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Abstract

West Frisian is a minoritized language spoken in the northern province of Fryslân in the Netherlands. The number of speakers of West Frisian is estimated at around 480,000, up to 27% of which are new speakers of the language.

There has recently been a spike of interest on the study of ‘new speakers’, especially in research concerning minoritized languages, with a large number of articles having been published since the first appearance of the term in English-language academic literature in Robert (2009). Answering O’Rourke, Pujolar and Ramallo’s (2015) call for more research on new speakers of different minoritized languages, this thesis aims to start the debate on new speakers of Frisian by surveying adults learning West Frisian at the evening courses offered by Afûk, their motivation to do so, their attitudes towards West Frisian and their language use.
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1. Introduction

The recent increase in the interest for ‘new speakers’ of minoritized languages, especially in the field of sociology of language (although not exclusively, cf. Nance, McLeod, Dunmore, & O’Rourke, 2016; Kasstan, 2017), has highlighted the importance of this speaker profile in language revitalization contexts. In fact, claims have been made that the survival of minoritized languages very often depends on non-speakers learning the language and adopting it as their own, or at least being able to understand it (e.g., Grinevald & Bert, 2011).

As pointed out in O’Rourke, Pujolar and Ramallo (2015, see also Pujolar & O’Rourke, 2018), new speakers “have come to constitute an important sociolinguistic group, in some cases outnumbering or replacing traditional native speaker communities altogether” (p. 2). Most studies have been so far based on Celtic (e.g., Hornsby & Quentel, 2013 and Hornsby, 2015 on Breton; McLeod & O’Rourke 2015 and Nance et al., 2016 on Scottish Gaelic; Ó hIfearnáin, 2015 on Manx; O’Rourke & Walsh, 2015 on Irish; Robert 2009 and Rosiak 2017 on Welsh) and Romance languages (e.g., Pujolar & Puigdevall, 2015 and Woolard, 2016 on Catalan; Jaffe, 2015 on Corsican; Kasstan, 2018 on Francoprovençal; O’Rourke & Ramallo, 2015 and O’Rourke & DePalma, 2016 on Galician; Costa, 2015 on Occitan), with the notable exception of Basque (e.g., Ortega, Urla, Amorrortu, Goirigolzarri, & Uranga, 2015). Little research has been done on new speakers of other languages, and no article has yet been published on new speakers of West Frisian.

West Frisian is a minoritized language spoken in the northern province of Fryslân in the Netherlands. The number of speakers of West Frisian is estimated at around 480,000, up to 27% of which are new speakers of the language (see ‘West Frisian’ under section 2.1.5.). Even though the percentage of new speakers is smaller than that of other minority contexts —it is reported at around 42% for Catalan in Catalonia (cf. Pujolar & O’Rourke, 2018), for example, and in some extreme cases of language shift there are only new speakers, as is the case of Manx (cf. Ó hIfearnáin, 2015)—, this new profile of speaker should be taken into account when designing, for instance, language promotion campaigns, and it is therefore essential to study their characteristics.

Despite the alleged importance of this speaker profile for the survival of minoritized languages —or perhaps because of it—, many studies have found controversial and even paradoxical discourses surrounding new speakers. In the case of
Corsican, for example, Jaffe (2015) claims that native-like competence is the reference to measure the success of language learning, but she also notes how unlikely it is for anyone in Corsica to have ‘native-like’ command of Corsican in all domains. In other words, new speakers are encouraged to look up to an ‘authority’ that Jaffe claims does not exist. In the Basque context, Ortega et al. (2015) found an interplay between the notions of authenticity, identity and legitimacy, noting that members of the community clearly distinguish between being a Basque speaker and being able to speak Basque. These issues seem to go even further in the Gaelic context, in which McLeod and O’Rourke (2015) affirm that new speakers and native speakers even see themselves as totally separate communities. Issues of authenticity and legitimacy also seem to feature prominently in the discourse around new speakers of Galician, in which new speakers fail to identify themselves as ‘real’ or legitimate speakers of the language (O’Rourke & Ramallo, 2015).

This project will attempt to start the conversation on new speakers of West Frisian by surveying adults learning the language in courses organized by Afûk, an organization for the promotion of the Frisian language and culture. An overview of the demographic characteristics of these learners will be provided, together with an analysis of their motivation to learn West Frisian, their attitudes towards the language and their linguistic behavior.

This thesis contains 6 sections. Section 2 of starts by presenting the key concepts at the core of this study and gives the reader an overview of the sociolinguistic context of West Frisian. The methodology and the questionnaire design are discussed in section 3, in order to facilitate the interpreting of the results presented in section 4 and discussed in section 5. Finally, section 6 draws some conclusions and puts forward some suggestions for future research on new speakers of West Frisian.
2. Literature background

This section analyzes the key concepts of ‘minoritized languages’, ‘motivation’, ‘attitudes’, ‘native speakers’ and ‘new speakers’. It also contextualizes West Frisian as a European linguistic minority, and it presents a brief discussion on statistical data of the knowledge and use of Frisian in the province, as well as a review of previous studies on motivation of learners and general attitudes towards the Frisian language.

2.1. Minoritized language

Minorities are commonly understood as “non-dominant groups of individuals” who share some characteristics which are “different from those of the majority population” (Thompson, 2001, p. 130). These characteristics may be national, ethnic, religious or linguistic, but they can also be defined by lifestyle choices (cf. Jennings, 1991; Beckett, 1995; Foa, 2015) or differences in physical and/or mental abilities (cf. O Braithwaite, 1990; McQuigg, 2003). For the purpose of this study, the focus will be placed on linguistic minorities.

In 1992, the Council of Europe passed the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages and defined them as “languages that are (a) traditionally used within a given territory of a State by nationals of that State who form a group numerically smaller than the rest of the State’s population; and (b) different from the official language(s) of the State”, explicitly excluding “dialects of the official language(s) of the State or the languages of migrants” (Council of Europe, 1992). The Charter also makes reference to ‘non-territorial languages’, which are defined as “languages used by nationals of the State which differ from the language or languages used by the rest of the State’s population but which, although traditionally used within the territory of the State, cannot be identified with a particular area thereof” (Council of Europe, 1992).

This definition seems to correlate with languages such as West Frisian or Welsh—sometimes labeled languages without a hinterland (Salamon, 2011)— and Russian as spoken in the Baltic states or Greek as spoken in other Balkan states—linguistic varieties often called ‘Dachlose Außenmundarten’ (Klos, 1987, as cited in Dal Negro, 2014) or ‘roofless external dialects’. Nevertheless, official languages are explicitly excluded, regardless of their vitality and their sociolinguistic situation, and so are the languages of migrants—more recently, several authors have argued for the inclusion of migrant
languages in the charter (cf. Dunbar, 2010; McDermott, 2016; Ruiz Vieytez, 2018). For this reason, and despite it being a legislative umbrella for linguistic minorities in Europe, the definition of the European Charter needs to be updated (cf. Climent-Ferrando, 2018; Ruiz Vieytez, 2018). To begin with, reference to ‘traditional’ should be dispensed with, as should the explicit exclusion of official and migrant languages, and the charter should account for new forms of communication and media (cf. Dunbar, 2010; Climent Ferrando, 2018).

In addition, the term itself has often been met with reluctance. Many see this characterization of minority languages as smaller as a double-edged sword: while it may help get the necessary resources to promote it, it may also stigmatize the language as unfit for wider communication, a language to be used only for ‘small’ purposes. A handful of other terms have been suggested —such as ‘lesser used’, ‘heritage’, ‘stateless’, ‘indigenous’, ‘dominated’, ‘threatened’, ‘endangered’, ‘ethnic’, ‘minoritized’ or ‘non-dominant’—, some of which have come to be used to refer to languages with specific sets of characteristics (e.g. ‘heritage’ language is commonly used to refer to the languages spoken by migrant populations). All these terms, in fact, reflect an opposition to so-called ‘majority languages’, also referred to as ‘dominant’, ‘national’ or ‘state’ languages (cf. Kosonen, 2010; Gorter & Cenoz, 2012).

In this thesis, the term ‘minoritized’ will be used to refer to languages such as West Frisian. This term was chosen to acknowledge the emergence of ‘minorities’ as a consequence of nation-state formation (Pujolar & O’Rourke, 2018), rather than an intrinsic characteristic of these communities, as well as to include languages with a fairly high number of speakers (e.g., Catalan, with approximately 10 million speakers; Basque, with around 800,000 speakers; or even West Frisian, with almost half a million speakers). A ‘minoritized’ language will henceforth refer to a language which, regardless of its number of speakers, is in a constant state of diglossia with a dominant language and “whose value is not recognized on the interactional scene by speakers of a sociolinguistically dominant language” (Kasbarian, 1997, p. 188).

2.2. Motivation of learners of minoritized languages

According to Gardner (2001, as referenced in Comajoan, 2012), motivation is the combination of ‘effort’, ‘desire’ and ‘attitude’, and it also seems to imply a clear ‘goal’, which links it to the notion of ‘success’. Several studies have looked at the role which
motivation plays in the process of second language learning (e.g., Noels, Pelletier, Clément, & Vallierand, 2000; Bernadó, Comajoan, & Bastons, 2009), and it seems clear that motivation has a significant effect on students’ performance and the development of new attitudes towards the language(s) (Comajoan, 2012).

Many models have been put forward to analyze motivation and its effects, from the so-called traditional model suggested by Gardner and Lambert in the late 1950s during their research with learners of French in Canada, to new approaches such as those by Noels (i.e., self-determination theory) and Dörnyei (i.e., ideal L2 self) (Comajoan, 2012), or factor analysis (e.g., Bernadó et al., 2009). In this thesis —and following the work of Robert (2009) on new speakers of Welsh—, motivation will be analyzed as a three-fold model (i.e., instrumental, integrative and personal) based on the work developed by Lambert and Gardner.

Table 1. Types of motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Personal gain (e.g., increased opportunities for employment; salary raise; etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate</td>
<td>Integrate in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learn about the culture of a given community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Own heritage or that of close ones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In minority contexts, the instrumental —or economic— value is often associated with the dominant —rather than the minoritized— language, which makes it less likely for learners to report instrumental motivation. In fact, in a study on the motivation of adults learning Galician in summer schools, O’Rourke and DePalma (2016) noted that none of the participants reported purely instrumental goals. Instead, their motivation to learn Galician was rooted in their interest for local culture (i.e., Personal motivation) or the fact that Galician was the language of their friends and/or family (i.e., Integrative motivation). These findings are very similar to those found by Rosiak (2017) on her study.

1 Lambert and Gardner, as referenced by Robert, 2009, p. 113
of motivation and learner trajectories of Polish new speakers of Welsh, as well as those found by Juarros-Daussà (2012) and Casesnoves-Ferrer and Juarros-Daussà (2015) on their study of language transmission in Catalan and Galician diaspora communities in New York.

2.3. Attitudes towards minoritized languages

Minoritized languages are often associated with rural life, away from modernity (Pietikäinen & Kelly-Holmes, 2013) or even unfit for present-day needs (as noted in Aguilar-Amat & Santamaria, 1999). This reinforces the position of the dominant language as the only language which guarantees access to modernity, the only tool for upwards social mobility (Pujolar & O’Rourke, 2018), and therefore the only language with economic incentives for ‘learners’.

