a difference in the attitudes of students who have a high level of Frisian and students who have a low level of Frisian? It was expected that the students who had a high level of Frisian would have a more positive attitude towards Frisian than the students who had a low level of Frisian, because earlier research showed that a high level of Frisian positively influenced the attitudes towards Frisian (Swarte, 2011). For this sub-question, two proficiency groups were made: students with a high level of Frisian and students with a low level of Frisian. The students in the high level group were those who rated themselves good/very good on all levels, and those who rated themselves good/very good on understanding, speaking and reading Frisian and reasonable on Frisian writing. The other students formed the low level group. Students who spoke only Dutch at home were included in this test, because they could have learned Frisian at school.

To answer sub question three, the following hypotheses were set.

1) H1: There is no difference between the two groups in the scores on the social dimension for Frisian.
2) H2: There is no difference between the two groups in the scores on the social dimension for Dutch.
3) H3: There is no difference between the two groups in the scores on the status dimension for Frisian.
4) H4: There is no difference between the two groups in the scores on the status dimension for Dutch.
5) H5: There is no difference between the two groups in the scores on the likeability for Frisian.

The alternative hypotheses are that there is a difference in scores between the students with different levels of Frisian: students with a high level will have more positive attitudes towards Frisian than those with a low level.

4.2.3.1 Hypothesis 1

First the descriptive statistics have been measured. These can be found in table 17.
Table 17: Descriptive statistics of the scores for the social dimension of Frisian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Complete group</th>
<th>High level Frisian</th>
<th>Low level Frisian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>16.32</td>
<td>17.18</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Welch Two Sample t-test showed that there was a significant effect of proficiency level. On average, the students with a high level of Frisian had a higher score on the social dimension of Frisian ($M=17.18$, $SD=2.21$) than the students with a low level of Frisian ($M=15.6$, $SD=2.19$). This difference was significant: $t(33.898) = 2.171 p < 0.05$. This effect was of a medium size: $r = 0.349$ (Field, Miles and Field, 2012: pp. 58-59). This can also be seen in figure 5.

Figure 5: Boxplot showing the dispersion in the scores of the participants for the social dimension of Frisian divided by level of Frisian: high level (high; left side) and low level (low; right side).

4.2.3.2 Hypothesis 2

First the descriptive statistics have been measured. These can be found in table 18.

Table 18: Descriptive statistics of the scores for the social dimension of Dutch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Complete group</th>
<th>High level Frisian</th>
<th>Low level Frisian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.18</td>
<td>16.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Welch Two Sample t-test showed that there was no significant effect of proficiency level on the social dimension of Dutch: \( t(27.72) = -1.27, p = 0.22 \).

4.2.3.3 Hypothesis 3

First the descriptive statistics have been measured. These can be found in table 19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Complete group</th>
<th>High level Frisian</th>
<th>Low level Frisian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 19: Descriptive statistics of the scores for the status dimension of Frisian.*

The preliminary Shapiro-Wilk normality test showed that the scores were not normally distributed. However, a Welch Two Sample t-test was performed, but the results from this test are doubtful and should be tested again. This Welch Two Sample t-test showed that there was a significant difference between the high level and low level Frisian group: \( t(34.989) = 2.773, p = 0.009 \). The participants with a high level of Frisian rate Frisia significantly higher on the status dimension of Frisian (\( M = 7.53, SD = 0.94 \)) than the participants with a low level of Frisian (\( M = 6.6, SD = 1.1 \)). This was a medium to strong size: \( r = 0.424 \) (Field, Miles and Field, 2012: pp. 58-59). This can also be seen in figure 6 below.

*Figure 6: Boxplot showing the dispersion in the scores of the participants for the status dimension of Frisian divided by level of Frisian: high level (high; left side) and low level (low; right side).*
4.2.3.4 Hypothesis 4
First the descriptive statistics have been measured. These can be found in table 20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Complete group</th>
<th>High level Frisian</th>
<th>Low level Frisian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 20: Descriptive statistics of the scores for the status dimension of Dutch.*

The preliminary Shapiro-Wilk normality test showed that the scores were not normally distributed. However, a Welch Two Sample t-test was performed, but the results from this test are doubtful and should be tested again. This Welch Two Sample t-test showed that there was no significant effect of proficiency level on the status dimension of Dutch: \( t (34.699) = 0.84, p = 0.40 \).

