Es ich groter bin *dan mag ik naar de basisschool!*

Analysing the Multilingual Landscape of Eijsden-Margraten's Pre-School Playgrounds

Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen

TILBURG UNIVERSITY

Gino Morillo Morales
Student number: s4251563 (RU), u1277988 (UvT)
Radboud University, Tilburg University
Research Master's in Language and Communication

Date: 18/09/2017

Index

Preface

A thesis about the multilingual landscape at pre-school playgrounds in Eijsden-Margraten. In a sense, although the situation might be different in Reuver and Tegelen, two other villages in Limburg, it felt like delving into my own history, too. Crucially, "Limburg" and "my own history" are mentioned in the same sentence here, which is not as straightforward as it might seem. While growing up, the question "Who am I?" has always intrigued me. Am I Spanish? Because of my family, name, appearance, or because my father makes a great *paella* every now and then? Or am I Limburgish? Because I was born here, grew up here, and like a big piece of *kiersevlaai* once in a while? The answer, which I found not too long ago, is that I am both. Therefore, fittingly in my view, I will thank one of the persons – Leonie Cornips – who helped me uncover *who I am*, in Limburgish, and my family in the end in Spanish, the two languages I feel great affection for.

Ich wil es ierste Leonie Cornips gaer bedanke veur häör geweldige en motiverende begeleiding, positieve invloed, en oneindig gedöld tiejes miene scriptie, mien veldwerk en mien lierprocès in 't algemein. Umdet ich met 'n boel nieje óngerwèrpe in aanraking kwaam en veur 't iers ech veldwerk höb kènne doon, is 't soms mèt valle en ópsjtaon gegange, mer Leonie waas altied dao um te hèlpe en mich de goeie richting op te sjture. Leonie waas neet geweun "de begeleidster", mer väöl mier es det: 't waas 'ne insjpiratiebron, 'n väörbeeld en sjteun.

Additionally, I would like to thank Ad Backus and Marianne Starren for their guidance within the university. Venturing outside of the known university environment, while still having to fit everything in the university's framework was quite a challenge, but thanks to them, I had a firm back-up, which helped me succeed, and hopefully, excel.

I would also like to express my gratitude to the municipality of Eijsden-Margraten, *Stichting Spelenderwijs*, teachers of the pre-school playgrounds *Humpie Dumpie, Pinokkio,* and *Roelekeboel*, and the *SFBO*-employee for their cooperation, interest, and permission to let me conduct this research. It was fulfilling and inspiring to see the municipality have a lot of interest in the proceedings and results of my research, and while doing the field work, the teachers did their best to make me feel at home: our conversations during lunchtime were equally inspiring.

Al final, quiero darles las gracias a mis padres y familia – en Países Bajos y España – por su apoyo, ayuda y confianza en mis capacidades. Sin vosotros, yo no hubiera sido el primero de nuestra familia en alcanzar este hito. No ha sido un trabajo individual, sino un trabajo de equipo, de familia.

Gino Morillo Morales

Reuver, 18th of September 2017

1. Introduction

One of the characterising aspects of the Dutch province of Limburg is its multilingual landscape. Aside of Dutch as a national language and various other languages spoken by migrants, tourists and visitors, Limburgish is frequently spoken as well. The Limburgish language has been recognised by the Dutch government since 1997 as a regional language of the province of Limburg (Rijksoverheid 2015) and as a consequence receives moderate protection under Chapter II of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (ECRML) since 1997 (Council of Europe 1997). In a way, Limburg's multilingualism is reflected to a certain extent at pre-school playgrounds in the province, and thus in a Limburgian municipality like Eijsden-Margraten too, resulting in children with Dutch, Limburgish or another language like Turkish, Spanish or Dari sharing a single classroom, and resulting in several languages purposely being used or avoided in communication with specific individuals or groups in specific situations. Quote (1) below is an illustration of how young children learn to navigate through this multilingual landscape. Karina (pseudonym), a three-year old girl at one of the playgrounds in this research, starts her sentence in Limburgish and finishes it in Dutch (in italics).

(1)   Karina: "Es ich groter bin *dan mag ik naar de basisschool!"*
        "When I am taller, I can go to primary school!"

This thesis contains an analysis of many actors' (teachers and pupils with varying backgrounds) ways of dealing with multilingualism at the pre-school playgrounds and an assessment of how they employ this multilingualism, with whom and with what reasoning. Subsequently, the results of the analyses of Eijsden-Margraten will be reflected against the results of a written interview about the multilingual environment at pre-school playgrounds connected to the *Sintrum Frysktalige Berne-opfang* (*SFBO, Centre for Frisian Children Day Care*) in Friesland. In order to provide an adequate analysis, the main goal in this thesis is to answer the following questions:

    (i) What does the multilingual landscape at pre-school playgrounds in Eijsden-Margraten look like for all actors (teachers, children and parents)? Concretely, what does 'a multilingual environment at pre-school playgrounds' actually mean for a specific individual or group, which differences are there in language use between different 'groups', when is which language used by whom and with whom?

    (ii) To what extent is social inequality present at pre-school playgrounds in Eijsden-

Margraten?

(iii) What are the similarities and differences between the observations from this research and the information provided by the *SFBO* about the Frisian situation? That is, how do the aforementioned 'multilingual landscape' and 'social (in)equality' differ at these playgrounds, where a firm pro-bilingual language policy is in place?

It is vital to emphasise clearly that the Frisian data are based on reported behaviour by the *SFBO*, unlike the Limburgish data which are based on ethnographic fieldwork. As a consequence, it is unknown whether the Frisian reported data would look like observed data at the Frisian pre-school playgrounds.

In addition to this introduction, five more chapters will follow in this thesis. Firstly, chapter 2 will contain a literature overview, divided into five main topics. Subchapter 2.1 consists of literature on language socialisation, that is, how young children and new learners learn to be competent members within the society they currently live in. The next subchapters, 2.2 and 2.3 will contain literature about (the effects of) multilingualism and language policy, respectively, including specific literature on the language policy of pre-school playgrounds in Eijsden-Margraten, two of the factors which mould teachers' language practices and thus how language socialisation takes place, based on the 'ideal situation', according to ideology. In subchapter 2.4, a literature overview of one of the (often unconscious) linguistic processes taking place amongst speakers will be given, which is (linguistic) accommodation, followed by an overview of the usage-based theory in 2.5, which contains a possible explanation for the routinisation and automatisation of certain specific processes.

The research methodology will be the main subject of chapter three, with information on the pre-school playgrounds in subchapter 3.1, details on the ethnographic fieldwork process and how interaction with children and teachers occurred in subchapter 3.2, how data has been collected in 3.3, how interviews have been conducted in subchapter 3.4, and finally, how the data have subsequently been processed in 3.5. Subsequently, the results of the study will be presented in chapter 4, largely making use of the same subdivision as in chapter 2 (results of language socialisation in subchapter 4.1, results of multilingualism in practice subchapter 4.2 and language policy in practice in subchapter 4.3, and finally, results of linguistic accommodation subchapter 4.4. In each subchapter, the Frisian situation as described by the *SFBO* will be provided as well. Chapter 5 will contain analyses of the results presented in chapter 4. Subchapter 5.1 will detail how the multilingual landscape looks for children with Dutch as their native language. Subchapter 5.2 will do the same for the children growing up

with Limburgish as their mother tongue. Subsequently, subchapter 5.3 will contain an analysis of the multilingual landscape for children with a language other than Limburgish or Dutch as their mother tongue and finally, subchapter 5.4 will contain an interpretation of the teachers' multilingual environment. Each of these subchapters will contain analyses incorporating a usage-based perspective. After the analyses, a conclusion will follow in chapter 6, encompassing the five main topics of chapter 2 as well as the results of both the Limburgish pre-school playgrounds and the Frisian pre-school playgrounds, followed by a summary in Dutch. After the conclusion, a discussion and possibilities for future research will be presented briefly. Six appendices will be included, the first one being a summary in Dutch, the second one being a scan of a typical daily activity schedule at pre-school playgrounds in Eijsden-Margraten, the third one being the e-mail in which the municipality contacted *Spelenderwijs* (in Dutch), the fourth appendix contains scans (in Dutch) of the language policy at the pre-school playgrounds in this research, the fifth appendix contains a transcript (in Dutch) containing teachers' opinions on multilingualism and language policy in Limburg and specifically at pre-school playgrounds, and the final appendix contains the interview questions discussed with the *SFBO* (in Dutch).

2. Theoretical Framework

In this chapter, an overview of the relevant literature in this study will be provided, starting with literature on language socialisation in 2.1, after which 2.2 will contain literature on multilingualism. Subsequently, in 2.3 literature on language policy will be presented, which includes literature specific to Eijsden-Margraten (2.3.1) and Friesland (2.3.2). Literature on (linguistic) accommodation will be presented in 2.4, with literature on convergence and divergence in 2.4.1 and child-directed speech in 2.4.2. Finally, 2.5 will contain literature on the usage-based theory, with an overview of entrenchment and conventionalisation in 2.5.1.