This is hinted in an article by Henk Wolf, published in the Frisian-language magazine De Moanne in October 11th 2013. Wolf claims that “net-sprekkers fan it Dútsk yn Dútslân bliuwe net sa lang net-sprekkers. Net-sprekkers fan it Sorbysk of Noard-Frysk yn Dútslân bliuwe oer it generaal altyd net-sprekkers [Non-speakers of German in Germany do not remain non-speakers for long. Non-speakers of Sorbian or North-Frisian in Germany generally always remain non-speakers]”. As he also points out, however, this may be due to a manifested unwillingness of non-speakers to learn the language, but it is often just as much due to the invisibility to which speakers themselves subject these languages: “Komt in net-sprekker in sprekker tsjin, dan krijt er de lijerige taal net te hearren (…) Sa wurdt de lijerige taal stachoan in groepstaaltsje foar ynwijden” [If a non-speaker speaks with a speaker, he will not get to hear the ‘suffering’ language (…) Thus the ‘suffering’ language slowly becomes an ‘in-group language’]² (Wolf, 2013).

In addition, this depiction of minorities as romanticized communities stuck in time has also been the basis for strong ideologies of language ‘purism’. Linguistic innovation is often suspicious of interference, and dialectal usage is deemed ‘pure’ and ‘unsullied’ by borrowing (Tomas, 1988, as quoted in Robert, 2009, p. 97). Tensions arise often in minority contexts between ‘real’ language and ‘pure’ language, the latter often being the core of the standardized version of the language (cf. Hincks, 2000; Hornsby, 2015; Belmar, 2017).

² Translation from the Frisian original is mine. Single quotation marks are also mine.
Attitudinal studies are, therefore, a keystone of language revitalization processes and research on new speakers of minoritized languages. In fact, it was in an article on attitudes of L2 speakers of Welsh (Robert, 2009) that the term ‘new speaker’ was first used in an English-language journal. Negative attitudes towards a minoritized language can be linked several factors —e.g., social class, religion, national identity, etc. among others (Ó Riagáin, 2007)—, and may bring about a smaller number of new speakers and a greater difficulty to learn the language —especially due to the fewer opportunities available to practice (as reported for West Frisian in Belmar, Eikens, De Jong, Miedema, & Pinho, 2018).

Early research focused almost exclusively on the attitudes of speakers of the dominant language towards the minoritized language (e.g. Amorrortu, Ortega, Idiazabal, & Barreña, 2009; Robert, 2009), but a few studies also looked at the attitudes of native speakers for the sake of comparison (e.g., Ytsma, 1995). These comparisons revealed that, albeit higher than that of non-speakers, the attitudes held by the speakers of the minoritized language themselves were still fairly negative. In many minority contexts, in fact, the speakers of the minoritized language hold negative attitudes towards their own language —or at least less positive than their attitudes towards the dominant language (e.g., as found for West Frisian in Gorter, Jelsma, Van der Plank, & De Vos, 1984; Ytsma, 1995; Gorter & Jonkman, 1995 and Hilton & Gooskens, 2013).

More recent studies on the attitudes of new speakers have often found that these promote the minoritized language more actively than the native speakers themselves (cf. McLeod & O’Rourke, 2015; O’Rourke & Ramallo, 2015). New speakers are thus sometimes depicted by the majority language supporters as a militant group (Pujolar & Puigdevall, 2015), less likely to switch to the dominant language during a conversation (O’Rourke & Ramallo, 2015; Ortega et al., 2015) and often more actively involved in revitalization programs (Hornsby, 2015).

Furthermore, some studies have shown that top-down policies for language promotion may have a positive effect on attitudes among both speakers and non-speakers of the language (cf. Bourhis, 1983 on French in Quebec; Newman, Trenchs-Parera, & Ng, 2008 on Catalan in Catalonia; Bouzada-Fernández, 2003; and González 2011 on Galician; and Amorrortu et al., 2009 on Basque in the Basque Autonomous Community).
2.4. Native Speaker in minority contexts

The term ‘native speaker’ has been constantly featured in linguistic and sociolinguistic literature, and yet there seems to be little to no agreement as to how it can be defined (cf. Paikeday, 1985; Davies, 2003; Kubota, 2009; O’Rourke et al., 2015). In fact, the term seems to stem from European conceptions of citizenship and naturalization (Train, 2009), bound to the idea of a standard language (Milroy, 2001) which serves as the basis to position the elite as ideal speakers, a notion featured prominently, for example, in Generative Linguistics (Pujolar & O’Rourke, 2018). It is, in fact, a controversial term, one that many argue is too often used to disparage ‘non-native speakers’ and anchor a notion of monolingual purity (Holliday, 2015, as referenced in Weber & Horner, 2012, p. 18-19). In fact, ‘nativeness’ is often idealized —and romanticized— as the ‘most authentic’ form of language (O’Rourke et al., 2015).

As Kubota (2009) points out, native speakers are often thought to feature a “perceived superiority of their linguistic competence (...) in the areas of accuracy, fluency, range of vocabulary and knowledge of cultural nuances of language” (p. 234). In other words, ‘nativeness’ —or native-like command of the language— is often the goal ‘new’ speakers are encouraged to strive for, even in contexts where there is no clear set of language uses that may be labeled as ‘authentic’ or ‘native’ (Jaffe 2015). In fact, in research on minority language revitalization, studies have traditionally focused on native/heritage speakers (O’Rourke & Pujolar, 2013) and so have most language revitalization policies, often completely ignoring the needs of non-natives (O’Rourke & Ramallo, 2011; Woolard, 2016).

In minority contexts, however, a native speaker may actually show more contact phenomena than a new speaker. According to Doerr (2009), minority contexts —heritage language shift and revitalization— offer “a challenge to the belief in the automatic and complete competence of native speakers in their native languages” (p. 36). This conclusion can also be drawn from the findings of some more recent research on new speakers of Breton (Hornsby, 2015) and Frisian (Belmar et al., 2018) among others. This, therefore, challenges the notion of the idealized native speaker, which may be the reason why Grinevald and Bert (2011) left the term ‘native’ out of their seven-fold typology3 of speakers in a handbook on endangered languages. Instead, the term ‘fluent speaker’ is

---

3 The types of speaker distinguished by Grinevald and Bert (2011) are: fluent, semi-speaker, terminal speaker, rememberer, ghost speaker, neo-speaker and last speaker.
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suggested to describe the ‘idealized’ native speaker, and Hornsby (2015), for example, uses ‘traditional’ speaker to refer to those speakers who acquired the language through intergenerational family transmission, regardless of their proficiency.

Perhaps ‘speakerness’ —or ‘speakerhood’— should be thought in terms of language expertise, language inheritance and language affiliation (Leung, Harris, & Rampton, 1997, as referenced in Weber & Horner, 2012, p. 19) instead of the native-non-native dichotomy (O’Rourke & Ramallo, 2011). In this thesis, the term ‘native speaker’ will be used to refer to those speakers that acquired West Frisian through family transmission, regardless of their language proficiency and/or any other language they may have acquired in a similar fashion. It is worth noting, in fact, that in the case of West Frisian, in particular, most ‘native speakers’ report notably low writing skills (Provinsje Fryslân, 2015b).

2.5. New Speaker in minority contexts

‘New speakers’ have become a popular analytic category in studies on revitalization movements of minoritized languages, especially in the European context. From its first used in a scientific setting in an article on the attitudes of L2-speakers of Welsh in south-east Wales (Robert, 2009), it has been featured prominently in much of the literature written on language shift in Europe.

A new speaker is commonly defined as a person who had little to no exposure of the local minoritized language in their home or community, and who acquired it in immersion or bilingual education systems, through revitalization programs or in adult language classes (cf. Pujolar & O’Rourke, 2018). Other definitions also make reference to a “socially and communicatively consequential level of competence and practice” that learners need to reach to be considered ‘new speakers’ (Jaffe, 2015, p. 25); to the positive predisposition towards the language being acquired and the increasingly diverse origin of these ‘new speakers’ (Hornsby, 2015); or to the degree to which the speaker adopts the new language as part of their multilingual repertoire (O’Rourke & Pujolar, 2013). However, reading through the volume on “New Speakers of Minority Languages: the challenging opportunity” of the International Journal of the Sociology of Language, it is easy to realize that no definition seems to suit all contexts.

It is worth noting, furthermore, that the distinction between ‘native’ and ‘new’ speakers was first made colloquially in societies where this new profile of speakers had
started to gain relevance and became a self-defining label long before academics used it for analytical purposes. In fact, the use of the adjective ‘new’ to refer to a specific group of speakers is first recorded in the early 1980s in the Basque context. Those speakers of the language who had acquired it in *ikastolak*⁴ were referred to as ‘euskaldun berriak’ — literally, ‘new Basque speakers’ —, as opposed to ‘euskaldun zaharrak’ — literally, ‘old Basque speakers’ — who had learned the language at home (Urla, 1993, as referenced in O’Rourke et al., 2015, p. 3). In other contexts, such as Catalonia, more vague terms were used — e.g., ‘nous catalans’ or ‘new Catalans’ (Woolard, 1989) —, but that does not mean that ‘new speakers’ were less prominent.

As opposed to the strong idealization of ‘native’ speakers discussed in the section above — indexed as ‘rural’, ‘old’, ‘working class’, ‘traditional’, ‘authentic’ and ‘continuity’ —, in most minority contexts⁵, ‘new speakers’ are often portrayed as ‘urban’, ‘young’ and ‘middle class’, and their language is seen as ‘artificial’ and indexed as a ‘rupture’ with tradition (Costa, 2015, p. 132). These tensions around notions of ‘authenticity’ and ‘legitimacy’ are central to most research being done on new speakers, and it has been found to function as a ‘social closure’, a sort of ‘identity control mechanism’ (O’Rourke & Ramallo, 2013, p. 290) which may lead to frustration and may even prevent new speakers from using the language (McEwan-Fujita, 2010 and O’Rourke, 2011, as referenced in O’Rourke & DePalma, 2016, p. 4).

The label ‘new speaker’, in conclusion, marks a linguistic ‘re-embodiment’, the creation of a linguistic model in and of itself, and a shift of focus from the Fishmanian discourse of reversing language shift (cf. Fishman 1991; Kubota 2009) and the notion of ‘language loss’ to ‘revitalization’ — Grinevald and Bert (2011), for instance, claim that ‘neo-speakers’ are “central to language revitalization” (p. 51). Similar claims have been made by many authors for many languages — e.g., Hornsby (2015) on Breton; Ó hIfearnáin (2015) on Manx; Ortega et al. (2015) on Basque; or Dołowy-rybińska (2016) on the Sorbian languages (the latter, as referenced in Pujolar & O’Rourke, 2018, p. 4).

---

⁴ *Ikastolak* (*ikastola* in singular) is the name given to Basque-language immersion schools throughout the Basque-speaking territory.