4.2.3.5 Hypothesis 5
First the descriptive statistics have been measured. These can be found in table 21.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Complete group</th>
<th>High level Frisian</th>
<th>Low level Frisian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>17.54</td>
<td>18.76</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 21: Descriptive statistics of the scores for the likeability of Frisian.*

A Welch Two Sample t-test showed that there was no significant effect of proficiency level on the likeability of Frisian: \( t (26.538) = 1.23, p = 0.23 \).

The next section will discuss the analyses that were done in this section.
5. Discussion
In this section the results will be interpreted and compared with earlier research. 5.1 will discuss the main question, thereafter 5.2 till 5.4 will discuss the sub-questions.

5.1 Main question
The central question asked by this research was: What kind of attitudes do teacher training students have towards Frisian and Dutch? My hypothesis was that the teacher training students would have a positive attitude towards both Dutch and Frisian, because that has been showed before by Ytsma (2007) and Swarte (2011).

The analysis showed that the hypothesis was confirmed. The teacher training students give almost the same rating towards the Frisian as the Dutch fragment on the social traits of the MGT. Since the mean score is 16.32 for Frisian and 15.70 for Dutch on the social traits, it means that their attitude is more on the positive side of the spectrum. This, because the scores could range from 4 to 20, where 20 was the positive side of the trait.

The students also score high on the status traits in both languages. The score could range from 2 to 10 and the means are 7.03 for Frisian and 7.43 for Dutch. Since the scores are more to the positive end of the spectrum, it can be said that the students rate both languages positive on status. Dutch is even rated significantly higher than Frisian on status. Thus, the covert attitudes of the teacher training students are positive towards both languages. This confirms the findings of Ytsma (1990; 2007) and Swarte (2011). In their research the overall attitude towards Frisian and Dutch was positive. It also confirms the findings of Ytsma (1990), where he already found that Dutch was rated significantly higher on status than Frisian.

However, the results from the direct questions are not as positive as those from the MGT. The mean is 17.54, and it could range between 6 and 30. The attitudes in the direct test are more around the neutral point (which is 18), whereas the scores for the MGT are around the somewhat agree point. This confirms Swarte’s finding that the attitudes differ between testing method (Swarte, 2011: p. 81), whereas it contrasts the findings of Hilton and Gooskens (2013), who did not find a difference between testing methods.

The next paragraphs will discuss the sub-questions.

5.2 Sub-question 1
The first sub-question was: Is there a difference in the attitudes of students from the Pabo and the Aolb? I expected that the students from the Pabo would have a more positive attitude towards Frisian than the students from the Aolb, because Frisian plays a big role in the primary schools in the province of Fryslân, who the Pabo students will have contact with. The Aolb students have less connection with Fryslân, because they also have university courses which do not connect to the province nor are followed in the province.
The analysations showed that there was a difference in only one aspect. The Pabo students rated Frisian significantly higher than the Aolb students regarding the status aspect of the language in the MGT. However, since this result was measured with a small group of participants and the outcomes did not completely follow a normal distribution, we can only say that this is a trend. The results should be tested again with a bigger group of participants.

For now, it can be said that the study which teacher training students follow can influence their covert attitudes towards Frisian. Students from the Pabo have a more positive attitude towards Frisian when looked at the status of Frisian.

5.3 Sub-question 2
The second sub-question dealt with the home language of the students. Earlier research showed that people with Frisian as home language had a more positive attitude towards Frisian than people who speak Dutch at home (Ytsma, 2007; Hilton and Gooskens, 2013). So, in this research the question was: Is there a difference in the attitudes of students who speak Frisian at home and students who speak Dutch at home? The hypothesis was that the students who speak Frisian at home are expected to have a more positive attitude towards Frisian than to Dutch, whereas students who speak Dutch at home will have a more positive attitude towards Dutch than to Frisian.

However, the results showed only a difference between the bilingual and Dutch students regarding the status dimension of Frisian. This result should also be interpreted as a trend, because the participant groups were not that big. It partly confirms the findings of Ytsma (2007) and Hilton and Gooskens (2013), who found a difference between Frisian and Dutch speakers. However, Ytsma also found that students with Frisian as a home language were more positive than bilingual students, which is not found in this study.

It might be the case that teacher training students have become more favourable towards Frisian the last years, or that just this group is more positive about the languages spoken in Fryslân. Another explanation can be the positive attention that Fryslân has received, because Leeuwarden is now the Cultural Capital of Europe. This might positively influence the thoughts of the students about Fryslân and Frisian. However, these are just speculations. This group should be tested again to see what the actual reason is.