2.1. Language socialisation in literature

In the words of Alessandro Duranti, "language [is] a set of cultural practices, that is, [...] a system of communication that allows for interpsychological (between individuals) and intrapsychological (in the same individual) representations of social order and helps people use such representations for constitutive social acts" (Duranti 1997: 3). Consequently, extrapolating this to pre-school playgrounds, young children come in touch with language socialisation at the pre-school playgrounds and learn through teachers' language practices what the social order is like. Ochs and Schieffelin (2001: 2) detail on language socialisation by mentioning that "[t]he process of acquiring language is deeply affected by the process of becoming a competent member in society", which is the process of learning about social order through language practices, and that "[t]he process of becoming a competent member of society is reali[s]ed to a large extent through language, through acquiring knowledge of its functions, its social distribution and interpretations in and across socially defined situations, i.e., through exchanges of language in particular social situations" (Ibidem). As a consequence, according to language socialisation theory, both learning processes are intertwined. Becoming a competent member in society is realised through learning about and participation in language practices and learning about language use is shaped by the process of becoming a competent member in society (Ochs 1986: 2).

In a multilingual environment or society, the use and coexistence of two or more codes is rarely an uncontested state of affairs, since more often than not "children's acquisition and use of two codes is a value-laden, ideologically charged, discursively elaborated process [in bilingual settings]" (Garrett 2007: 252). Therefore, children are socialised in the desired way of dealing with both languages and when which language can be spoken, with whom, and in

what context. For instance, the use of a particular language could be restricted to a specific domain, genre or environment (Garrett 2011: 516).

2.2. Multilingualism in literature

Within scientific literature, several diverging perspectives, both positive and negative, on multilingualism can be discerned. Bialystok (2009) mentions that bilinguals possess a smaller vocabulary than monolinguals in each of the languages they speak. In this study, 971 children participated in a Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT-III) for testing receptive vocabulary size. Half of the participating children were bilingual in English and another language and half were monolingual. On average, the English monolingual children had a score of 105, while the bilinguals had a score of 95. Additionally, bilinguals are slower in verbal fluency tasks, and have more 'tip-of-the-tongue' moments. Compared to monolinguals, they have a deficit in lexical access and retrieval, according to this study (4). Bilinguals are also slower in picture naming and commit more errors in such a task, even in their dominant language, although this disadvantage usually goes unnoticed in regular conversations (Bialystok & Craik 2010: 20). Furthermore, bilingual children are exposed to a lesser extent to each of their languages. They have fewer opportunities to use either language, and the actual use of each language differs as well (depending on language socialisation practices, as shown in chapter 2.1). Because of this, bilingual children often have a 'dominant language' and a 'weaker language', and which language takes a dominant position can change during a child's development. When growing up bilingually, complete language acquisition is certainly possible, but not guaranteed (Montrul 2008: 99). Moreover, children raised with a heritage language which is barely spoken by others in the local society generally will be less proficient in the heritage language when compared to their proficiency in the dominant language in society (Ibidem 2008: 100).

Contrasting with the negatives of growing up bilingually and being bilingual, several positive points have been widely discussed in scientific literature as well. One of the main advantages is that multilingualism is advantageous for the executive functions. Bialystok and Martin (2004) determined in an experiment that bilingual children between the ages of 4 and 5 are significantly faster in changing the dimensions in which to select an object (by 'colour' or 'shape') than their monolingual counterparts ($F(1, 65) = 37.50$, $p < .02$) (331). Furthermore, Costa, Hernández and Sebastián-Gallés (2008) have shown that, compared to monolinguals, bilinguals have an increased capacity for ignoring 'disturbing signals' while answering questions and that these cognitive advantages will remain present across a person's entire life span. Moreover, in contrast to Bialystok and Craik (2010)'s findings about English bilingual

children speaking another language as well, Cornips, Francot, Van den Heuij, Blom, Heeringa, Buchstaller & Siebenhaar (2017) have determined that children in Limburg score higher than the Dutch national average on a PPVT-NL-test for Dutch, and that speaking Limburgish does not hamper the size of a child's receptive vocabulary in Dutch (95). In addition to the aforementioned cognitive advantages, children growing up bilingually also experience a cultural advantage. Growing up bilingually allows children to function as a kind of 'buffer' and 'mediator' between cultures, or more precisely, "[t]hese youths learn, at an early age, to act as buffers to ameliorate the tensions and differences of the cultural worlds they inhabit and, in so doing, they still manage to uphold the moral standards of their home communities." (Baquedano-López & Mangual Figueroa 2011: 549).

2.3. Language policy in literature

Language policy is a powerful instrument for achieving political goals and justifying ideological choices (Van Avermaet, Pulinx & Sierens 2014: 2). European nation states, like the Netherlands, manifest themselves by propagating a single standard language, like Dutch, in order to create a national identity. The ideal image of a nation state is to create external differentiation, the national identity should contrast with those of the other countries, and internal cohesion, within a country, everyone should feel 'united'. Haugen (1966) mentions that, "[i]n language this has meant the urge not only to have one language, but to have one's own language [which is different from the languages of other nations]" (928). Having such a standard language is an ideal tool for creating a feeling of national cohesion. The ideal place to propagate a standard language is within schools, since one of the goals of education in the Netherlands is to teach children a specific type of Dutch (Ibidem 1966: 927). Aside of language policy, several other factors can influence teachers' opinions and beliefs on language policy and the presence of multilingualism in general. These are, for instance, a child's background, native language and whether standard Dutch is spoken or not (Agirdag, Van Avermaet & Van Houtte (2013: 34). In the long run, if a teacher has a negative attitude towards a language variant spoken by a person, the person's academic achievements could be hampered by this (Godley, Sweetland, Wheeler, Minnici & Carpenter 2006: 30).

2.3.1. Language policy in Eijsden-Margraten

The language policy implemented at the pre-school playgrounds in this study (included in appendix 4) is provided by *Spelenderwijs*, the umbrella organisation which coordinates the programmes at the pre-school playgrounds in the municipality of Eijsden-Margraten (and in

several other preschools in municipalities in Southern Limburg: Beek, Gulpen-Wittem, Meerssen, Schinnen, Sittard-Geleen, and Stein). In their language policy, they state that Dutch should be the language used in communication at all pre-school playgrounds in the municipality, but that teachers are also allowed to use a regional language with a child, although the use of this regional language should mainly be confined to an individual conversation between child and teacher (Spelenderwijs 2015: 11). Spelenderwijs overtly states that Dutch is the language to be used in communication in their language policy in order to stimulate a child's general development and acquisition of the Dutch language. In doing so, they hope to provide children with an increased chance of a good career in school (Wouterse 2016: 1).

2.3.2. Language policy in Friesland

In Friesland, a strict language policy exists for the pre-school playgrounds connected to the *SFBO*. In contrast with *Spelenderwijs*' language policy, which states that the regional language should be spoken in an individual situation, the *SFBO* connects the use of a specific language (either Frisian or Dutch) to a specific teacher, and not the communicative situation (group or individual communication). In doing so, both languages are equal and can be used equally and actively with all children. At *SFBO*-pre-school playgrounds, about 60% to 70% of all input is in Frisian. Additionally, as a part of their language policy, the *SFBO* actively provides information about multilingualism for teachers and parents, for instance by organising specific 'parent evenings' on multilingualism and providing concise and easy to read information on the advantages and added value of being multilingual (Sintrum Frysktalige Berne-opfang 2010). In doing so, teachers and parents are provided with accurate knowledge about the choice for this specific language policy and its advantages, and common rumours about multilingualism can be debunked professionally.

2.4. Accommodation in literature

Linguistic accommodation can be defined as the process "[i]n interaction in which we adjust and adapt our communication to our fellow speakers. Sometimes these adjustments are conscious and deliberate [and i]n some cases, they are unconscious and automatic" (Dragojevic, Gasiorek & Giles 2015: 1). Accommodation can take place in various ways, some of them being simplifying explanations for children (child-directed speech), adapting one's speech rate, pitch, volume, and lexical choices (Ibidem) and occurs in order to either facilitate interaction and communication between people or keep people at a social distance (Ibidem 2015: 17). Another form of accommodation can be found in expressing an opinion, for instance. Most likely, people

express a vivid opinion on a subject differently to their boss in comparison to their neighbour (Giles 2008: 2).