⁵ In languages such as Catalan, new speakers do not necessarily fall into these categories (cf. Pujolar & Puigdevall, 2015; Woolard, 2016).
In the 1980s the newly restored Basque Autonomous Government started a series of revitalization policies that led to an unprecedented increase in the number of speakers of the language\(^6\) (Ortega et al., 2015). It is no coincidence that it was in the Basque context that a term similar to ‘new speaker’ (i.e., *euskaldun berri*) was first used colloquially. Basque immersion schools —D-model— have ensured the survival of the language: it is estimated that around 60% of Basques under the age of twenty-four can speak the language and over half of them acquired it at school (Ortega et al., 2015, p. 88). This apparent success of language revitalization policies in the Basque country, however, has not resulted into an increase in the use of the language (cf. Martínez de Luna & Suberbiola, 2008), which may be linked to the fact that new speakers of Basque are said to often refer to themselves as ‘being able to speak Basque’ rather than identifying as ‘speakers’ of the language (Ortega et al., 2015).

**Breton**

New-speaker-led revitalization programs in Brittany are said to encounter frequent frontal opposition by native speakers (Hornsby, 2015). Standard Breton, used mainly by new speakers —or *néo-bretonnants* (Timm, 2010; Hornsby, 2015)—, is often regarded with suspicion by native speakers (Hornsby & Quentel, 2013; Hornsby, 2015) and even intelligibility between traditional dialects and the Breton of new speakers is sometimes compromised (Hornsby, 2015). These tensions hinder the revitalization process of Breton, and the number of speakers is declining despite all the efforts put in *Diwan* schools across Brittany\(^7\).

**Catalan in Catalonia**

The Catalan case has often been cited as a successful case of language revitalization (e.g., Fishman, 1991, p. 323). Proficiency and prestige of the local language has definitely increased due to a series of language policies —especially in Catalonia, where these policies were more decisive and successful (Strubell & Boix, 2011, as referenced in

\(^6\) The current number of Basque speakers is estimated to be around 800,000 (Ortega et al., 2015, p. 86).

\(^7\) *Diwan* schools are Breton-language immersion schools, a system that started in 1977.
Pujolar & Puigdevall, 2015, p. 168). In addition, the demographic change in Catalonia has been more pronounced than in most European regions where a minority language is spoken, with almost 15% of the population reported as ‘migrant’ (Pera-Ros, 2017, p. 13; see also Juarros-Daussà & Lanz, 2009). Of those inhabitants of Catalonia who reportedly use Catalan ‘habitually’, approximately 42% are new speakers\(^8\) (Pujolar & Puigdevall, 2015), which represents a considerable percentage of the Catalan-speaking community. According to Pujolar and Puigdevall (2015), there are several key moments where people may undergo a linguistic ‘muda’ — a term coined by Pujolar and Gonzàlez (2013) to refer to ‘biographical junctures’ in which speakers change their linguistic behavior (Pujolar & Puigdevall, 2015, p. 168). These are often linked to circumstances where the language — in this case, Catalan — ceases to be used exclusively in academic settings and becomes a language of socialization.

**Corsican**

In the Corsican context, on the other hand, there seems to be no reference for ‘native’ competence in Corsican (Jaffe, 2015, p. 41). According to Jaffe (2015), there is virtually no speaker of Corsican that has the same proficiency in both French and Corsican in all contexts. In addition, the language is hardly ever used either in informal or formal situations, new speakers are reported to produce their own new contexts where the language can be used and, consequently, their own new standards of performance (Jaffe, 2015). New speakers of Corsican, therefore, seem to be immersed in the creation of a new type of Corsicanness, away from localism and purity, and they are mostly found in the bigger towns on the island. However, they are not alone in this process. Teachers have also been found to be actively involved in the construction of this new type of Corsican identity.

**Galician**

New speakers of Galician — or neofalantes (O’Rourke & Ramallo, 2015) — began to emerge in the 1960s and became a significant proportion of the Galician-speaking community mainly due to bilingual education policies in place since the 1980s (O’Rourke

---

\(^8\) There is no commonplace term in Catalan to refer to ‘new speakers’. Instead, the expression ‘new Catalans’ is sometimes used, but it does not refer exclusively to ‘new speakers’ of the language.
& Ramallo, 2015). Despite these revitalization policies, Galician seems to be losing native speakers (O’Rourke & Ramallo, 2013; O’Rourke & Ramallo, 2015; O’Rourke & DePalma, 2016), but attitudes towards the language are increasingly positive (Bouzada-Fernández, 2003) and the number of new speakers is on the rise (O’Rourke & Ramallo, 2015; O’Rourke & DePalma, 2016). Galicia, therefore, presents an interesting case study of a community where native speakers —albeit still idealized (O’Rourke & Ramallo, 2013)— are facing a demographic shift\(^9\) that may lead to their ‘authority’ being questioned and challenged (O’Rourke & Ramallo, 2015).

**Irish in the Republic of Ireland**

As the number of Irish speakers in the Gaeltachtai continues to decline, the number of new speakers of Irish outside traditional areas has long surpassed that of ‘traditional native’ speakers. Tensions, however, are still prominent. Gaeltacht Irish is still idealized —and commodified— as the ‘real’, the ‘most authentic’ form of Irish. Standard Irish, on the other hand, is often viewed by native speakers as an artificial language, and speakers who acquired this variety in Gaelscoileanna\(^10\) are often referred to as gaeilgoiri —literally, Irish speaker—, a term only used to refer to new speakers generally in a pejorative manner (O’Rourke, 2011). As for urban Irish speakers —there is a fast-growing community of Irish speakers in Dublin—, they are often portrayed as ‘hybrid’ speakers, featuring too much interference from English (O’Rourke & Walsh, 2015).

**Manx**

Contexts such as Manx, were a native speaker community no longer exists, present specific characteristics, since new speakers make up the whole community —and a large percentage of non-Manx currently learning the language (Ó hIfearnáin, 2015). As noted by Ó hIfearnáin (2015), however, this does not prevent conflict. With a lack of native speakers claiming ‘authority’, the most active members of the revitalization programs reportedly become the new role models for language use in the community, hence establishing a new ‘linguistic elite' based on ‘activism’ rather than ‘nativeness’.

---

\(^9\) In 2008, the Instituto Galego de Estatística reported that less than 30% of Galicians under 25 had acquired Galician as their first language (O’Rourke & Ramallo, 2015, p. 149).

\(^{10}\) *Gaelscoileanna* are Irish-language immersion schools.
Occitan in Provence

Research on Occitan new speakers —or néo-locuteurs (Costa, 2015)— presents an interesting case of a language with a highly contested standard variety\(^{11}\). Dialectal use is, consequently, highly idealized, and it serves as a distinctive mark of ‘nativeness’. This idealization is also found among new speakers, and even in discoursive practices in the Calendretas\(^{12}\) (Costa, 2015).

Scottish Gaelic

The Gaelic-speaking community in Scotland seems to be experiencing a paradigm shift. In 2011, it was reported that 48% of Gaelic speakers were living in Lowland central Scotland, an area that had not had Gaelic speakers for centuries (McLeod & O’Rourke, 2015, p. 159). It is thought that many of these are new speakers, even though census data does not allow us to establish the exact number. In fact, many adults have been taking up Gaelic classes in the cities of Glasgow and Edinburgh (Nance et al., 2016), and new speakers are projected to become a significant percentage of the Gaelic-speaking community in recent years. Many of these new speakers —or luchd-labhair ùra— have come to represent ‘authoritative’ use of the language, even when their ‘authenticity’ is still commonly challenged. Yet, in a context where most native speakers do not have a very high command of their own language outside familiar settings, new speakers seem to have taken over as role models for language use in specialized areas (McLeod & O’Rourke, 2015).

Welsh

The relatively recent increase in the number of Welsh speakers has been attributed to Welsh-medium education, a setting where many have acquired the language. Especially in South Wales new speakers far outnumber native speakers, and the traditional local varieties are spoken by only a few people (Robert, 2009). In addition, regional varieties enjoy more prestige than standard Welsh, which is seen as unauthentic (Robert, 2009),

\(^{11}\) There are actually movements that reclaim the status of traditionally considered Occitan dialects as language on their own, particularly Gascon and Provençal (Costa, 2015).
\(^{12}\) Calendretas are the Occitan-language immersion schools in southern France.
and North Wales has come to symbolize the idealized Welsh-speaking traditional territory. However, Robert (2009) already noticed some changes on the attitudes of new speakers in South East Wales —the area of Wales with the smallest percentage of Welsh speakers—, reporting a re valorization of standard Wales and English lexical items as a means to assert a local identity different from ‘traditional’ Welsh areas.

**West Frisian**

Little research has been conducted on new speakers of West Frisian. The number of new speakers of West Frisian is estimated at around 130,000 (see section 2.2.2.1.), which represents approximately 27% of all speakers of the language. In Belmar at al. (2018), the authors found that most of the tensions discussed in the literature on new speakers of other minoritized languages are also present in the West Frisian context. Questions of ‘authority’, ‘authenticity’ and ‘legitimacy’ among others are prominently featured in the discourse of both learners and teachers, and new speakers may even be considered an ‘authoritative’ speaker (i.e., a role model for language use) while still having their legitimacy as speakers of the language questioned (i.e., not ‘natural’ or ‘genuine’ enough) (Belmar et al., 2018).

### 2.6. European linguistic minorities: in the peripheries

Despite their differences in number —from bigger languages such as Catalan or Bavarian to the moribund Sami languages or the revived Cornish—, all European linguistic minorities share a similar history which is the reason behind their ‘minorization’.

Regardless of their current sociolinguistic context, the decline of these languages began in the 18th century with the formation of the European nation-state. The processes of industrialization undermined the socioeconomic basis of these languages, and many members of the communities migrated to the sprawling urban centers. In addition, universal school, new centralized bureaucracies and military conscription were strong factors which imposed the learning and use of the standardized ‘state languages’ (cf. Martin-Jones, 1989; Fishman, 1991; Cameron, 2007; Leerssen, 2010; O’Rourke, et al., 2015; Pujolar & O’Rourke, 2018).

Native speakers of other languages spoken in the state were relegated to the periphery, often in more than one sense (e.g., geographic periphery —these languages’
hinterland is often found far away from the capital—; economic periphery —mostly employed in the agricultural sector—; cultural periphery —portrayed as backwards and uneducated by the dominant discourses—; and sociopolitical periphery —often underrepresented, if at all, in the legislative, executive and judicial powers of the state) (cf. Grillo, 1989; Pietikäinen & Kelly-Holmes, 2013). Sociolinguist Robert Lafont (1967) even called this ‘cultural subjugation’ colonialisme intérieur when describing the relationship between the elites in Paris and the different regions of France (as referenced in Pujolar & O’Rourke, 2018, p. 4).

It can be said that linguistic minorities, therefore, emerged because of the construction of nation-states (cf. Blommaert & Verschueren, 1998; Auer 2005; Pujolar & O’Rourke, 2018). They are, in a sense, consequences —and victims— of a series of processes aiming for the homogenization of a single political entity. These homogenizing processes, linked with modernization, condemned all languages other than the state language(s) to a permanent state of diglossia, and purposefully excluded them from modernity (O’Rourke et al., 2015). With little to no incentive for speakers to keep their language —let alone for newcomers to learn it—, these languages retreated to a ‘shrinking rural hinterland’ (O’Rourke et al., 2015, p. 5) as many speakers switched to the state language in search of new opportunities.

In addition, members of these minority groups were disparaged from using their language, sometimes through a ‘no policy’ policy (Fishman, 2001, p. 454), but often through overt policies exerting shame, de-naturalization and self-hatred through stigmatization, physical punishment and, in some extreme cases, forced boarding schooling for the children of minority language speakers, incarceration, outright repression or even deportation (Pujolar & O’Rourke, 2018, p. 3).