5.4 Sub-question 3
The last sub-question dealt with the level of Frisian. As shown before in Swarte (2011: pp. 43-57), the level of Frisian can positively influence the attitudes towards Frisian and Dutch. Therefore, the last sub question was: Is there a difference in the attitudes of students who have a high level of Frisian and students who have a low level of Frisian? The hypothesis was that students with a high level of Frisian will have a more positive attitude towards Frisian than students with a low level of Frisian.
This hypothesis has been confirmed. The analyses showed that the students with a high level of Frisian had a significantly higher score on both the social and status dimension of Frisian. There were no significant differences for Dutch or the likeability of Frisian.

Thus, the students with a high level had a significantly more positive attitude regarding the social and status traits towards Frisian than students with a low level of Frisian. Therefore, the level of Frisian influences the attitudes towards Frisian. This research supports the findings from Swarte (2011), because the social traits are influenced by the level of Frisian. However, it differs from Swarte (2011) in one point: she found a positive correlation between level of Frisian and the attractiveness of Dutch, which was absent in this research. It can be the case that students have become less diverse in their attitudes towards Dutch, but another reason can be the small sample I have in this study. The last explanation can be the difference in age and educational level. The participants from Swarte were more diverse than the sample of this study. These reasons might explain the difference in outcomes from Swarte (2011) and this study. This result suggests that this part of the research should get more attention in the future.

The next paragraph will summarize this research and give some concluding remarks.
6. Conclusion
This research discussed the question: What kind of attitudes do teacher training students have towards Frisian and Dutch? The conclusion is that teacher training students have a neutral to positive attitude towards both Frisian and Dutch. This confirms the earlier research of Ytsma (1990; 2007) and Swarte (2011). However, there is a difference between the attitudes found with an indirect method (MGT) and direct method (questionnaire): the attitudes found with the MGT are more positive than those found in the questionnaire. This confirms the findings of Swarte (2011), who said that there is a difference in testing method. It also contradicts the research of Hilton and Gooskens (2013), who did not find a difference in testing methods.

Furthermore, the level of Frisian influences the attitudes on social traits, such as, honesty and friendliness when tested with a MGT. Students with a high level of Frisian have a more positive attitude towards Frisian than students with a low level of Frisian. This had been found before by Swarte (2011). The level of Frisian did not influence all traits, but Swarte (2011) showed that it can influence more traits, so this is a question for further research.

Contradictory to earlier research (e.g. Ytsma, 2007), this research did not find a big influence of home language on the attitudes towards Frisian or Dutch. Only the status of Frisian was influenced by the home language: bilinguals were more positive than students with Dutch as home language. Since this partly contradicts with earlier research, the researcher strongly recommends conducting further research in towards the influence of home language(s) on language attitudes.

Another direction that should be examined better is the influence that the study program could have on the attitudes towards Frisian. This study only found a difference on the attitudes towards the status dimension of Frisian, but the participant group in this study was relatively small. Therefore, this part of the study should be examined again.

The results of this research can be used to write new policies for Frisian and the role that it should play in the teacher training. Since Aolb-students have a lower attitude towards Frisian, it might be a good idea to give them more possibilities to learn about Fryslân and Frisian. The current Aolb program from NHL and Stenden university of applied sciences is located outside of the province. It would be good if the province of Fryslân tried to get a location for the study in Leeuwarden.

Another possibility could be to make it more attractive for students to follow the Frisian course in the Pabo program. The students should be asked about how Frisian could become more attractive to learn, because when students learn more Frisian, their level will be increase, which should lead to more positive attitudes.
The outcomes should not only lead to top-down changes, but it should also be tried to involve the students and teacher training programs to make new policies and gain new ideas that would improve the position of Frisian.
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Appendix I: Test

Hallo,

Ik ben Dorien en studeer aan de Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, locatie Leeuwarden. Om mijn studie Multilingualism af te ronden, doe ik onderzoek naar de rol van verschillende talen in het onderwijs. Dit onderzoek bestaat uit een aantal vragen over geluidsfragmenten die u krijgt te horen en een aantal stellingen. Het onderzoekje duurt ongeveer 15 minuten.

Alle gegevens uit het onderzoek zullen geanonimiseerd worden en zijn niet terug te leiden tot u. Boven in het scherm zal er een balkje meelopen, waaraan u kunt zien hoever u bent met de vragen.

Alvast heel erg bedankt voor het invullen!
Wanneer u vragen of opmerkingen heeft naar aanleiding van dit onderzoek, kunt u die mailen naar: d.l.te.boome@student.rug.nl

Groeten,
Dori
te Boome

Deel 1
U krijgt zo dadelijk vier korte fragmenten te horen waarin iemand vertelt over het weer. Bij elk fragment horen een aantal stellingen over de spreker. Het is de bedoeling dat u in elke rij een keuze maakt. Kies de optie die u het best vindt passen, u kunt namelijk geen goed of fout antwoord geven. Wanneer u de stellingen van verhaaltje 1 heeft ingevuld kunt u door naar nummer twee. U krijgt zo eerst een voorbeeld te zien en daarna start de test. Zorg ervoor dat u het geluid van uw computer aan heeft staan!