Instead of all possible forms of accommodation occurring to a certain degree in every conversation, the ways in which humans accommodate their speech depends on the interaction partner. In the 1970s, Howard Giles developed the base of the Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT, which used to be called SAT, Speech Accommodation Theory, back then). The goals of CAT are to "[...] explain and predict [...] communicative adjustments, and model how others in an interaction perceive, evaluate, and respond to them" (Ibidem 2015: 1). Aside of describing and influence language behaviour as well: an individual can either converge (accommodate towards a conversational partner), maintain the status quo and not accommodate or diverge and create social distance by overtly diverging from the conversational partner's way of speaking (Giles 2008: 1).

2.4.1. Convergence, maintenance and divergence

Dragojevic, Gasiorek & Giles (2015) define 'convergence' as "[...] adjusting communicative behavio[u]rs to be similar to another's" (3), meaning that in a conversation, communicative partners adapt several elements (for example, pitch, or lexical complexity) of their usual ways of speaking in order to match the way their conversational partner speaks and vice versa. Divergence can be defined as the exact opposite, concretely "[...] adjusting communicative behavio[u]rs to accentuate verbal and nonverbal differences with others, to appear more dissimilar" (Ibidem 2015: 4). Maintenance is somewhat in between of convergence and divergence. In this situation, a speaker does neither adapt to the conversation partner's way of speaking nor move away from it.

Several factors can influence the choice to converge or diverge. Firstly, one of the motives for convergence is the wish to obtain social approval. By speaking in a more similar way, people want to increase interpersonal liking. Consequently, by mimicking a certain accent, a speaker might want to express that he or she is 'part of the group'. Secondly, reinforcing a speaker's own identity is a motive for divergence. In doing so, a member of for instance a social minority, can emphasise and express pride of their (diverging) cultural or linguistic identity (Ibidem 2015: 9). A cognitive motive for converging would be that accommodating to a more uniform way of speaking facilitates interpersonal communicating and mutual understanding (Ibidem 2015: 10).

An example of divergence thoroughly described by Bourhis, Giles, Leyens en Tajfel (1979) is about a group of Flemish youths who diverged – on purpose – from a French speaking

conversational partner when this French speaking person started making derogatory remarks about the Dutch language. A second example of divergence, presented in Bourhis & Giles (1977), occurred when an English speaking interviewer told a group of Welsh speaking youths that Welsh is a dying language without a future. After this remark, the Welsh youths consciously started speaking more Welsh to support their Welsh identity and distance themselves from the interviewer and his statements. In both examples, both groups opt for the language which their conversational partner does not speak in order to emphasise their belonging to a different cultural and linguistic group – due the derogatory remarks by the persons not belonging to the respective groups, the youths probably did not feel the need to converge to them anymore and preferred diverging.

Convergence and divergence take place in two possible directions: "upwards" and "downwards". Dragojevic, Gasiorek & Giles (2015) define both forms in the following way: "[u]pward convergence refers to shifts toward a more prestigious variety of speech, whereas downward convergence refers to shifts toward a less prestigious, or even stigmati[s]ed, variety" (4). For illustration, an example of upward convergence would be adapting to an interviewer's more prestigious accent in an interview, while the other end of the spectrum is downward divergence: emphasising a speaker's own less prestigious accent in an interview with an interviewer speaking with a more prestigious accent. Additionally, interspeaker convergence and divergence processes do not necessarily occur to an equal extent within two speakers. Convergence and divergence can either be symmetrical, with both speakers equally adapting their speech, or asymmetrical, with only one of the speakers converging or diverging, or one of the speakers converging or diverging more than the other.

2.4.2. Child-directed speech

Child-directed speech (CDS), also known as 'motherese' (Cooper & Aslin 1990: 1584), refers to the way adults converge asymmetrically towards a child's language use (Schaerlaekens 2008: 47). As briefly described in subchapter 2.4, it often involves simplification of language, in explanations, speech rate, and for instance, lexical complexity. A previous study conducted by Fernald (1985) amongst 48 children at the age of four months has indicated that children at this age prefer listening to CDS over regular speech (Fernald 1985: 190). Even though CDS is a common phenomenon in the western world, it is not a universal phenomenon. Lots of societies do not make use of child-directed speech (Pinker 1994: 40).

Some of the chataracteristics of CDS are frequent repetition of certain expressions, simplifying grammar (Pinker 1994: 39), and using diminutives in abundance, as well as an

increased pitch and slower speech rate in comparison to a regular conversation between two adults (Narayan & McDermott 2016: 1).

2.5. Usage-based theory in literature

People adhere to norms. Whether these are traffic rules (stopping for a red light, driving when it is green), written rules, certain behavioural rules (greeting when meeting someone), or desired ways of speaking (using a formal register or an informal one), people adhere to them (Backus 2016). According to usage-based theories, knowledge, which includes knowledge about language as well, is not innate, but rather a result of *stored* knowledge about its usage, obtained in past experiences, as illustrated by Backus (2016): "[...] we know how to behave in a bar because (most of us) have been in one often enough, and, likewise, we know how to construct a subordinate clause or how to inflect a verb because we practice it hundreds of times per day".

Elaborating on the aspect of stored knowledge, from a usage-based perspective, 'grammar' is a collection of an individual's experiences with language, both actively and passively. Consequently, several factors of these experiences with language, such as the frequency of active or passive use of a certain construction, "[has] an impact on representation that we can see evidenced in various ways, for example, in speakers' recognition of what is conventionali[s]ed and what is not, and even more strikingly in the nature of language change" (Bybee 2006: 711). Additionally, aside of visible and audible evidence of frequency effects, frequency also has an impact on the stored information within an individual's mind, that is, on the information which gets entrenched. Ibbotson (2013) further elaborates the effects of frequency by mentioning that "[t]he relative frequency of items in a corpus obviously plays a key role in many usage-based processes. Items that consistently co-occur together in the speech stream and are consistently used for the same function face a pressure to become *automati[s]ed*, in a manner that is similar to those which occur in a variety of non-linguistic sensory-motor skills", in doing so, he argues that frequent exposure and use leads to automatisation, thus using a specific, frequent expression does not require a conscious effort once it is automatised.

Young children often have a specific expression ready to which they have been frequently exposed. If they do not have such an expression at hand, they can cut and paste linguistic items which they have acquired. Tomasello (2000: 77) elaborates this by stating the following:

When young children have something they want to say, they sometimes have a set expression readily available and so they simply retrieve that expression from their stored linguistic experience. When they have no set expression readily available, they retrieve linguistic schemas and items that they have previously mastered [...] and then "cut and paste" them together as necessary for the communicative situation at hand

Aside of frequency, (language) variation, (language) change and the usage pattern (of language) are important elements in the usage-based theory, since everyone belongs to different speech communities and consequently is exposed to, for instance, different conventions, registers and words (Bybee & Beckner 2010: 827). As a consequence, a different idiolect will get entrenched in every individual, and an individual can change their register depending on the speech community they take part in at a given point in time. The importance of frequency and repetition is emphasised in *Spelenderwijs'* current language policy at pre-school playgrounds in Eijsden-Margraten. Teachers have to repeat the expressions of a child with a question and possibly a correction to provide them with feedback and an example of what the correct expression is (Wouterse-Schmitz 2005: 8).

Repetition plays an important role in language acquisition and social acts. Even young children make use of repetition in order to achieve their goals in communication with other children. Aside of that, it is also beneficial in a child's acquisition of both linguistic and cultural acts (Moore 2011: 220). Repetition also serves as a form of confirmation or negation, and is both a sign that the hearer is acutally paying attention to the speaker (Ochs 1974: 10) and that the hearer has actually understood the speaker (Brown & Bellugi 1964).

2.5.1. Entrenchment and conventionalisation

'Entrenchment' and 'conventionalisation' are key elements within the usage-based theory. Entrenchment is the "[...] continuous routini[s]ation and re-organi[s]ation of associations, depending on exposure to and frequency of identical or similar processing events, subject to the exigencies of the social environment" (Schmid 2014). In other words, frequently occurring language practices, constructions, or situations in general, will be entrenched more deeply in an invidiual's memory, consequently routinising and automatising the language practice, construction or situation.

Regarding automatisation, a large part of human activity is automatised, meaning that no conscious effort is needed for performing the automatised activity. For illustration, learning to use a bicycle requires a conscious effort, whereas when this skill has been acquired,

balancing, the leg and feet movements for moving forward, as well as the hand-eye coordination for steering happen without thinking about it. Entrenchment occurs passively too, if a certain person, a teacher for example, consistently uses a specific register when addressing a child, then it will be entrenched in the child's mind that this is the way he or she will be addressed in.

Constrasting with entrenchment, which takes place within an individual's mind, conventionalisation occurs in a certain group and is the "[...] continuous mutual coordination and matching of communicative knowledge and practices, subject to the exigencies of the entrenchment processes taking place in individual minds." An example of this is the use of a formal register in a work meeting at a company. New employees joining this meeting will learn about the communicative norms (which will get entrenched), and in doing so, they will learn to follow the collective norm, or convention (Schmid 2015: 11).