In the 19th century, language revival movements emerged throughout Europe. These revitalization movements were often linked to romantic nationalist European ideals of language and identity, and the recovery of a ‘pure’ form of language was seen as a necessary step towards the creation or reclamation of a national identity separate from that of the state-nation (cf. Hroch, 2000; Leerssen, 2010). It is in this century that most standardized versions of European minoritized languages were created, West Frisian amongst them (Hoekstra, 2003, as referenced in Hilton & Gooskens, 2013, p. 142).

In fact, new speakers of minoritized languages in Europe are largely the product of these revitalization processes: (re)gained prestige, new socioeconomic status of the language, standardization, official recognition, immersion or bilingual schooling are
some of the achievements of these movements and some of the reasons behind the rising numbers of new speaker profiles among linguistic minorities. O’Rourke et al. (2015) argue that new speakers actually defy well-established ideologies traditionally used to “legitimize claims to nationhood and cultural authenticity” (p. 2). In other words, the existence—and prominence—of new speakers of minoritized languages openly challenges the minorization to which these languages have been subjected, and it also questions the language purism of early language revival through hybrid language use and more fluid identities (O’Rourke et al., 2015; Hornsby, 2015).

2.7. West Frisian

West Frisian is a minoritized language spoken in the province of Fryslân, in the Netherlands, as well as in some neighboring villages in the province of Groningen. It is one of the Frisian languages still spoken today, the others being Saterland Frisian and North Frisian—both spoken in Germany. These are all West Germanic languages, most closely related to English. However, throughout the centuries they have been largely influenced by the surrounding Low Saxon varieties, and more recently by Dutch—in the case of West Frisian—, German—both Saterland Frisian and North Frisian—and Danish—in the case of North Frisian. West Frisian has actually been said to be converging with Standard Dutch (cf. Nerbonne, 2001; Nota, Coler, & Hilton, 2015), and it has been found to be largely intelligible for Dutch native speakers (cf. De Vries, 2010; Belmar & Pinho, 2018).

Of the 646,317 inhabitants of the province (Proevinsje Fryslân, 2015a), 54% reported West Frisian—referred to as simply Frisian henceforth—as their mother tongue (approximately 350,000 people), 35% claimed their mother tongue was Dutch and 11% reported another mother tongue—a percentage that includes not only migrant languages, but also Bildts, City Frisian, Hylpers and the Low Saxon varieties spoken along the border with Groningen and Drenthe (Proevinsje Fryslân, 2015b). With almost half a million speakers, West Frisian is by far the most widely spoken of the Frisian languages—there are approximately 10,000 speakers of North Frisian and only around 1,000 speakers of Saterland Frisian.

---

13 North Frisian is commonly referred to as a single language, but it is arguably best thought of as a group of closely related languages. In fact, each variety has its own standardized grammar, vocabulary and orthography (Mercator, 2015).
Frisian is co-official, alongside Dutch, in the province of Fryslân (Bijlagen II, 1993/1994, 23543, 3, p. 8 (MvT), as referenced in Laanen, 2001, p. 69), and the Dutch government considers it to be one of the indigenous languages of The Netherlands (Bijlagen II, 1993/1994, 23543, 3, p. 2 (MvT), as referenced in Laanen, 2001, p. 68). It is worth-mentioning, however, that the Charter for the Kingdom of the Netherlands makes no reference to language (Laanen, 2001, p. 72), and neither did the Dutch constitution until 2010, when Dutch and Frisian were included as the only official languages of the Netherlands (Hilton & Gooskens, 2013, p.140).

The Van Ommen Committee’s report (Ministerie van Cultuur, Recreatie en Maatschappelijk Werk, 1970; as referenced in Mercator, 2007) is considered the start of the official recognition of Frisian in the Netherlands, and it stated that the national government was responsible for resolving “specific problems caused by bilingualism in the Frisian culture” (Mercator, 2007). This was further established in 1978, when the Law on the Frisian Language was passed in the Dutch Parliament and Frisian became the second official language of the Netherlands (Laanen, 2001).

In 2001, the Dutch and the Frisian governments signed the Covenant on the Frisian Language and Culture, which stated that the Dutch government would have to consider any implications on the Frisian language of any policy concerning Fryslân. This was followed by the Administrative Agreement on Frisian Language and Culture, in 2013, as well as the Law on Frisian Language Use, which reaffirmed the official status of Frisian in Fryslân. In addition, this law devolved some powers to Fryslân, particularly that of education.

The legislation on Frisian is based on co-responsibility between the Dutch and the Frisian governments. In other words, both governments acknowledge the official status of the Frisian language, and both governments need to take it into consideration. To that end, the Dutch government invests an approximate 1.4 million euros every year in the protection and promotion of the Frisian language (Mercator, 2007), and discussions are taking place in the province about making Frisian a compulsory subject in schools in Fryslân—even though many schools are currently exempted from the formal teaching of the language. Nevertheless, the results of this language policy are far behind European Standards (cf. De Jager & Van der Meer, 2007).
2.7.1. Knowledge of Frisian

Every four years, the province of Fryslân publishes a report on the Frisian language in the province. Among other aspects, the inhabitants are asked to report on their knowledge of the language —‘very good’ (tige goed), ‘good’ (goed), ‘pretty comfortably’ (frij aardich), ‘with difficulty’ (mei muoite) or ‘not at all’ (hielendal net). In 2015, the last report available, 95% of the inhabitants of Fryslân claimed to be able to understand the Frisian language to some extent —‘very good’, ‘good’ or ‘pretty comfortably’—, about 75% report to be able to speak the language, about 78% claim to be able to read it and only 32% claim to be able to write it (Provsinsje Fryslân, 2015b).

These values are very similar to those registered in 1994, 2007 and 2011 respectively, with the exception of written proficiency, which has increased from a 17% to a 32% (Provsinsje Fryslân, 2015b; Gorter, Riemersma, & Ytsma, 2001). The fact that these values have remained stable in the 21 years between 1994 and 2015 suggests that the education system in Fryslân does not seem to be increasing proficiency in the language, since there is little difference between self-reported proficiency over the last twenty years. However, it is also true that the situation of Frisian does not seem to be worsening.

Figure 1. Knowledge of Frisian in Fryslân

---

14 Gorter et al., 2001; Provsinsje Fryslân, 2011; Provsinsje Fryslân, 2015b.
Moreover, taking into account that 75% (480,000 people) of the population claims to be able to speak the language and 54% (350,000 people) of the population reports Frisian to be their mother tongue (Provinsje Fryslân, 2015b), one must conclude that there are approximately 130,000 new speakers of Frisian in Fryslân.

2.7.2. Use of Frisian

In these reports on the Frisian language, the province also includes some information on the use of Frisian. In particular, they include the percentage of respondents that indicated that Frisian was the language they used the most when talking to their partner/spouse and/or their children. This is shown for Fryslân as a whole, as well as by municipality. However, the most recent information available online on the use of Frisian is from 2011.

![Figure 2. Most used language with partners and children in Fryslân](image)

In 2011, 47.9% of the respondents indicated that the language they used the most with their children was Frisian, followed closely by Dutch (47.7%), and only 4.4% claimed they used another language. As for their partners, most people seem to use Dutch

---

15 Provinsje Fryslân, 2011.
(46.6%), followed by Frisian (45.4%) and 8.1% uses another language (Provinsje Fryslân, 2011).

By municipality, Frisian is most used in Dantumadiel (82.0% uses it with their partners and 85.8% with children), and it is least used in Weststellingwerf16 (10.9% with partners and only 10% with children) and Harns (11% with partners and only 10.7% with children). It is worth noting, however, that the data does not include the insular municipalities of Fryslân (i.e., Flylân, It Amelân, Skiermûntseach and Skylge)17.

![Figure 3. Percentage of people with Frisian as their most used language with partners and children in each Frisian municipality1819.](image)

---

16 However, one must bear in mind that the traditional language in Weststellingwerf is actually a variety of Low Saxon, commonly called Stellingwarfs.
17 Frisian is nowadays only spoken in two of the islands, Skiermûntseach and Skylge.
18 Provinsje Fryslân, 2011.
19 There have been, however, some changes in the municipalities of Fryslân since 2011. In 2014 the municipalities of Gaasterlân-Slear, Lemsterlân, Skarsterlân and part of Boarnsterhim were merged into one single municipality: De Fryske Marren. As of 2018, the municipalities of It Bilt, Frjentsjerteradiel and Menameradiel—as well as some villages of the municipality of Littenseradiel—were merged into one: Waadhoeke.
Use on social media platforms

Jongbloed-Faber, Van de Velde, Van der Meer and Klinkenberg (2016) claim that 56% of Frisian teenagers use the Frisian language on social media to some extent — up to 87% of those who have Frisian as their sole mother tongue —, even though Dutch appears to be the preferred language.

2.7.3. Motivation to learn Frisian

Similar to what O’Rourke and DePalma (2016) found for Galician, the main motivation behind new speakers of Frisian seems to be integrative. As found in Belmar et al. (2018), the main motivation to learn Frisian seems to be of an integrative or a personal sort. In this study, students reported their interest in Frisian culture and their desire to integrate with their Frisian-speaking friends and relatives, as their main reasons to learn the language. They also showed personal motivation, stating that Frisian is a ‘nice language’ which sounds ‘interesting’. Some instrumental motivation was hinted at by the participants, but it was clearly marked as not essential.

2.7.4. Attitudes towards Frisian

In his attitudinal study in 1995, Ytsma surveyed 410 children and 220 adults and found that while children generally did not significantly favor one language over the other, Dutch-speaking parents held negative attitudes towards Frisian in almost all measures (Ytsma, 1995). These results, as pointed out in Hilton and Gooskens (2013), may be understood as a sign that attitudes towards Frisian worsen with time or that the new generation holds a more positive view of Frisian. Similar results were found in Gorter and Jonkman (1995) and Ytsma (2007), showing a wide gap between the attitudes of Frisian speakers and Dutch speakers.

Thus, language attitudes in Fryslân seem to be largely determined by one’s mother tongue. According to Hilton and Gooskens (2013) the situation has not changed, despite the increasing institutional support for Frisian. Dutch speakers continue to be ‘largely

---

20 All Frisian speakers are also Dutch speakers. However, for the sake of brevity, the term Dutch speaker will be used to refer to those inhabitants of Fryslân who can speak Dutch but who cannot speak Frisian.
negative’ towards Frisian, and even Frisian speakers living outside the province show more positive attitudes towards Frisian than those living in Fryslân.

This general negative attitude towards Frisian has reportedly had a negative effect on new speakers of the language. Especially in the city of Ljouwert, opportunities to practice the language are very scarce, and speaking Frisian may still be frowned upon (Belmar et al., 2018).

2.8. Research questions

This thesis aims to start the debate on new speakers of Frisian by answering the following questions: a) Who is learning Frisian? b) What is their motivation to learn the language? c) What attitudes do they hold towards the Frisian language? and d) With whom and in what situations do they use Frisian? Furthermore, the effect of the native language and gender on attitudes, as well as the effect of identity and gender on language use will also be tested. Finally, a typology of new speaker contexts will be suggested by comparing the cases reviewed in this section and the case of Frisian.
3. Methodology

Our study targeted adults enrolled at the Frisian-language courses offered by Afûk. 21 teachers were employed to teach the 25 courses which were taking place at the time when this research was conducted (February and March 2018).