Voorbeeld
Klik op de Playbutton om naar het fragment te luisteren en vul daarna de gegevens in. U kunt het fragment meerdere keren beluisteren.

Welke indruk maakt deze spreker?
De spreker klinkt:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Onvriendelijk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vriendelijk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wanneer u vindt dat de spreker onvriendelijk klinkt, dan klikt u op het meest linker rondje, zoals hieronder te zien is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Onvriendelijk</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vriendelijk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wanneer u vindt dat de spreker vriendelijk klinkt, dan klikt u op het meest rechter rondje, zoals hieronder te zien is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Onvriendelijk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vriendelijk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wanneer u vindt dat de spreker een beetje onvriendelijk klinkt, kiest u voor het rondje onder nummer 2 en wanneer u vindt dat de spreker een beetje vriendelijk klinkt dan kiest u voor het rondje onder nummer 4. Wanneer u de spreker niet onvriendelijk, maar ook niet vriendelijk vindt klinken, dan kiest u voor het middelste rondje onder nummer 3.

Klik op volgende om te beginnen met het eerste deel van de test.

---

**Spreker 1**
Klik op de Playbutton om naar het fragment te luisteren en vul daarna de gegevens in. U kunt het fragment meerdere keren beluisteren.

Welke indruk geeft deze spreker u?
Deze spreker klinkt:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Onvriendelijk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onbehulpzaam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oneerlijk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onaardig</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Spreker 2**
Klik op de Playbutton om naar het fragment te luisteren en vul daarna de gegevens in. U kunt het fragment meerdere keren beluisteren.

Welke indruk geeft deze spreker u?
Deze spreker klinkt:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Onvriendelijk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onbehulpzaam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oneerlijk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onaardig</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Spreker 3**
Klik op de Playbutton om naar het fragment te luisteren en vul daarna de gegevens in.
U kunt het fragment meerdere keren beluisteren.

Welke indruk geeft deze spreker u?
Deze spreker klinkt:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Vriendelijk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Onvriendelijk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onbehulpzaam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oneerlijk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onaardig</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spreker 4**
Klik op de Playbutton om naar het fragment te luisteren en vul daarna de gegevens in.
U kunt het fragment meerdere keren beluisteren.

Welke indruk geeft deze spreker u?
Deze spreker klinkt:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Vriendelijk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Onvriendelijk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onbehulpzaam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oneerlijk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onaardig</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spreker 5**
Klik op de Playbutton om naar het fragment te luisteren en vul daarna de gegevens in.
U kunt het fragment meerdere keren beluisteren.

Welke indruk geeft deze spreker u?
Deze spreker klinkt:
Onvriendelijk  1  2  3  4  5  Vriendelijk
Arm  0  0  0  0  0  Rijk
Onbehulpzaam  0  0  0  0  0  Behulpzaam
Dom  0  0  0  0  0  Slim
Oneerlijk  0  0  0  0  0  Eerlijk
Onaardig  0  0  0  0  0  Aardig

Spreker 6
Klik op de Playbutton om naar het fragment te luisteren en vul daarna de gegevens in. U kunt het fragment meerdere keren beluisteren.

Welke indruk geeft deze spreker u?
Deze spreker klinkt:

Onvriendelijk  1  2  3  4  5  Vriendelijk
Arm  0  0  0  0  0  Rijk
Onbehulpzaam  0  0  0  0  0  Behulpzaam
Dom  0  0  0  0  0  Slim
Oneerlijk  0  0  0  0  0  Eerlijk
Onaardig  0  0  0  0  0  Aardig

Nu volgen er tien stellingen. Ook hier zijn geen goede of foute antwoorden mogelijk. Probeer niet te lang na te denken over elke stelling, want het gaat om uw eerste gevoel.

Deel 2
Geef bij elke stelling aan in hoeverre u het hier mee eens bent.

1) Iedere leerling in het voortgezet onderwijs zou Fries als vak moeten krijgen.
   1. Helemaal mee oneens.
   2. Een beetje mee oneens.
   3. Niet mee oneens, maar ook niet mee eens.
   4. Een beetje mee eens.
5. Helemaal mee eens.