3. Methodology

The majority of the data in this study have been collected by ethnographic fieldwork at pre-school playgrounds in Cadier en Keer, Eijsden, and Margraten. Details of the observation period, daily schedule, and inital contact with the pre-school playgrounds will be provided in subchapter 3.1. In 3.2, the proceedings of the ethnographic fieldwork will be explained, including the way interaction with both children and teachers took place. In addition to this method, several other methods have been applied in order to obtain the data, such as audio recordings which have subsequently been transcribed and analysed (see 3.3) and conducting interviews. In 3.4, the method used for structuring and conducting these interviews will be explained, and finally, the way the data have subsequently been processed will be explained in 3.5.

3.1. The pre-school playgrounds

The main method of data collection of the current study is ethnographic fieldwork. All observations were done at three pre-school playgrounds in the municipality of Eijsden-Margraten, during the regular opening hours, between February 2016 and June 2016. More specifically, all observational data have been collected at pre-school playgrounds Pinokkio (in Cadier en Keer), Roelekeboel (in Eijsden) and Humpie Dumpie (in Margraten) during thirteen days of observation: February 23, March 8, 15, and 29, April 5, 12, and 21, May 12, 19 and 26, and June 2, 23 and 30. The former two pre-school playgrounds were only open during the morning hours (8:45-11:45), whereas the latter one in Margraten was also open during the afternoon hours (13:00-15:30). Consequently, all observations in Cadier and Keer, and Eijsden, have been conducted in the morning hours (alternating between pre-school playground per observation day), whereas during the afternoon of every observation day, fieldwork has been done in Margraten.

At these pre-school playgrounds, children are welcome from the age of 2, and proceed to a primary school at the age of 4. The pre-school playgrounds make use of a structured daily programme, usually starting with parents arriving with their children and playing together with them from 8:45 until around 9:15 after which they slowly leave, followed by a group activity in the circle preceded by an instruction song to perform an activity (such as "Wij gaan opruimen", where children have to take the chairs back from the circle to where they took them) at 9:30, activities with toys in smaller groups (under supervision) at 9:45, eating and talking at 10:00 (preceded by the instruction song "Smakelijk eten"), a toilet round at 10:20, the

opportunity to play freely inside or outside (depending on the weather) at 10:30, singing and moving around on music at 11:30, and finally, the time when parents would pick up their children at 11:45. The morning programme was usually repeated in the afternoon. Some children were only present during a part of the day, whereas others were present during both parts. An example of the daily schedule, copied from *Spelenderwijs*' guide for pre-school playgrounds, can be consulted in appendix 2.

Pre-school playgrounds and parents with children at those playgrounds were informed about the presence of an 'intern' doing observational language research via *Spelenderwijs*. The municipality of Eijsden-Margraten explained the goal of the research in an e-mail to *Spelenderwijs*, who subsequently gave permission for the research to be conducted. This e-mail can be consulted in appendix 3.

3.2. Ethnographic fieldwork and interaction

All ethnographic fieldwork has mainly been conducted by myself with active participation in the daily programme. That is to say, I participated actively as an in-group member: teachers would ask me the same questions they would ask a child ("How has your weekend been?"), however, by occasionally calling me "mister Gino" and due to the age difference, I was probably seen more as a teacher by the children, for instance, several times when a child did something which was not allowed, another child would tell me about it so I would "solve the situation". In these cases, I would usually alert a teacher if some attention really was required. Generally, I tried not to interrupt the teachers' activities, and not to interfere with their responsibilities, but also assist where I could lend a helping hand (in cleaning up, for instance). At times, external observation proved to be relevant as well, such as, observing children play from a distance, in order to not interrupt their activity. While playing outside, for instance, I would stand where the teachers stood, or sit on a bench at a 5 to 10 metre distance, watch, and listen. Children, curious as they are at such a young age, happily engage in conversation with a newcomer. Consequently, whenever a child would start a conversation with me, I happily joined them, while following the language choices they made in all activities. If they seeked contact in Dutch, I would reply in Dutch, and if they seeked contact in Limburgish, I would reply accordingly. Usually, these conversations were on an individual basis. Regarding active participation in the daily programme, in the case of sitting in the circle, the location where teachers and children do group activities and follow instructions provided by the teachers, this meant sitting in the circle as a member of it. I followed all conventions in-group members follow: as will be demonstrated elaborately later on, children are socialised by teachers in the

usage of Dutch in group communication. Thus, when teachers explained to the entire group how their weekend was – in Dutch – I would follow that convention and do so as well. When singing instruction songs – with the majority of the songs still being familiar to me – I would join them and sing along as well, while observing them. When playing outside, which occurred once per part of the day, this entailed joining in children's activities as well. Children making a 'sand castle', playing with a ball, or simply sitting on a bench were sometimes actively accompanied by me to experience their language practices from a close distance (I would join them in making a sand castle or playing with a ball), and sometimes observed externally (from a distance) in order to take the observer's paradox (Labov 1972: 209) as much into account as possible. After all, my close presence could disturb their activities since they could feel supervised by me, or make a child shy and say nothing at all, as I have seen several times. At every moment, I carried a notebook and a pen with me, in order to take notes immediately whenever something noteworthy occurred. Some children were eager to learn, so whenever they saw me writing, they approached me and asked what I was doing. In some situations "I am writing in my notebook" satisfied their curiosity, whereas in some other cases they wanted to write as well, after which I turned to a blank page so we could write together. Sometimes I would give them my pen (under close supervision) after which they would scribble a bit, and sometimes I would write their name and show it to them. When a record of a longer sequence was desired, or whenever a lot was happening simultaneously, recordings were made, which were subsequently transcribed, as will be discussed in 3.3.

In the case of teachers, who were very much interested and willing to help in the observational process, actively informing them about the observations was avoided, since doing so could have influenced their behaviour, but aside of that I also happily participated actively in conversations about basically anything relevant and irrelevant to the pre-school playground and cooperated in activities with them, for example, in placing all chairs in a circle, cleaning up at the end of the day, and reorganising tables. In a way, several helpful teachers also took the role of 'drawing me in' upon them, by directing questions at me in the circle in the presence of the children, so the children could listen to me. In some cases where additional explanations were required, for instance to get more details *why* teachers made a certain choice, short questions were asked, usually at the end of the day or during a quieter moment, while all children were busy colouring for instance. An example of this is when I asked why one of the teachers consistently spoke Limburgish with a Dutch speaking child, to which she then said that the parents specifically asked for it. When longer, elaborated explanations about more complicated topics were required, for instance on teachers' opinions on language policy and

multilingualism, a short, structured interview was conducted at the end of the day, which was recorded and subsequently transcribed. These will be discussed in 3.4.

3.3. Recordings

In some cases, solely taking notes using a notebook would have yielded insufficient details. During a group conversation in the circle for instance, or in rapid individual communication, keeping up with listening and writing notes would have been impossible. Additionally, when observing the conversational dynamics of language practices at pre-school playgrounds, analysing a larger chunk of conversation (such as the structured interviews, which will be discussed in 3.4) provides more details and prevents missing out on a lot of paralinguistic elements, such as pitch, volume, or intonation. Therefore, recordings were made using the recording application of a Samsung Galaxy S5 (in silent mode). In the placement of the mobile phone, audibility of the recording and visibility of the device were key considerations. Ideally, the device was either placed somewhere centrally, but not too visibly for the children, for instance, in front of me on the table where teachers and children gathered, between my notes and pens, or in a circle situation where no table was present, on top of the notebook on my lap. The device might have distracted the children for a few seconds, but they usually quickly continue with their current activities since the screen was switched off and they most likely did not understand that I was recording them. The teachers were well aware I would record every now and then, so they did not act surprised whenever I started recording. They would simply continue with their usual activities. Later on, when analysing, the recordings were replayed using VLC Media Player and transcribed using Microsoft Word.

3.4. Interviews

In two cases where a more elaborate explanation or opinion of a certain topic were required, concretely, teachers' opinions on multilingualism, dialect usage, and language policy, or the multilingual landscape at the *SFBO* pre-school playgrounds, structured interviews were conducted by creating an interview guide beforehand in which questions were organised by topic, as described in Brinkmann & Kvale (2014). When this was done orally, in the former case, several questions were prepared during the day, and after the end of the day, the interview would be held and recorded with permission of the teachers involved, to avoid interrupting the programme in any way. The interview was transcribed afterwards, using specific codes for speaker (L1, L2 and so on for 'leerkracht (teacher) 1'), and several signs meant for

paralinguistic elements ([for an interrupted utterance,] for the interrupting utterance and (<) for a brief pause), which can be seen in appendix 5.