Three different kinds of language courses are offered, with two levels each: LearnarFrysk —for those who do not know any Frisian but wish to learn it—; PraatmarFrysk —for those who understand Frisian but wish to speak it—; and SkriuwmarFrysk —for those who want to improve their writing skills in Frisian. The courses consist of 10 lessons of two hours each, and cost 110€, which includes the coursebook, a Frisian-Dutch dictionary and complete access to eduFrysk —a partially free digital learning platform which people can use anywhere to practice their Frisian.

3.1. Participants

Adults registered at the Afûk Frisian-language courses were asked to participate in the study, which resulted in a sample size of 148 participants (86 females and 62 males). These courses took place in different locations in the province of Fryslân, with the exception of KM (Kursus op mat) which took place in Den Bosch (in Noord-Brabant).

Table 2. Participants by course and location(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Locations</th>
<th>Students enrolled at the beginning of the course</th>
<th>Students that completed the questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LMF1</td>
<td>Kimswert</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>58 (79.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ljouwert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Snits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMF2</td>
<td>Ljouwert</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Snits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.2. Materials

The materials used in this study consisted of a questionnaire (see appendix) in which participants were asked 20 questions that could be divided in five different topics: personal background, self-reported language proficiency, motivation, attitudes and language use.

The questionnaire was structured and designed following Dörnyei (2003). The questions were based on the findings of Belmar et al. 2018, as well as drawing from existing questionnaires with similar aims (such as Lasagabaster, 2006; Casesnoves-Ferrer & Juarros-Daussà, 2015; and Bernadó et al., 2009).

The questionnaire was designed in English and Renske van der Meer-Pasma, from Afûk, translated it into Dutch. Dutch, rather than Frisian, was chosen as the language of the questionnaire to make sure that participants, including those who had just started learning Frisian, would have no problems understanding what they were being asked.
Personal background

Questions referring to the personal background of the participant were aimed at collecting information such as their place of birth and that of their parents, their age, gender, level of studies, time of residence in Fryslân, national identification, time learning Frisian, the course they were enrolled in when they filled the survey and their relationship with the Frisian language — be it a ‘learner’, a ‘new speaker’, a ‘speaker’ or a ‘native speaker’ (cf. Grinevald & Bert, 2011; Ortega et al., 2015).

Self-reported language proficiency

The participants were also asked to assess their language proficiency in Frisian, the language they are actively learning; Dutch, the dominant language in Fryslân; English, since it is very widely spoken as a second language; and German, which is a language closely related to Dutch (cf. Beerkens & ten Thije, 2011; Blees, Mak, & ten Thije, 2014; Gooskens, van Bezooijen, van Heuven, 2015; Gooskens, van Heuven, Golubović, Schüppert, Swarte, & Voigt, 2018) and commonly taught in schools (cf. Kuhlemeier, van den Bergh, & Melse, 1996). They were also given two more spots in blank where they could add other languages they know. They were asked to fill in the table with HG (heel goed – very good), G (goed – good), VA (vrij aardig – pretty comfortably), MM (met moeite – with difficulty) and HN (helemaal niet – not at all), which are the same answers used in De Fryske taalatlas 2015 (Provinsje Fryslân, 2015b).

Motivation

Participants were first asked whether they have any intention to further their knowledge of the Frisian language and were later given six different reasons why a language would be important for them. They were then asked to choose what language(s) (English, Dutch, Frisian or German) each reason applied to. These reasons can be divided into three types of motivation: instrumental, integrative and personal (based on Lambert and Gardner, as referenced in Robert, 2009; Comajoan, 2012 and Casesnoves-Ferrer & Juarros-Daussà, 2012).
Table 3. *Motivation statements included in the questionnaire*

**INSTRUMENTAL**

- Because I need it to function in my daily life
- Because it can give me a professional advantage

**INTEGRATIVE**

- Because I need it to communicate with my (extended) family
- Because I need it to be a part of the community

**PERSONAL**

- Because I am proud of my heritage
- Because I like it

*Attitudes*

This question consisted of six sentences, and the participants were asked to indicate on a 5-point scale —anchored at one end by 1 = *Disagree completely* and at the other end by 5 = *Agree completely*— the degree to which they agreed with the suggested sentence —with four sentences linked to positive attitudes and two sentences linked to negative attitudes. Thus, a high score corresponded to a high degree of agreement. The participants were asked to repeat the same exercise for English, Dutch, Frisian and German.

Table 4. *Attitude statements included in the questionnaire*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is useful</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is necessary</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is beautiful</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is ugly</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Language use

The participants were asked six questions regarding their language use. They were first asked what language they used more often and given a series of options to choose from. These options were thought of acknowledging the possibility that participants may use more than one language and viewing language as a spectrum, rather than different blocks (e.g., only Frisian, more Frisian than Dutch, etc.) (cf. Gorter & Cenoz, 2015). This same approach was taken when asking participants about their national identification, allowing for different degrees of mixed identifications (e.g., I feel Frisian, I feel more Frisian than Dutch, etc.)

Secondly, participants were asked how often they use Frisian, and they were given the options every day, sometimes, hardly ever and never. In addition, they were also asked to choose the best statement to complete the sentence When I speak Frisian... for which they were given four options, based on Belmar et al. 2018: a) most people reply to me in Dutch; b) most people reply to me in Dutch unless I ask them to speak Frisian to me; c) most people reply to me in Frisian; and d) some people reply to me in Frisian, but they change to Dutch when they see I struggle.

Participants also had to mark with whom they speak Frisian, as well as with whom they feel comfortable when speaking Frisian. The options they were given are based on De Fryske taalatlas 2015 (Proovinsje Fryslân, 2015b) —my children and my partner—, but as suggested by Renske van der Meer-Pasma, from Afûk, the options of my family, my friends and my colleagues were added —options that can also be found in other questionnaires with similar purposes (e.g., Casesnoves-Ferrer & Juarros-Daussà, 2015). In addition, two new options —my classmates and my Frisian teacher— were added to include the setting where the learning of the Frisian language takes places, which is also where beginners are much more likely to use the language.

Finally, participants were given thirteen situations and they were also asked to indicate on a 5-point scale —anchored at one end by 1 = Never and at the other end by 5 = Always— how often they used each language (Frisian, Dutch and English) in each setting. Based on previous questionnaires (e.g., Lasagabaster, 2006; Casesnoves-Ferrer & Juarros-Daussà, 2015), as well as Belmar et al. 2018, the settings with which the participants were presented were chosen by the researcher in collaboration with Renske van der Meer-Pasma, from Afûk, who provided some insight from surveys conducted by this Frisian-language organization. In addition, the situation in my Frisian class was
added, since it was assumed that participants would be more likely to use Frisian in this particular setting.

These settings could be divided into two different kinds of use: mainly oral (10 settings) and mainly written (3 settings). The settings in which mainly a written use of the language was expected are three widely used Social Media Platforms in the Netherlands: Twitter, Facebook and WhatsApp. According to Statista (2018), by number of daily users, WhatsApp and Facebook are the two most widely used Social Media Platforms in the Netherlands. They are followed by YouTube, Instagram, Snapchat and Twitter, in this order. For the purpose of this study, Twitter was chosen, since users are more likely to write and there is previous literature on the use of Frisian on this particular platform (cf. Jongbloed-Faber et al., 2016; and Jongbloed-Faber, Van Loo, & Cornips, 2017).

3.3. Procedure

3.3.1. Data collecting

The questionnaires were sent by post to all the teachers who were giving lessons at the time. The researcher also sent all teachers an email explaining the aim of the research and asking them to have their students fill in the questionnaires during regular class time. In some cases, however, this was not possible, and teachers allowed students to take the questionnaire home and bring it back the following day. The students filled in the questionnaires without a time limit.

An online questionnaire was also considered, but it was discarded since students might not necessarily have access to internet and/or computers in class. Also, some of the older students might have struggled with an online questionnaire. For this reason, and after discussing it with the coordinators of the Frisian courses at Afûk, it was decided to hand out printed questionnaires.

3.3.2. Data processing

All participants were given a code in reference to the course they were enrolled in, and their answers were entered in a Google Form from which an Excel Sheet was extracted. This was used to create the graphs to make the results more visual and easy to interpret.
When possible, the results will be compared with available data on the Frisian language in Fryslân as a whole.

The values of the negative attitude statements were reversed in order to get an attitude score by adding up the values. In other words, an attitude score was calculated for each participant —6 being the lowest score possible and indicating an extremely negative attitude towards the language; and 30 being the highest score, showing an extremely good attitude towards it. These attitude scores were then averaged so that comparison between languages and between groups of participants could be easily made. Similarly, the values of the language use Likert-scale were added up in order to get a language use score for each participant —65 being the highest score possible and indicating the participant use Frisian always in all the situations suggested; and 13 being the lowest score possible, indicating the participant never uses Frisian in these situations.

A regression analysis will be completed to find out the relationship between attitudes, gender and native language; and another regression will be carried out for language use, gender and identity. Finally, a Pearson $r$ correlation will be used to establish the relationship between the attitudes towards Frisian and the use of the language.
4. Results

This section presents the results of the study. These results will be divided into five subsections: the participants’ background, their self-reported language proficiency, their motivation, their attitudes, their language use and the relationship between the latter two.

4.1. Participants’ background

Who is learning Frisian?

Gender

The sample consisted of 148 participants, of which 58.1% identified as female and 41.9% as male. Participants were also given the choice to identify as neither male nor female by selecting the option other. However, none of the participants chose that option.

Age

They ranged in age from 18 to 85, with a mean age of 49.61. Almost half of them (48.6%) were between 50 and 70 years old, followed by 29.7% between 30 and 50, 14.2% between 18 and 30 and 7.4% over 70 years old.

Birthplace

Most of the participants, were born in a Dutch province other than Fryslân (66.2%), and so were their parents. Participants born in Fryslân made up 29.7% of the sample, and
4.1% were born in another country. Of those who were born outside Fryslân, 42.2% had been living in Fryslân for less than a year, 28.9% had been living there for between 1 and 3 years, 6.7% between 4 and 8 years and 22.2% had been living in Fryslân for over 9 years.

An overwhelming majority of the people surveyed (95.9%) were born in the Netherlands, with only 6 participants (4.1%) born abroad. These were born in Australia (1), Germany (1), Indonesia (1), the United Kingdom (2) and Switzerland (1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fryslân</td>
<td>44 (29.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noord-Holland</td>
<td>28 (18.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuid-Holland</td>
<td>22 (14.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noord-Brabant</td>
<td>17 (11.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utrecht</td>
<td>10 (6.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelderland</td>
<td>9 (6.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelderland</td>
<td>5 (3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groningen</td>
<td>4 (2.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeeland</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>142 (95.9%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Birthplace of participants and their parents

Figure 7. Participants born outside of Fryslân by duration of stay.