2) Het is goed om Fries te spreken bij andere vakken dan het vak Fries.
   1. Helemaal mee oneens.
   2. Een beetje mee oneens.
   3. Niet mee oneens, maar ook niet mee eens.
   4. Een beetje mee eens.
   5. Helemaal mee eens.

3) Ik gebruik vaak Fries op WhatsApp, Instagram of Facebook.
   1. Helemaal mee oneens.
   2. Een beetje mee oneens.
   3. Niet mee oneens, maar ook niet mee eens.
   4. Een beetje mee eens.
   5. Helemaal mee eens.

4) Iedereen in Friesland zou Fries moeten kunnen praten
   1. Helemaal mee oneens.
   2. Een beetje mee oneens.
   3. Niet mee oneens, maar ook niet mee eens.
   4. Een beetje mee eens.
   5. Helemaal mee eens.

5) Iemand die Fries spreekt is rijk.
   1. Helemaal mee oneens.
   2. Een beetje mee oneens.
   3. Niet mee oneens, maar ook niet mee eens.
   4. Een beetje mee eens.
   5. Helemaal mee eens.

6) Iemand die Fries spreekt is aardig.
   1. Helemaal mee oneens.
   2. Een beetje mee oneens.
   3. Niet mee oneens, maar ook niet mee eens.
   4. Een beetje mee eens.
   5. Helemaal mee eens.

7) Iemand die Fries spreekt is eerlijk.
   1. Helemaal mee oneens.
   2. Een beetje mee oneens.
   3. Niet mee oneens, maar ook niet mee eens.
   4. Een beetje mee eens.
   5. Helemaal mee eens.

8) Iemand die Fries spreekt is vriendelijk.
   1. Helemaal mee oneens.
   2. Een beetje mee oneens.
   3. Niet mee oneens, maar ook niet mee eens.
4. Een beetje mee eens.
5. Helemaal mee eens.

9) Iemand die Fries spreekt is slim.
   1. Helemaal mee oneens.
   2. Een beetje mee oneens.
   3. Niet mee oneens, maar ook niet mee eens.
   4. Een beetje mee eens.
   5. Helemaal mee eens.

10) Iemand die Fries spreekt is behulpzaam.
    1. Helemaal mee oneens.
    2. Een beetje mee oneens.
    3. Niet mee oneens, maar ook niet mee eens.
    4. Een beetje mee eens.
    5. Helemaal mee eens.

Deel 3
Nu volgen er nog een paar achtergrondvragen. Daarna is de test afgelopen.
Heel erg bedankt voor het invullen van de test!

1) Ik ben ...... jaar.
   a. 17
   b. 18
   c. 19
   d. 20
   e. 21
   f. 22
   g. 23
   h. 24
   i. 25
   j. 26
   k. 27
   l. Anders, namelijk ..... 

2) Ik ben een
   a. Man
   b. Vrouw
   c. Wil ik liever niet zeggen

3) Ik ben geboren in
   a. Friesland
   b. Andere provincie

4) Ik ben opgegroeid in
   a. Friesland
b. Andere provincie

5) Thuis spreek ik: (u kunt hier meerdere antwoorden aankruisen)
   a. Fries
   b. Nederlands
   c. Engels
   d. Anders, namelijk: .................................................................

6) Met mijn vrienden spreek ik: (u kunt hier meerdere antwoorden aankruisen)
   a. Fries
   b. Nederlands
   c. Engels
   d. Anders, namelijk: .................................................................

7) Ik doe de volgende studie:
   a. Pabo
   b. Docent Fries
   c. Anders, namelijk ............

8) Ik zit in mijn ... studiejaar
   a. 1e
   b. 2e
   c. 3e
   d. 4e
   e. 5e
   f. Anders, namelijk ............

9) Ik volg het vak Fries.
   a. Ja
   b. Nee

10) Ik kan Fries ...... verstaan:
    a. Niet/Slecht
    b. Een beetje
    c. Redelijk
    d. Goed
    e. Heel goed

11) Ik kan Fries ...... spreken:
    a. Niet/Slecht
    b. Een beetje
    c. Redelijk
    d. Goed
    e. Heel goed

12) Ik kan Fries ......... lezen:
    a. Niet/Slecht
    b. Een beetje
c. Redelijk
d. Goed
e. Heel goed

13) Ik Fries ........ schrijven:
a. Niet/Slecht
b. Een beetje
c. Redelijk
d. Goed
e. Heel goed

Hartelijk bedankt voor het invullen van deze test! Als u nog vragen heeft, kunt u die hieronder stellen of mailen naar: d.l.te.boome@student.rug.nl.