In the case of the interview with an *SFBO* employee, the interview was designed based on the results of the observations in Eijsden-Margraten. Consequently, all questions encompassed the five main topics discussed in chapter 2 (language socialisation, multilingualism, language policy, (linguistic) accommodation and the usage-based theory), in order to obtain an overview of how these processes work in Friesland. Since interview was conducted via telephone, it was not recorded or transcribed as elaborately as the interview with the teachers in Eijsden-Margraten. Rather, all questions were pre-prepared in a document and all answers were typed into this document during the phone call. Afterwards, this document was sent for feedback to the *SFBO* employee to ascertain whether all responses had been interpreted properly, and all feedback has been incorporated in the document afterwards. This interview can be found in appendix 6.

3.5. Processing the data

After the observation process, all accumulated data from notes and transcriptions were analysed according to the five topics (language socialisation, multilingualism, language policy, (linguistic) accommodation and the usage-based theory) presented in chapter 2. The interview transcriptions have been included in appendices 5 and 6. Since the results and analyses were reported to the municipality of Eijsden-Margraten, briefly after the observation period, several separate reports were made, separated by each of the five topics. All names used in those reports, as well in this thesis, have been anonimised. Consequently, even though almost all reports primarily made use of the same data set, they were all written independently from each other and a separate literature study on the topic of the report preceded the analyses, meaning that the same data set has been processed using five distinct perspectives. After the five reports, a sixth report was delivered to the municipality which linked all topics. That same connecting link is continued in this thesis. Language socialisation is about what actually happens at pre-school playgrounds. (Ideas on) language policy and multilingualism portray the 'ideologically ideal situation'. Linguistic accommodation is one of things that happen, often unconsciously, whereas a usage-based approach as a theoretical framework can help to explain why certain processes occur.

4. Results

In this chapter, all results will be presented, separated by topic, starting with language socialisation in 4.1. Afterwards, teachers' and parents' opinions on multilingualism and dialect use will be presented in 4.2, followed by teachers' opinions on language policy at the pre-school playgrounds in Eijsden-Margraten in 4.3, and finally, various aspects of accommodation will be presented in 4.4.

4.1. Language socialisation at pre-school playgrounds

At pre-school playgrounds, children are socialised by teachers in the language use specifically desired in this environment. In language socialisation through specific language practices of teachers, they learn how to be a competent member in society. Vice versa, the process of becoming a competent member in society influences a child's language acquisition as well (Ochs & Schieffelin 2001: 2). Teachers' language socialisation processes may vary according to various facets, such as context (*where* the conversation is being held), person (with *whom* a teacher speaks), number (*how many* people the teacher is addressing), and activity (*what* is everyone doing). Therefore, in 4.1.1, language socialisation in the circle will be elaborated on. Afterwards, the results of language socialisation while playing outside will be presented in 4.1.2, followed by language socialisation in instruction songs in 4.1.3, next, the results of language socialisation processes for non-Dutch and non-Limburgish speaking children will be presented in 4.1.4, and finally this subchapter will conclude with a section about language socialisation in Friesland in 4.1.5.

4.1.1. Language socialisation in the circle

In 'the circle', an activity reoccurring several times per day, teachers and children perform several activities together, while sitting on small chairs alinged in a circular shape. Some examples of these activities are, for instance, listening to a story read by the teachers, putting an object in the centre of the circle, and then talking about it, answering questions asked by the teachers ("How was your weekend?"), or singing for someone's birthday.

Regarding language choice in the circle, teachers clearly show the tendency to speak Dutch in the circle to a group consisting of more than one child. In example (2), shown below, one of the teachers announces to all children what the next part of the programme will be: cutting out a small flower shape on paper. Contrastingly, teachers show a tendency to use Limburgish primarily in dialogues between two people, as shown in example (3). When asking

Iris whether she would like to cut out a small heart shape, she does so in Limburgish. The following examples took place shortly after each other, in the circle:

(2)   A teacher to the group: "We gaan zo een bloemetje prikken!"
          "We will cut out a small flower in a minute!"

(3)   A teacher to Iris: "Wils se 'n hertje prikke?"
          "Do you want to cut out a small heart?"

While eating, which basically is a group activity while sitting in a circle as well, an instance of a teacher speaking Limburgish has been observed. In example (4), which was a rare event, Limburgish speaking children were assembled at a table, while the other table (example (5)) was mixed between Dutch and Limburgish speaking children. In both examples, the teachers asked the respective groups whether anyone would like something to drink. Similarly, during another group activity, a teacher was reading in Dutch about bears, and two children were listening. One child spoke Limburgish, while the other child spoke Dutch. The teacher asked the Limburgish speaking child individually a question in Limburgish (example (6)), and repeated the question individually for the Dutch speaking child (example (7)). Both children only answered to the questions aimed at them.

(4)   A teacher at the Limburgish table: "Waem wilt nog 'n bitsje drinke?"
          "Who wants something to drink?"

(5)   A teacher at the mixed table: "Wie wil nog een beetje drinken?"
          "Who wants something to drink?"

(6)   A teacher to John: "Bis doe bang veur beren?"
          "Are you afraid of bears?"

(7)   A teacher to Sarah: "Ben jij bang voor beren?"
          "Are you afraid of bears?"

Seeing how teachers communicate in the circle and while eating still leaves the question how children communicate in these contexts. Children with either Dutch or Limburgish as their first languages will also reply in their first language, regardless whether their language choice contrasts with the teacher's or not. Whenever a teacher asks a *collective* question to the entire group, usually an *individual* response from the children is provoked. This is illustrated in example (8). In this example, a teacher asks the entire group in the circle which colour a specific

object is in its centre. Afterwards, all Dutch speaking children reply with "Green!" in Dutch, while all Limburgish speaking children do the same, but in Limburgish.

(8) A teacher to the group: "Welke kleur is dit?"
 "Which colour is this?"
Dutch speaking children: "Groen!" *("Green!")*
Limburgish speaking children: "Greun!" *("Green!")*

Repetition is one of the tools at a teacher's disposal to stimulate a specific language choice in the circle (De Houwer 2009: 134). In example (9), Giulia, a Limburgish speaking girl, states in Limburgish that she wants to go to her grandparents, to which the teacher replies with a repetition in Dutch. In example (10), a similar pattern can be observed. Frits, a Limburgish speaking boy, states in Dutch that the caterpillar in Eric Carle's *The Very Hungry Caterpillar* is about to nibble on a leaf, which the teacher confirms and repeats in Dutch. In both examples, all children were paying attention to the conversations. In example (11), Lotte tells a teacher in Limburgish that she has watered the flowers, however, in this case, the other children are not paying any attention. Subsequently, the teacher repeats her question in Limburgish.

(9) Giulia to a teacher: "Ich wil nao opa en oma!"
 "I want to go to grandpa and grandma!"
A teacher to Giulia: "Jij gaat naar opa en oma, ja!"
 "You will go to grandpa and grandma, yes!"

(10) Frits to a teacher: "Kiek, dao geit d'r knabbele!"
 "Look, he is going to nibble there!"
A teacher to Frits: "Ja, daar gaat hij knabbelen!"
 "Yes, he is going to nibble there!"

(11) Lotte to a teacher: "Ich höb de bloemetjes water gegeve!"
 "I have watered the flowers!"
A teacher to Lotte: "Oh! Höbs doe de bloemetjes water gegeve?"
 "Oh! Have you watered the flowers?"

4.1.2. Language socialisation while playing outside

For children, time for playing outside means time for spreading out all over the playground. During this part of the programme, children have the chance to decide for themselves what they would like to do, and with whom. Children do activities like hide-and-seek, a bicycle race, or making sand cakes in the sandpit. Since the playground outside is such a stimulating and interesting environment for children, they often forget some of their stuff. How a teacher deals

with this is shown in example (12). Here, the teacher asks all the children in a loud voice – in Dutch – whose coat she has just found. Antonio, a young boy, tries to claim it – in Limburgish – after which the teacher tells him the coat is definitely not his.

(12)   A teacher to all children: "Van wie is deze jas?"
        "Whose coat is this?"
        Antonio to the teacher: "Van mich!"
        "Mine!"
        A teacher to Antonio: "Nae, dae is neet van dich!"
        "No, that one is not yours!"

Repetition is not only relevant for a circle activity, it also takes place in a playing context. In examples (13) and (14), a teacher repeats the children's Dutch utterances in Limburgish. Firstly, in example (13), Vera sadly says that her mother is not coming to pick her up at the end of a long day. The teacher rephrases her utterance in question form, and in Limburgish. Secondly, in example (14), Iris says she has paint at home too, which a teacher again rephrases as a question, in Limburgish. These children are raised in Limburgish at home and no other children were paying attention to the conversation in both examples.