Table 5. Participants by province of birth

Figure 8. Percentage of participants born in each Dutch province.
Table 6. Participants born in Fryslân by municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Südwest-Fryslân</td>
<td>15 (10.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ljouwert</td>
<td>11 (7.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dongeradiel</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harns</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waadhoeke</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It Hearrenfean</td>
<td>2 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smellingerlân</td>
<td>2 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tytsjerksteradiel</td>
<td>2 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Fryske Marren</td>
<td>2 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weststellingwerf</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>44 (29.7%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A similar distribution can be found looking at the birthplace of their parents. 93.9% of the participants’ fathers were born in the Netherlands (30.4% in Fryslân), and only 6.1% were born in another country. These were born in Germany (3), Indonesia (3), Luxembourg (1) and the UK (2).
Table 7. Participants’ fathers by province of birth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fryslân</td>
<td>45 (30.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noord-Holland</td>
<td>27 (18.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuid-Holland</td>
<td>18 (12.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noord-Brabant</td>
<td>15 (10.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utrecht</td>
<td>10 (6.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelderland</td>
<td>9 (6.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groningen</td>
<td>5 (3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overijssel</td>
<td>5 (3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drenthe</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeeland</td>
<td>2 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>139 (93.9%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10. Percentage of participants’ fathers born in each Dutch province.

Table 8. Participants’ fathers born in Fryslân by municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Südwest-Fryslân</td>
<td>13 (8.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ljouwert</td>
<td>10 (6.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Fryske Marren</td>
<td>4 (2.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It Hearrenfesn</td>
<td>4 (2.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dongeradiel</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eaststellingwerf</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smellingerlân</td>
<td>2 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waadhoeke</td>
<td>2 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferwerderadiel</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flylân</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harns</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opsterlân</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>45 (30.4%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11. Percentage of participants’ fathers born in each Frisian municipality.
As for the participants’ mothers, 95.9% were born in the Netherlands (31.8% in Fryslân), and only 4.1% were born in another country. These were born in Germany (1), Indonesia (3) and the UK (2).

Table 9. Participants’ mothers by province of birth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fryslân</td>
<td>47 (31.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noord-Holland</td>
<td>22 (14.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noord-Brabant</td>
<td>21 (14.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuid-Holland</td>
<td>18 (12.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groningen</td>
<td>10 (6.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelderland</td>
<td>8 (5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utrecht</td>
<td>8 (5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeeland</td>
<td>4 (2.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overijssel</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drenthe</td>
<td>2 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>142 (95.9%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12. Percentage of participants’ mothers born in each Dutch province.
Table 10. *Participants' mothers born in Fryslân by municipality*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Súdwest-Fryslân</td>
<td>13 (8.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ljouwert</td>
<td>10 (6.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Fryske Marren</td>
<td>4 (3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waadhoeke</td>
<td>5 (3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opsterlân</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dantumadiel</td>
<td>2 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dongeradiel</td>
<td>2 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eaststellingwerf</td>
<td>2 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferwerderadiel</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harns</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It Hearrenfean</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kollumerlân en Nijkruslân</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smellingerlân</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tytsjerksteradiel</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47 (31.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Educational background**

At the time they were surveyed, most of the participants (83.1%) had a higher education degree — MBO (18.9%), HBO (41.8%), WO/University (14.2%), Master’s (6.8%), PhD (1.4%).

*Figure 13. Percentage of participants’ mothers born in each Frisian municipality.*

*Figure 14. Participants’ by educational background.*
National identification

Most participants identified primarily as Dutch — only Dutch (39.2%) or more Dutch than Frisian (22.3%) —, followed by those who identified primarily as Frisian — only Frisian (13.5%) or more Frisian than Dutch (8.1%) — and finally those who identify as both Frisian and Dutch equally (15.5%). In addition, two participants identify as only German and as more English than Dutch respectively.

Relationship with Frisian

A majority of the participants identify as ‘learners’ of Frisian (62.8%), followed by ‘native speakers’ of Frisian (21.6%), ‘new speakers’ of Frisian (13.5%) and just ‘speakers’ of Frisian (2%). The native speakers were all enrolled in the in the SkriuwmarFrysk courses, aimed at acquiring literacy skills in the language.
Time learning Frisian

The time the participants had been learning Frisian when they completed the survey ranged from 1 month and 20 years, with a mean duration of 13.2 months (excluding the native speakers). The majority of the participants (75%) had only been learning Frisian for less than a year.

Courses

Most of the participants (39.2%) were enrolled in the LearmarFrysk module 1 course, which is the beginner’s level, aimed mainly at acquiring passive skills. There was also a high percentage of participants enrolled in the SkriuwmarFrysk module 1 course (16.9%), aimed at acquiring literacy skills in Frisian; and also, in the PraatmarFrysk module 1 course (16.2%), aimed at practicing speaking skills.

Figure 17. Percentage of participants enrolled in each course.
4.2. Language proficiency

*How do they rate their language skills?*

83.8% of the participants claimed to be able to understand Frisian (‘very good’, ‘good’ or ‘pretty comfortably’), 38.5% to be able to speak it, 78.4% claimed to be able to read it and only 32.6% claimed to be able to write it.

![Figure 18. Self-rated proficiency in Frisian](image)

Unsurprisingly, participants rated their Dutch-language skills the highest, with 100% of them claiming to be able to understand Dutch, 99.3% claiming to be able to speak Dutch, 100% able to read it and 97.3% claiming to be able to write it. Following Dutch, the self-rated proficiency of the participants’ English-language skills was also quite high, with 97.3% of them being able to understand English, 91.3% claiming to be able to speak it, 93.9% being able to read it and 81.2% claiming to be able to write it. The self-rated proficiency in German was comparatively lower for a language most of the participants had studied at school, with 77.7% of the participants reportedly being able to understand it, 54.8% being able to speak it, 67.5% claiming to be able to read it and 41.2% being able to write it. In addition, 15.5% of the participants claimed to be able to
understand another language, 12.8% to able to speak it, 14.9% claimed to be able to read another language and 8.8% claimed to be able to write a language other than those mentioned above. Of these languages, French (23) is the most common one, followed by Spanish (3), Norwegian (2), Dutch Sign Language (1), Italian (1), Portuguese (1), Swedish (1) and Tweants (1).

**Figure 19.** Percentage of participants who claim to have some proficiency in each language and each skill.

**Figure 20.** Self-rated proficiency in Dutch.

**Figure 21.** Self-rated proficiency in English.

**Figure 22.** Self-rated proficiency in German.

**Figure 23.** Self-rated proficiency in a 5th language.
4.3. Motivation

*Do they intend to further their knowledge of Frisian?*

![Figure 24. Participants’ will to further their knowledge of Frisian.](Image)

Most of the participants (54.1%) had not decided yet whether they would enroll in the next Frisian course available. Only 24.3% were certain that they would continue studying the language.

*Why is Frisian important for them?*

The main motivation for participants to learn Frisian seems to be personal preference (see table 11). 91.2% of the participants claimed that Frisian is important for them because they ‘like it’, and 47.3% linked the importance of the Frisian language to being proud of their heritage. In addition, 74.3% claimed that the Frisian language is necessary to integrate in the community (i.e., integrative motivation), even though only 39.2% claim that they need it to communicate with their families.

The percentages are slightly lower for instrumental motivation. 45.9% consider Frisian to be necessary to function in their daily lives, and 43.9% think that Frisian gives them an economic advantage over their peers.
Table 11. Participants’ reasons why the Frisian language is important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because I like it</td>
<td>Personal2</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I need it to feel part of the community</td>
<td>Integrative2</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I am proud of my heritage</td>
<td>Personal1</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I need it to function in my daily life</td>
<td>Instrumental1</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because it may give me an economic advantage</td>
<td>Instrumental2</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I need it to communicate with my extended family</td>
<td>Integrative1</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides Frisian, participants also gave their reasons for the importance of Dutch, English and German. Surprisingly, Frisian is the language the participants seem to like the most—91.2% claiming they like it, compared to 73.6% for Dutch, 52.7% for English and only 27% for German. Moreover, Frisian is only second to Dutch in the other options, except for ‘Instrumental2’, where 50% of the participants—6.1% more than for Frisian—agree that English gives you an economic advantage.

Figure 25. Participants’ reasons for the importance of Frisian, Dutch, English and German.
4.4. Attitudes

*What do they think about Frisian?*

Total scores for attitude were calculated for each language (see Table 12), with values between 6 —very negative attitude— to 30 —very positive attitude. As we can see, participants have the most positive attitude towards Dutch, followed closely by English. Their attitude towards Frisian is lower, but it is still positive. In fact, according to the participants (see table 13 and Figure 26), Frisian seem to be the language which they find more beautiful, and over half of the participants (56%) consider it to be useful. However, only 30.4% think it is necessary, and up to 47.3% view it as a difficult language to learn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 12. Participants’ attitude scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frisian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 13. Percentage of participants that agree with these statements (attitudes)*21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beautiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*21 4 or 5 on the Likert-scale*
Figure 26. Participants’ attitudes towards the Frisian language.

Figure 27. Participants’ attitudes towards the Dutch language.

Figure 28. Participants’ attitudes towards the English language.

Figure 29. Participants’ attitudes towards the German language.

Table 14. Regression coefficients for the linear model of attitudes towards Frisian as a function of gender and native language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>17.21</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>21.72</td>
<td>&lt;2e-16***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenderMale</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>-1.72</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpeakNonnative</td>
<td>-4.46</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-4.90</td>
<td>2.5e-06***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A simple linear regression was calculated to predict the attitude score towards the Frisian language based on gender and native language. A significant regression equation was found \( F(2, 145=16.57, p < 0.001) \) with \( R^2=0.186 \). On average, native speakers held more positive attitudes towards Frisian \( (M=16.97; SD=4) \) than non-native speakers \( (M=12.13; SD=4.6) \). For gender, no significant influence was found at \( p < 0.05 \).
4.5. Language Use

*What language(s) do they use more frequently?*

Most participants use mostly Dutch (76.4%) — only Dutch (46.6%), more Dutch than Frisian (28.4%) or more Dutch than English (1.4%). 13.5% of the participants use more Frisian than Dutch, and 7.4% claim to use both of these languages equally. In addition, 1 participant reportedly uses more English than Dutch, and 2 participants claim to use Dutch and a language other than Frisian — Dutch Sign Language (NGT) and English respectively — equally often.

*Figure 30. Language(s) the participants use more frequently.*
How often do they use the Frisian language?

![Figure 31. Participants’ frequency of use of the Frisian language.]

While only 21.2% of participants say they never use Frisian and 24% claim they use it rarely, 31.5% claim that they use the language every day and 23.3% say they use it at least sometimes.

What happens when they try to speak Frisian outside the classroom?

When participants try to speak Frisian outside the classroom, only 35.7% of the participants report that they are generally replied to in Frisian. In other words, 64.3% of the participants claim that they are generally replied to in Dutch when addressing somebody in Frisian outside the classroom. In fact, 30.8% of the participants claim their interlocutor quickly changes to Dutch when they start struggling with Frisian; 20.3% of the participants affirm that they are always replied to in Dutch, and 13.3% say that their interlocutors only use Frisian if they are asked to.

Table 15. Percentage of participants for each claim on people’s reaction to their using Frisian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When I try to speak Frisian…</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People usually answer me in Dutch</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People usually answer me in Dutch, unless I ask them to speak in Frisian</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People usually reply in Frisian</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some people speak Frisian to me at first but change to Dutch when they notice I struggle</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who do they speak Frisian with?

81.1% of the participants claim that they speak Frisian to some of the people suggested in the survey. The majority reportedly speaks Frisian with their Frisian teachers (64.9%) and their classmates (60.8%). Between 30 and 40 percent of the participants claim that they speak Frisian with their partners (39.2%), with their friends (36.5%), with their colleagues (34.5%) and with their families (30.4%). Finally, only 20.3% uses the language with their children.

Who do they feel comfortable with when speaking Frisian?

61.5% claim to feel comfortable when speaking Frisian to some of the people suggested in the survey. Half of the participants feel comfortable when speaking Frisian with their classmates, followed closely by their teachers (48.6%). The percentages drop drastically, and just over 30 percent feel comfortable when using Frisian with their partners (31.1%), followed by their friends (29.7%), their families (26.4%) and their colleagues (25.7%). Finally, only 18.2% of the participants claim to feel comfortable when speaking Frisian to their children.

Figure 32. Percentage of participants that use the Frisian language with these people, compared to the percentage of participants who feel comfortable when doing so.
In what situations do they use Frisian?

Unsurprisingly, even though most of the participants use the Frisian language in class (78.9%) at least sometimes, most of them do not use it in any other situation or do so only rarely. Other than the classroom, the situations where they are more likely to use the language are (see figure 30): in a small village (43.5%), in a small shop (41.2%), at work (37.2%), at a supermarket (35.8%), in a café (30.4%), in a street market (29.8%) and on WhatsApp (27.1%). On the other hand, participants are much less likely to use Frisian at the bank (24.3%), in big cities (20.3%), at the doctor’s (19.2%), on Facebook (11.6%) and on Twitter (5.4%).

As far as use is concerned, Dutch overwhelmingly dominates in each situation, with the exception of the classroom, where Frisian remains the most used language. It is also worth noting, however, that the use of English only surpasses that of Frisian in big cities, on Twitter and on Facebook, which may be explained by a more international target audience.
A simple linear regression was calculated to predict the Frisian language use based on gender and identity. A significant regression equation was found ($F(7, 140)=27.36, p < 0.001$) with $R^2=0.58$. On average, those who identify as ‘only Frisian’ use Frisian more often ($M=45.95, SD=11.51$), followed by those who identify as ‘more Frisian than Dutch’ ($M=43.58; SD=11.27$), ‘Frisian and Dutch equally’ ($M=28.78, SD=13.46$), ‘more Dutch than Frisian’ ($M=22.85, SD=9.69$) and, finally, ‘only Dutch’ were the ones that used Frisian less often ($M=18.47, SD=4.20$). For gender, on average males use less Frisian ($M=29.63, SD=15.02$) than females ($M=22.90, SD=20.4$).

Since only two participants identified as ‘other’ or ‘other more than Dutch’, these will not be taken into account for this model.
Table 17. *Regression coefficients for the linear model of Frisian language use as a function of gender and identity*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>46.59</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>22.66</td>
<td>&lt;2e-16***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenderMale</td>
<td>-3.18</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>-2.05</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdentityMoreFthanD</td>
<td>-1.94</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdentityFandD</td>
<td>-16.42</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>-5.86</td>
<td>3.20e-08***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdentityMoreDthanF</td>
<td>-22.29</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>-8.55</td>
<td>1.88e-14***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdentityDutch</td>
<td>-26.59</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>-11.09</td>
<td>&lt;2e-16***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6. Relationship between attitudes and language use

A positive correlation between attitudes and language use was found, $r(146)=0.51$, $p<0.001$. The more positive the attitudes they hold towards Frisian, the more the participants used the language.
5. Discussion

The results of this study give us an overview of the new speaker profile in the West Frisian context. Typically, these are middle-aged Dutch nationals born outside the province of Fryslân (66.2%) and they have completed some sort of higher education. They seem to decide to learn Frisian quite early on —42.2% of the participants had only been living in Fryslân for less than a year—, they identify as ‘mostly Dutch’ (61.5%) and as ‘learners of Frisian’ (62.8%) —only 13.5% identify as ‘new speaker of Frisian’— and they are plurilingual —most of them report some proficiency in at least four languages: Dutch, English, German and Frisian; and around 15% of the participants claim to have some proficiency in a fifth language (see figure 19). There is also a sizeable proportion of people born in Fryslân (29.7%), some of which actually identify as ‘native speakers’ of the language (21.6% of all participants). These were all enrolled in courses aimed at developing their writing skills. Finally, there is a small percentage of people born outside the Netherlands who are also learning the language (4.1%).

Most participants report that they can understand Frisian to some degree, both in listening and reading (see figure 18). This is hardly surprising, since Frisian has been found to be highly intelligible for Dutch native speakers (cf. De Vries, 2010; Belmar & Pinho, 2018). In addition, the self-reported proficiency for German —another language closely related to Dutch and said to be highly intelligible (cf. Blees et al. 2014; Gooskens et al. 2015; Gooskens et al., 2018)— presents surprisingly similar values (see figures 18 and 22). Participants report similar proficiency in Frisian and German, perhaps because both languages are closely related to Dutch and most participants had German as a subject at school (cf. Kuhlmeier et al., 1996).

However, when the data for this set of participants is compared to the self-reported proficiency in the 2015 Fryske taalatlas, it is surprising to see how similar they look (see figure 36). Speaking skills are significantly lower among leaners, but writing skills are almost the same. In other words, the percentage of people reporting the ability to write in Frisian is almost the same among learners (of whom only 21.6% were native speakers) as it is in the province as a whole (where native speakers make up 54% of the population). This data suggests that despite revitalization programs and new policies favorable to Frisian, writing skills in the language are still extremely low, which may be due to the unfavorable position —or even exclusion— of the language in most schools throughout the province (cf. De Jager & Van der Meer, 2007). Immersion and bilingual programs are
reportedly the key factors for the creation of new speakers in other contexts (cf. Ortega et al., 2015; O’Rourke & Walsh, 2015; Pujolar & Puigdevall, 2015), and perhaps the adoption of more bilingual practices in the Frisian educational system would benefit the language.

![Figure 36. Self-reported proficiency in Frisian in Fryslân as compared to self-reported proficiency of the participants](image)

**Motivation**

As expected, the participants’ motivation to learn Frisian seems to be mainly personal and integrative, though some instrumental motivation is also reported. Just as found for other minoritized languages (cf. O’Rourke & DePalma, 2016; Rosiak, 2017) and for diaspora communities (cf. Juarros-Daussà, 2012) and as mentioned in Belmar et al. 2018 about Frisian, most participants do not report instrumental motivation to learn the language (see table 11). Dutch and English, on the other hand, seem to be mostly linked to instrumental motivation (see figure 25), as would also be expected of the dominant language and a global language such as English.

---

23 Provinsje Fryslân, 2015b

Guillem Belmar Viernes
**Attitudes**

Overall, attitudes towards the Frisian language are not as positive as for Dutch and English (see table 12). Frisian is, however, the language which the participants view as more ‘beautiful’ (68.9%), but only 56% consider it ‘useful’ and 30.4% sees it as ‘necessary’. In addition, 47.3% considers Frisian to be a ‘difficult’ language to learn, despite the large percentage of participants who reported to be able to understand Frisian.

Furthermore, nativeness was found to be a significant predictor for attitudes towards the Frisian language (see table 14). Native speakers were found to hold more positive attitudes towards Frisian than non-native speakers, thus replicating the results of previous studies on language attitudes in Fryslân (Ytsma, 1995; Gorter & Jonkman, 1995; Ytsma, 2010; Hilton & Gooskens, 2013). In addition, recent policies favoring the promotion of the Frisian language do not seem to have had any effect on overall language attitudes in Fryslân—as is reported to have been the case in other minorities (cf. Bourhis, 1983; Newman et al., 2008; Bouzada-Fernández, 2003; Amorrortu et al., 2009), not even among new speakers—who are often expected to be more positive than those who do not learn the language (e.g., Hornsby, 2015). This conclusion was also drawn from the results of Hilton and Gooskens (2013) and suggest that attitudes towards Frisian have not changed since 1995 (Ytsma, 1995; Gorter & Jonkman, 1995).

**Language use**

Most participants reported Dutch as the language they use more often (76.4%), followed by 13.5% who reported they use more Frisian than Dutch and 7.4% who claim to use both languages equally. If we group all participants who use Frisian to some extent, however, we can see that almost half of them (49.3%) use the language, a percentage quite similar to that reported in *De Fryske taalatlas 2015* (Provinsje Fryslân, 2015b).

Similar to the situation reported for other minoritized languages, new speakers of Frisian are often addressed to in the dominant language even when they try to speak Frisian (see table 15). This suggests that they are not entirely accepted as legitimate speakers of the language, as suggested in Belmar et al. (2018).

As for people with whom the participants report to speak Frisian, most of them claim to do so with their Frisian teacher and their classmates, and these are also the people they feel more comfortable with when speaking in Frisian (see figure 32). In fact, the...
people with whom the participants are less likely to use the Frisian language—and feel less comfortable when doing so—are their relatives. However unsurprising, this fact suggests that the province of Frislân should include these settings in their periodical reports on the use of the Frisian language. At the moment, only language use with children and with partner is reported, and while these might be the settings where native speakers may be more likely to use the language, this does not seem to be true for new speakers. The results of this study suggest, actually, that new speakers are more likely to use the language at work or with friends, rather than with relatives (see figure 32).

The results for language use in different situation give us, overall, the expected information. The classroom is the only setting where most participants claim to use Frisian to some extent (see figure 33). Dutch clearly dominates in all settings other than the Frisian classroom, which may be explained by the fact that most participants report low speaking proficiency in Frisian. A surprising finding, however, was the low percentage of reported use of English, which only surpasses Frisian in the more ‘international’ settings: ‘big cities’, ‘Twitter’ and ‘Facebook. The low percentage of use of Frisian in these last two settings could be due to audience design strategies (cf. Marwick & Boyd, 2011; Androutsopoulos, 2014), which would also explain why the use of Frisian is more common in WhatsApp (27.1%). Integrative motivation could also be at the basis for language choice in these platforms, since participants are more likely to interact with people who do not speak Frisian, and the use of the minority language on social media is often a device to target a very specific audience, rather than the whole range of possible visitors to one’s profile (cf. Cunliffe, Morris, & Prys, 2013; Johnson, 2013). Another possible explanation is the low written proficiency found throughout the province, even among native speakers themselves, which could easily be preventing them from using the language on social media platforms where they may be exposed to criticism for any mistake they make (cf. Jongbloed-Faber et al., 2016).

Finally, both national identity and gender were found to be significant predictors for Frisian language use (see table 17). Those who identified as ‘only Frisian’, on average used Frisian more often than those who identified as ‘more Frisian than Dutch’—although this difference failed to reach significance—, followed by those who identified as ‘Frisian and Dutch equally’, ‘more Dutch than Frisian’ and, finally, those who identified as ‘only Dutch’ are the least likely to use the Frisian language. Males were also found to use Frisian significantly less than females, but at $p = 0.04$ this difference is
probably just due to the characteristics of the population of this study —females make up 81.25% of the native speakers of the sample.