(13)   Vera to a teacher: "Mammie komt niet."
        "Mommy is not coming."
        The teacher to Vera: "Kömp ze neet?"
        "Is she not coming?"

(14)   Iris to a teacher: "Ik heb ook verf thuis!"
        "I also have paint at home!"
        The teacher to Iris: "Höbs se ooch verf thoes?"
        "Do you also have paint at home?"

4.1.3. Language socialisation in instruction songs

Another frequently recurring part of the daily programme are the instruction songs. Teachers start singing these songs in order to communicate that all children are expected to do a certain task, such as "Smakelijk eten" ("Have a nice meal") before dinner time, "Wij gaan opruimen" ("We are going to clean up") after playing and "Dag vriendjes en vriendinnetjes" ("Bye, friends") before leaving at the end of the day. On several occasions, some Limburgish speaking children repeated these songs by themselves in Dutch. During the observational period, these songs were solely sang in Dutch and songs in Limburgish were non-existent, however, after reporting about this to the municipality, several songs were either newly created or translated

into Limburgish by Ton Custers of *Hastijns* and sung by Edith Rutten, in cooperation with *Spelenderwijs*. One of these songs – "Smäokelik ëte" ("Have a nice meal") – can be found below.

Figure 1. Smäokelik ëte (Custers & Rutten 2016)

4.1.4. Language socialisation for non-Dutch and non-Limburgish speaking children
Aside of the children raised with either Dutch or Limburgish at home, some children are raised with another language, such as Arabic, Turkish or Italian. These children have either been born in the Netherlands to parents speaking another language than Dutch or Limburgish language, or have been born in another country and migrated to the Netherlands with their parents. For these children, just like their peers raised in Dutch or Limburgish, a pre-school playground is an area where they encounter new language socialisation processes.

Examples (15) and (16) both occurred within a short interval. In example (15), a teacher asks Remco (who speaks Limburgish) in Limburgish whether he would like to use another colour while painting. Briefly afterwards, the teacher asks Adil (who speaks Arabic at home) – in Dutch – which colour he would like to have in example (16).

(15)   A teacher to Nico: "Wils se 'ne angere kleur?"
        "Do you want another colour?"

(16)   A teacher to Adil: "Adil, welke kleur wil jij?"
        "Adil, which colour do you want?"

The following examples (17) and (18) nicely contrast. Both examples occurred almost simultaneously and both children were sitting at an almost equal distance from the teacher. Max

(with Limburgish as his first language) and Aziz (with Arabic as his first language) were both busy colouring and not making eye contact with the teacher. Both children could discern without making any eye contact which utterance was intended for whom.

(17) A teacher to Max: "Dich mós nóg eve wachte!"
      "You have to wait a bit longer!"

(18) A teacher to Aziz: "Wat wil jij?"
      "What do you want?"
      Aziz to the teacher: "Een vlinder!"
      "A butterfly!"

Ayaan, a Somali girl who has only been in the Netherlands for a brief period of time, has acquired enough Dutch to express what she wants and does not want, and she notices when an utterance is directed at her. In example (19), Joshua, a Limburgish speaking boy, addresses a group of children, including Ayaan, in Limburgish. Similarly to example (17) where Aziz did not feel addressed, Ayaan does not reply to Joshua's utterance in (19). In example (20), where a teacher asked Ayaan not to cut into a flower shape on a paper – in Dutch – Ayaan did reply, not verbally, but rather physically by nodding. Even though she ended up cutting in the flower shape anyway, she clearly did feel like she was being talked to.

(19) Joshua to a group of children: "Jonges, veer gaon dao sjpele!"
      "Guys, we are going to play over there!"

(20) A teacher to Ayaan: "Niet in het bloemetje prikken hè!"
      "Do not cut into the flower, okay?"

Similarly, during one of the observation days, a teacher was reading a story together with a group of children. One of them was a Dari speaking girl. She was listening attentively to the teacher's story, but once the teacher switched to Limburgish in order to engage in an individual conversation with a child, she lost her concentration and left.

In comparison to their Limburgish and Dutch classmates, children speaking another language tend to play alone more, and are left alone more by the other children. Usually, these children seek contact with a teacher. At one of the pre-school playgrounds, three children speaking another language often sought contact with each other, two of them were of Moroccan descent, and one of them of Afghan descent. Whenever there was interaction between children speaking another language and a Dutch or Limburgish speaking child, the former child would

often reply very shortly or would not reply at all, as shown in examples (21) and (22). In (21), Tom asks Ayesha (of Afghan descent) – in Limburgish – to take a look. She does not reply, and she does not look either. In (22), Amare (of Moroccan descent) takes a small object from Elisa, after which Elisa replies in Limburgish and walks off. There is no verbal input from Amare's part.

(21)   Tom to Ayesha: "Kiek es!"
        "Take a look!"

(22)   Elisa to Amare: "Nei, ich wil dat zelf höbbe."
        "No, I want to have that myself."

While observing, an additional observation of a failing interaction was made. Specifically, a Limburgish speaking boy tried engaging in a conversation with an Afrikaans speaking boy, however, the boy did not reply. Subsequently, the Limburgish speaking boy continued playing without him instead of rephrasing his utterance in Dutch.

An example to counter this could be found in Joost's behaviour. Joost, who truly befriended Ibrahim, his Arabic speaking friend, and they talk to each other in Dutch. In example (23), Ibrahim explains what he 'has cooked':

(23)   Ibrahim to Joost: "Ik heb de pizza gemaakt!"
        "I have made the pizza!"

Children that are not raised with either Limburgish or Dutch at home have relatively little experience with these languages once they start at the pre-school playgrounds. Quite often, even if they understand Dutch, they do not reply verbally but do fulfill the desired task, as shown for Yaseen (who speaks Arabic) in examples (24) and (25). Whenever they do reply, they usually reply with short answers, like Mahmud, who speaks Turkish, does in example (26).

(24)   A teacher to Yaseen: "Yaseen, doe jij nog even kleuren!"
        "Yaseen, keep on colouring!"

(25)   Another teacher to Yaseen: "Yaseen, ga eens opruimen!"
        "Yaseen, start cleaning up!"

(26)   A teacher to Mahmud: "Mahmud, ga jij ook iets geels zoeken?"
        "Mahmud, will you look for something yellow too?"
        Mahmud to the teacher: "Nee."
        "No."

Children speaking a foreign language are aware of their situation, they know that it is unlikely that anyone will speak their language. Ayaan, who would automatically choose to speak Somalian with her brother, only recently arrived in the Netherlands, still prefers to speak the little Dutch she knows over her more advanced knowledge of the Somalian language, as shown in examples (27) and (28). Most likely, she knows that the teachers cannot speak Somalian and always speak Dutch with her.

(27)   Ayaan to a teacher: "Kijk! Vogel!"
        "Look! Bird!"

(28)   Ayaan to a teacher: "Ik wil ook appeltje!"
        "I also want an apple!"
        The teacher to Ayaan: "Maar jij hebt druifjes, ga maar eens druifjes eten!"
        "But you have grapes, eat your grapes!"
        Ayaan to the teacher: "Ik wil niet. Is klaar."
        "I don't want to. [They] are finished."
        The teacher to Ayaan: "Nee, nog niet. Eet er toch nog maar een paar!"
        "No, not yet. Eat some more of them!"

4.1.5. Language socialisation in Friesland

As an *SFBO* employee mentioned during a telephone interview, at the Frisian pre-school playgrounds connected to the *SFBO*, both Frisian and Dutch are used, in both individual and group communication. Here, according to the answers provided by the *SFBO*, a teacher consciously sticks to his / her own preferred language in every situation, with every child, regardless of their first language (some rare exceptions would be children with a linguistic deficit, or migrant children who will only stay in Friesland for a short period). Consequently, children speaking Dutch are frequently exposed to the Frisian language, and even if a child individually replies in Frisian to a teacher, a Dutch speaking teacher would individually reply in Dutch. Additionally, group activities, such as the circle, or singing instruction songs, are often conducted in Frisian too, in order to use both languages equally, with everyone. During a day on which only Frisian speaking teachers are present, several activities (reading, for example) will be held in Dutch.

In Friesland, the *SFBO* mentioned that children will stick to their preferred language, as the answers of the interview revealed. At an age of 3 ½ years, the situation will change and Frisian speaking children will start to accommodate to Dutch speaking conversation partners. When the Frisian speaking children are 4 years old, they will be reasonably fluent in Dutch,

whereas the acquisition of Frisian for Dutch speaking children is slower. They generally accommodate less and will be able to speak Frisian when they are 5 to 7 years old. According to the *SFBO*, there is a (recent) tendency that children being raised bilingually (Dutch-Frisian) in Frisian cities will not speak Frisian, not even at home.

Aside of the Dutch and Frisian speaking children, children raised with another language living in Friesland are exposed to both languages at pre-school playgrounds as well, as reported by the *SFBO*. They mentioned that first language is no reason not to expose them to the Frisian language. Both Frisian and Dutch speaking children will speak their preferred language with them, although around the age of 3 ½, Dutch will be the dominant language in conversation, since this is often the language 'to play in', even for the Frisian speaking children.

4.2. Teachers' and parents' opinions on multilingualism and dialect

How do teachers and parents think about dialect usage? While observing, almost all teachers who could speak Limburgish did so, but mainly in individual communication. Yet, some individual variation amongst teachers could be observed as well. Example (29) shows how a teacher, even though she can speak Limburgish, consciously opts to speak Dutch with all children.

(29)   A teacher: "In de omgeving van de kinderen praat ik altijd Nederlands."
         "In the children's environment I always speak Dutch."

Contrastingly, several other teachers mention they are happy that they are still allowed to speak dialect at the pre-school playgrounds, which is not allowed in primary schools. Consider examples (30) and (31) below.

(30)   A teacher: "Ik vind het fijn dat [Limburgs spreken] op dit niveau nog mag. Dat is
         alleen maar goed en belangrijk, tweetalig opvoeden."
         "I like that [speaking Limburgish] is still allowed at this level. It is good and important,
         bilingual education."

(31)   A teacher: "Dialect is belangrijk. Het verlaagt vaak ook de drempel tussen leerkracht
         en kind. In de kring en tijdens het eten spreek ik toch Nederlands, de helft krijgt
         thuis namelijk geen Limburgs aangeboden. Het is een goede voorbereiding op
         de basisschool [daar wordt alleen Nederlands gesproken] en kinderen weten dat
         iets van hen wordt gevraagd als ik Nederlands spreek. Buiten de kring kan ik wel
         eens wisselen."

"Dialect is important. It decreases the distance between teacher and child. In the circle and while eating I speak Dutch anyway, because half of the children is not raised in Limburgish. It is a good preparation for primary school [where teachers speak Dutch], and children know something is expected from them when I speak Dutch. Outside of the circle, I might change my language every now and then."

As examples (31) and (32) below show, teachers are well aware of the effects and differences of speaking in either Dutch or Limburgish. In example (31), the teacher says that dialect is more personal and decreases the perceived distance between teacher and child. She mentions it adds a more personal touch to a conversation and facilitates communicating with children raised in Limburgish. She also mentions, however, that speaking Limburgish might exclude some of the children, leading her to choose for Dutch in group communication as shown in example (32).

(32)   A teacher: "Misschien verstaan niet alle kinderen Limburgs in de kring, dus spreek ik Nederlands."
"Perhaps not all children in the circle understand Limburgish, so I speak Dutch."

Some opinions of parents are shown in examples (33) and (34). In example (33), a parent noticed her child refused to speak Limburgish after going to the pre-school playground, even though she has been raised with it at home. Because the parent thinks it is important that her child speaks Limburgish, she keeps on using it while communicating with the girl. In example (34), another parent was observed speaking Limburgish with the teachers, but Dutch with her child. After inquiring about this, the parent mentioned something similar as the teacher in example (31) mentioned: she considers solely speaking Dutch with her child to be the ideal preparation for primary school and mentions that she uses Limburgish for more personal, emotional situations. This is further illustrated in example (35). Here, the mother speaks Dutch to Manon, except for one emotionally charged word ("sjat", meaning "treasure", or "darling"), which Manon repeats in the end.

(33)   A parent: "Ons ouder kind weigert sinds de peuterspeelzaal Limburgs te spreken, ook al houden we thuis Limburgs aan. We blijven wel gewoon in Limburgs antwoorden, dan gaat het vanzelf wel over."
"Our older child has refused to speak Limburgish since the pre-school playground, even though we stick to Limburgish at home. We will keep on sticking to Limburgish, then it will be solved after a while."

(34)   A parent (quote from the observational notes): "Haar ex-man sprak Nederlands met Manon, en opa en oma ook. [Ze zegt dat] het fijner is om haar goed Nederlands te leren, dat is ook handig voor op school. "Ze verstaat het wel. Als ik boos word gaat het in het plat, dan weet ze dat het menens is!", "Het is makkelijker om een taal aan te houden.""

"Her ex-husband spoke Dutch with Manon, and so did grandpa and grandma. [She mentions] it is easier to raise her in proper Dutch, because it is useful at school. "She can understand it. Whenever I get angry, I speak Limburgish, then she knows I am serious!", "It is easier to stick to one language."

(35)   Manon's mother to Manon: "Is dat moeilijk?"
"Is that difficult?"
Manon to her mother: "Ja"
"Yes."
The mother to Manon: "Nee hè, meid!"
"But no, girl!"
Manon to her mother: "Ik ben niet goed in puzzelen."
"I am not good at solving puzzles."
The mother to Manon: "Jawel. Volgens mij moet die zo om, of niet? Nee, ook niet."
"Yes you are. I think that one has to go that way, right? No, not that way..."
The mother to Manon: "Oh, jij gaat er gewoon mee bouwen, kan ook schat."
"Oh, you are [using the pieces] to build, you can also do that darling."
The mother to the teacher (in Limburgish):: "Fantasie haet 't genóg!"
"She has got enough imagination."
The mother to Manon: "Hè meid?"
"Right, girl?"
The mother to Manon: "Je fantaseert er wat op los thuis! Dag *sjat*, veel plezier!"
"At home you also show lots of imagination. Bye darling, have fun!"
The mother to Manon: "Doei meid, dag *sjat*!"
"Bye girl, bye darling!"
Manon to her mother:: "Dag **sjat**!"
*"Bye darling (*sjat)!"*

In a sense, example (36) below is similar to example (33). One of the children consistently spoke Dutch, even though her parents would have liked her to learn Limburgish as well. Consequently, they have requested the teachers to consciously stick to Limburgish while talking to her.

(36)   A teacher: "[De ouders zeiden l]eer haar maar gewoon dialect, thuis wordt namelijk ook gewoon dialect met haar gesproken."
"[The parents s]aid, just teach her dialect, because at home we also speak dialect with her."

4.3. Teachers' opinions on language policy at pre-school playgrounds

As discussed in chapter 2.3.1, *Spelenderwijs*' language policy states that a regional language is allowed to be used next to Dutch at pre-school playgrounds, but that this regional language should primarily be used in individual conversations (Spelenderwijs 2015: 11). In this section, several of the teachers' opinions of this language policy will be presented, starting with example (37), where a teacher specifically mentions how a conversation in the circle should be started.

(37)   A teacher: "We doen de opening in het Nederlands. Als we aangesproken worden in het dialect gaan we over in het dialect, worden we aangesproken in het Nederlands, dan geven we antwoord in het Nederlands, maar het gebeurt ook heel vaak, als ik iets spontaan wil zeggen, dat het gewoon dialect wordt."
"We will do the opening in Dutch. If we are addressed in dialect, we will switch to dialect as well, if we are addressed in Dutch, then we will answer in Dutch, but quite often, whenever I want to say something spontaneously, it happens in dialect."

One of the teachers elaborates on this in example (38) by mentioning that speaking Dutch in the circle stimulates the acquisition of Dutch, since some children have a language deficit and deserve some extra attention in Dutch. Teaching them Limburgish would only increase their difficulties. Additionally, she mentions in example (39) that speaking Dutch is also beneficent for the acquisition of Dutch by children of foreign descent at the pre-school playgrounds.

(38)   A teacher: "Het is ook een stimulans voor de Nederlandse taal, voor de woorden. Kindjes die al een taalachterstand hebben, moeten we het Nederlands aanleren. Omdat ze al moeite hebben met de taal, dan zitten we met dialect én Nederlands"
"It is also a stimulating factor for the Dutch language, for the words. We have to teach children with a language deficit Dutch. Because they already have difficulties with language, we would have dialect and Dutch on our hands."

(39)   A teacher: "Zeker de allochtone kindjes, ja, [het is nuttig om] dan meteen het goede Nederlandse woord benoemen."
"Especially the 'allochtone' children (of foreign descent), yeah, [it is useful to] name the appropiate Dutch word.

After inquiring further after examples (38) and (39) whether and why it would be good to stick to Dutch, especially in communication with children of foreign descent, the teacher elaborated on this in the following way:

(40)   A teacher: "Zéker. Ja, maar ook voor kindjes die een taalachterstand hebben. Kijk, die krigen dadelijk logopedie misschien, is ook allemaal Nederlands. Ga je ze nu alleen maar dialect aanbieden, dan moeten ze straks nog een keer omschakelen, en ze hebben al zo'n moeite met woorden op te slaan en woorden te onthouden. Evengoed ook kindjes uit Eijsden hoor, niet alleen allochtone kindjes. Zeker kindjes die moeite hebben met de spraak en de taal. Vooral die kindjes."