**Attitudes and language use**

As expected, a strong positive correlation was found between attitudes towards Frisian and Frisian language use (see figure 35). Taking into account the fact that the attitudes towards the Frisian language were not particularly positive —especially among new speakers—, we must conclude that it is of the utmost importance to understand the reasons behind the predominantly negative attitudes towards Frisian.

**New Speakers of a Minoritized Language**

Having studied the characteristics of new speakers of Frisian and comparing them to those reported for new speakers of other minoritized languages, a fourfold typology can be suggested. It is, however, essential to understand this typology as a spectrum along which different cases may fluctuate, rather than totally different categorical constructs.

For instance, Irish seems to share most of the characteristics of type C (see table 18), even though new speakers have long outnumbered ‘native’ speakers in the Irish context. New speakers of the language are often thought of as urban, young and middle-class, and their language is frequently portrayed as ‘hybrid’ and artificial (O’Rourke & Walsh, 2015). Similarly, new speakers of Galician are often criticized for speaking an artificial form of the language (cf. O’Rourke & Ramallo, 2013; O’Rourke & Ramallo, 2015). Tensions surrounding the authenticity of the language of new speakers can also be found in other contexts —such as the Catalan context (cf. Woolard, 2016) or the Basque context (cf. Ortega et al., 2015)—, but in these cases traditional ideologies of linguistic authority have begun shifting towards different notions of speakerness (cf. Woolard 2016).

In the case of West Frisian, new speakers are also reportedly beginning to challenge these traditional ideologies of linguistic authority (as found in Belmar et al., 2018), favoring notions of language knowledge, competence and usage —dimensions of speakerness suggested by Jaffe (2015)—; and language expertise, inheritance and affiliation —dimensions of speakerness suggested by Leung et al. (1997, as referenced in Weber & Horner, 2012, p. 9)— over ‘nativeness’. However, strong notions of language
purity are still present, and the standard language is still highly contested and viewed as artificial and unauthentic (as found in Belmar et al., 2018).

Table 18: Typology of New Speaker Contexts.24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type A</th>
<th>Type B</th>
<th>Type C</th>
<th>Type D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only New Speakers</td>
<td>Percentage of new speakers increasing steadily</td>
<td>Percentage of new speakers close to 50% or more</td>
<td>New speakers: increasingly diverse population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New speakers: urban, young, middle-class.</td>
<td>Language of new speakers: ‘artificial’ language.</td>
<td>Traditional notions of ‘purity’ increasingly questioned</td>
<td>Traditional notions of speakerness and authority increasingly questioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional notions of speakerness and authority.</td>
<td>Weak top-down revitalization policies</td>
<td>Strong top-down revitalization policies</td>
<td>Strong bottom-up revitalization movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak bottom-up revitalization movements</td>
<td>Weak presence —or no presence at all— of the language in the public educational system</td>
<td>Institutionalized presence of the language in the public educational system</td>
<td>Highly contested Standard Variety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex: Manx</td>
<td>Ex: Breton, Occitan, Scottish Gaelic, Corsican</td>
<td>Ex: Irish, Welsh, West Frisian</td>
<td>Ex: Basque, Catalan, Galician</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24 Drawing from Robert, 2009; O’Rourke 2011; O’Rourke & Ramallo, 2013; Costa, 2015; Hornsby, 2015; Jaffe, 2015; McLeod&O’Rourke, 2015; Ó hIflarnáin, 2015; O’Rourke & Ramallo, 2015; O’Rourke & Walsh, 2015; Ortega et al., 2015; Pujolar & Puigdevall, 2015; Belmar et al. 2018; Pujolar & O’Rourke, 2018
6. Conclusion

The number of new speakers of minoritized languages is rapidly increasing, and it is projected to become even more relevant in the following decades, outnumbering traditional native speaker communities in many contexts—which is already the case with Manx (Ó hIfearnáin, 2015) and even a bigger language such as Irish (O’Rourke & Walsh, 2015). These new speakers are often said to be key for the success of revitalization processes, since they present a golden opportunity to reverse language shift (Grinevald & Bert, 2011). In fact, new speakers are generally the consequence of immersion or bilingual educational programs or adult language courses (Pujolar & O’Rourke, 2018) and some may even experience linguistic ‘mudes’ (Pujolar & Puigdevall, 2015) and adopt the minoritized language in their linguistic practices, moving from a ‘monolingual habitus’ to a ‘multilingual repertoire’ (Pujolar & O’Rourke, 2018).

In the case of Frisian, however, where over half of the population still claims to be a native speaker of the language and where self-reported proficiency has been stable for the last twenty-one years, at least, new speakers adopting the language may not be necessary for maintenance, rather a desirable step towards balanced societal bilingualism in the province.

More research needs to be done, especially to understand the reasons behind the negative attitudes towards the Frisian language, particularly among non-native speakers of the language. Taking into consideration claims made in previous literature on the effect of top-down policies in attitudes of speakers of the dominant language towards the minoritized language (e.g., Newman et al., 2008), understanding why this effect is not perceived in the Frisian context seems to be the next logical step. From other minority contexts, many authors draw the conclusion that the educational system is the most relevant aspect of revitalization programs, thus suggesting that it would be interesting to study the attitudes of non-native speakers of Frisian who have attended a trilingual school and compare the results with the general population.

In addition, some of the findings suggest—in line with the conclusions of Belmar et al. 2018—that issues of ‘authenticity’ and ‘legitimacy’ are prominent in the Frisian discourse on new speakers, which may play a role in the attitude and the language use of new speakers. It is therefore necessary to carry out a qualitative study, ideally interviewing ‘new speakers’ who have successfully undergone a linguistic ‘muda’, learners and native speakers to understand how new speakers negotiate their place in the
Frisian-speaking community. This methodology could also be used to better understand the reasons why new speakers decided to acquire the language, and an analysis of the social situations that triggered these ‘mudes’ may lead us to new, more successful promotion campaigns.

Finally, more data on language use should be elicited in the reports published by the province of Fryslân every four years. Focusing only on language use with children and partners seems to be based on the assumption that Frisian is more used at home, and even though this may be true for native speakers of the language, results of this study suggest that it is not the case for new speakers.

In conclusion, as the number of new speakers of minoritized languages will continue to increase, long-held notions of speakerness and community will be challenged. Understanding these tensions is, therefore, of the utmost importance. As pointed out by Jaffe (1993), research on new speakers is essential if we want to understand “how to assert the value of mixed and plural identities in minority societies in which the attempt to escape relations of dominance places a high premium on declarations of absolute difference and clear-cut boundaries” (p. 101).
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Appendix

Questionnaire used for this study

1. Age: _________
2. Gender: 0 Man 0 Woman 0 Other
3. Where were you born?
   a. In Fryslân. What town? _________
   b. In another Dutch province. Which one? _________
   c. In another country. Which one? _________
4. If you were not born in Fryslân, how long have you been here?
   a. Less than a year
   b. Between 1 and 3 years
   c. Between 4 and 8 years
   d. 9 years or more
5. Where was your father born?
   a. In Fryslân. What town? _________
   b. In another Dutch province. Which one? _________
   c. In another country. Which one? _________
6. Where was your mother born?
   a. In Fryslân. What town? _________
   b. In another Dutch province. Which one? _________
   c. In another country. Which one? _________
7. Highest level of studies completed:
   a. Basisschool
   b. VMBO
   c. HAVO
   d. VWO
   e. MBO
   f. HBO
   g. WO / University
   h. Master’s
   i. PhD
8. Occupation: ______________
9. What language do you use more often?
   a. Only Dutch
   b. More Dutch than Frisian
   c. Frisian and Dutch equally
   d. More Frisian than Dutch
   e. Only Frisian
   f. Only another language
   g. Another language more than Dutch
   h. Another language and Dutch equally
   i. More Dutch than another language
   j. Another language more than Frisian
   k. Another language and Frisian equally
   l. More Frisian than another language
10. Which of these statements do you identify the most with:
   
a. I feel Frisian
   b. I feel more Frisian than Dutch
   c. I feel Frisian and Dutch equally
   d. I feel more Dutch than Frisian
   e. I feel Dutch
   f. I feel another nationality
   g. I feel more another nationality than Dutch
   h. I feel another nationality and Dutch equally
   i. I feel more Dutch than another nationality
   j. I feel more another nationality than Frisian
   k. I feel another nationality and Frisian equally
   l. I feel more Frisian than another nationality

11. Please, evaluate your language skills:
    Write: VW = Very well; W = Well; FW = Fairly Well; WD = With difficulty and N = Not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Understanding</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frisian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Which of these statements do you identify the most with:
    
   a. I am a native speaker of Frisian
   b. I am a speaker of Frisian
   c. I am a new speaker of Frisian

13. When did you start learning Frisian? _________________
    And what course are you in now?
    
    a. LearmarFrysk module 1
    b. LearmarFrysk module 2
    c. PraatmarFrysk module 1
    d. PraatmarFrysk module 2
    e. SkriuwmarFrysk module 1
    f. SkriuwmarFrysk module 2

14. Why are the following languages important to you?
    
    a. Because I need it to function in my daily life
       0 English    0 Dutch    0 Frisian    0 German
    b. Because it may give me an economic or professional advantage
       0 English    0 Dutch    0 Frisian    0 German
    c. Because I am proud of my heritage
       0 English    0 Dutch    0 Frisian    0 German
    d. Because I need it to communicate with my extended family
0 English 0 Dutch 0 Frisian 0 German
e. Because I need it to feel part of the community
0 English 0 Dutch 0 Frisian 0 German
f. Because I like it
0 English 0 Dutch 0 Frisian 0 German

15. To what degree do you agree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>Frisian</th>
<th>German</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is useful (1 = totally disagree / 5 = totally agree)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult (1 = totally disagree / 5 = totally agree)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is necessary (1 = totally disagree / 5 = totally agree)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy (1 = totally disagree / 5 = totally agree)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is beautiful (1 = totally disagree / 5 = totally agree)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is ugly (1 = totally disagree / 5 = totally agree)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. How often do you speak Frisian?
0 Every day 0 Sometimes 0 Rarely 0 Never

17. When you do…
   a. People usually answer you in Dutch
   b. People usually answer you in Dutch, unless you ask them to speak in Frisian
   c. People usually reply in Frisian
   d. Some people speak Frisian to you at first but change to Dutch when they notice you struggle

18. Who do you speak Frisian with? Who do you feel comfortable with when speaking Frisian? (Check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who…</th>
<th>I speak Frisian with…</th>
<th>I feel comfortable with…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My classmates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Frisian teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. What language(s) do you use in the following situations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where…</th>
<th>Frisian</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In my Frisian class</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 = never / 5 = always)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the supermarket</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 = never / 5 = always)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the street market</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 = never / 5 = always)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a café</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 = never / 5 = always)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At work</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 = never / 5 = always)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the doctor’s</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 = never / 5 = always)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a small shop</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 = never / 5 = always)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the bank</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 = never / 5 = always)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cities</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 = never / 5 = always)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In small villages</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 = never / 5 = always)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Twitter</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 = never / 5 = always)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Facebook</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 = never / 5 = always)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On WhatsApp</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 = never / 5 = always)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Are you planning on continuing studying Frisian when this course is over?

a. Yes, I am planning on enrolling when the next course opens.

b. No, I am not.

c. Maybe, I am not sure.