"Definitely. Yes, but also children with a language deficit. Look, those children will perhaps get speech therapy, which is completely in Dutch as well. If you would only offer them dialect input, they will have to change language once again, and they already have a lot of trouble remembering words. This goes for the children from Eijsden as well, not just 'allochtone' children (of foreign descent). Especially the children with speech and language difficulties. Especially those children."

In *Speelplezier's* VVE-programme (Pre- and Early School Education), which is used at the playgrounds in Eijsden (Roelekeboel) and Margraten (Humpie Dumpie), it is indeed mentioned that one of the goals is to reduce a language deficit (Spelenderwijs 2015: 23). Regarding the language policy's contents, teachers mention that they usually follow it because there probably is a good reason for it to be the way it is. Consequently, they do not take a too critical stance towards it, as shown in examples (41), (42), and (43).

(41)   A teacher: "We moeten kringgesprekken openen in het Nederlands, dat moet van Spelenderwijs. Spelenderwijs is de organisatie waar de leerkracht en peuterspaalplaats bij hoort. Hoe komen ze aan die regel? Ik weet het niet. We werken met een onderwijsplannetje dat dat ook voorschrijft."

"We have to open conversations in the circle in Dutch, Spelenderwijs instructs us to do so. Spelenderwijs is the organisation the teacher and pre-school playground belong to. How did they devise this rule? I do not know. We work with an educational plan in which this is stated as well."

(42)   A teacher: "Ja, maar je gaat er ook vanuit, je krijgt het [taalbeleid] opgelegd en je denkt, iedereen weet waar hij mee bezig is, dat zal wel ergens onderzocht zijn, dat zal wel eh... een goeie reden hebben dat dat zo moet."

"Yes, but you also believe it, you are instructed to follow [the language policy] and think, everyone knows what they are doing, so it probably has been researched somehwere, and that it would have eh... a good reason to be the way it is."

(43)   A teacher: "Dan ga je jezelf er niet meer in verdiepen, van, is dat écht goed of hoort dat écht zo, of als ik het anders zou doen, bijvoorbeeld in het dialect, heeft dat meerwaarde of is dat verkeerd, of... Nee, je denkt inderdaad, je krijgt het zo voorgelegd dus dat is onderzocht, onderbouwd, dus dat is goed zo, dat hoort zo."

"Then you will not delve into it further, like, is it really good, or should it really be like this, or if I would do it differently, in dialect for instance, will that be an added value, or... No,

you think, you are instructed to do it like this, so it has been properly reserached, supported with arguments, so it is good, it should be like this."

Karina, about to turn 4, seems to be well aware of the linguistic conventions at pre-school playgrounds and how these differ at the primary school. In example (44), she starts her sentence in Limburgish, as is allowed at the pre-school playground, but when she mentions the primary school, she switches to Dutch, which is the convention at the primary school.

(44)   Karina: "Es ich groter bin *dan mag ik naar de basisschool!"*
         "When I am taller, I can go to primary school!"

4.4. Accommodation at pre-school playgrounds

There are various facets to be discussed when describing linguistic accommodation, the adaptation of the way of speaking towards or away from the way of speaking of the conversational partner, at the pre-school playgrounds in Eijsden-Margraten. Firstly, in 4.4.1, an insight in how child-directed speech (CDS) occurs will be provided, after which the results for accommodation in language choice between teachers and children will be presented in 4.4.2. Subsequently, the results for accommodation in language choice amongst children will be presented in 4.4.3, followed by interdialectal accommodation in 4.4.4, and finally a reflection on linguistic accommodation in Friesland will be provided in 4.4.5.

4.4.1. Child-directed speech at pre-school playgrounds

Child-directed speech (CDS) is a frequently occurring phenomenon at the pre-school playgrounds. Teachers, mostly unconsciously, adapt their speech to make it easily accessible to children. In examples (45), (46), and (47), the teachers use a lot of diminutives (underlined in the respective examples) – that is, in comparison, which is typical for CDS (Narayan & McDermott 2016: 1). Other noteworthy paralinguistic elements which cannot be expressed in written text is that the teachers made use of an elevated pitch and spoke slower than in their usual conversations amongst each other (Ibidem 2016: 1).

(45)   A teacher to Maite: "Heb jij nog wat kind<u>jes</u> gezien? Ik mis er een paar!"
         "Have you seen some (little) children? I am still missing a few of them!"

(46)   A teacher to Iris: "Wils se 'n her<u>tje</u> prikke?"
         "Do you want to cut out a small heart shape?"

(47)   Ayaan to a teacher: "Ik wil ook appeltje!"

"I also want a (small) apple!"
The teacher to Ayaan: "Maar jij hebt druif<u>jes</u>, ga maar eens druif<u>jes</u> eten!"
"But you have (little) grapes, eat your (little) grapes!"

Circumlocution is one of the many characteristics of CDS (Pinker 1994: 39). As can be seen in example (47), the teacher uses the imperative "ga" ("go") followed by the infinitive "eten" ("eat") instead of simply using the imperative "eet" ("eat"). Repetition is another frequently occurring characteristic of CDS, as can be seen in the word "druifjes", said twice by the teacher. Several additional instances of CDS are shown in examples (48), (49), and (50). In example (48), Carla tells the teacher she wants a real baby in the pram she is playing with, instead of a doll. The teacher repeats the word she uses for baby: "babyke", which contains a diminutive as well. In example (49), the teacher even answers a statement by Sanne with a repetition. Sanne's "I am a girl" is answered with the teacher's "Yes, you are a girl", and even though Sanne speaks in Limburgish, she says "girl" ("meisje") in Dutch, which the teacher repeats in Dutch ("maedje" is the Limburgish equivalent). Repeating a child's simplified constructions, as shown in example (50) is the final instance of CDS which will be presented (Schaerlaekens 2008: 62). In this example, Luna tells the teacher that she has made "a large sausage", meaning a large sausage of clay. She omits the subject and a conjugated verb, a decision which the teacher subsequently mimics.

(48)   Carla to a teacher: "'n Ech babyke mót dao in!"
       "A real baby has to go in there!"
       The teacher to Carla: "Dèn mótte veer 'n baby*ke* zoeke!"
       "Then we have to look for a real baby!"

(49)   Sanne to a teacher: "Juffrouw Marianne, ich bin 'n meisje!"
       "Miss Marianne, I am a girl!"
       The teacher to Sanne: "Ja, doe bis 'n meisje!"
       "Yes, you are a girl!"

(50)   Luna to a teacher: "Een groot worstje [heb ik gemaakt]!"
       "[I have made] a large sausage!"
       The teacher to Luna: "Ja, een groot worstje!"
       "Yes, a large sausage!"

4.4.2. Accommodation in language choice between teachers and children

Linguistic accommodation is a widely discussed topic in scientific literature (e.g. Bourhis 1979; Dragojevic, Gasiorek & Giles 2015: 17; Giles 2008). In a multilingual environment like the pre-school playgrounds, specific children or groups can be either included or excluded because

of a certain language choice. Therefore, if a teacher decides to converge to a Limburgish speaking child, (s)he might exclude a Dutch speaking child, and vice versa, as elaborated by Dragojevic, Gasiorek & Giles (2015): "[...] a speaker's choice to converge toward one conversational partner may inadvertently entail divergence from another. Bilingual and bidialectical individuals face such dilemmas daily, particularly when interacting with monolingual individuals who speak different languages" (17). In example (51), the teacher asks a question to the entire group in Dutch. Max diverges from this and replies individually in Limburgish. Subsequently, the teacher converges to Max, and replies individually to him in Limburgish as well. A similar pattern can be observed in example (52). A teacher asks a group of children in Dutch what is happening with the balloon. Fer decides to diverge from this language choice and replies individually to the teacher in Limburgish. Additionally, in examples (53) and (54), the teacher converges to Limburgish with a Limburgish speaking child and to Dutch with a Dutch speaking child or a child speaking another language.

(51)   A teacher to a group of children: "Wat is dit? Tok tok tok!"
        "What is this? Bwok bwok bwok!"
        Stan to the teacher: "Iech wil ooch kieke!"
        "I also want to look!"
        The teacher to Stan: "Jao, diech maags ooch kieke!"
        "Yes, you can also look!"

(52)   A teacher to Fer: "Wat gebeurt er met de ballon?"
        "What is happening to the balloon?"
        Fer to the teacher: "Dae weijt weg!"
        "It is flying away!"

(53)   A teacher to Nico: "Wils se 'ne angere kleur?"
        "Do you want another colour?"

(54)   A teacher to Adil: "Welke kleur wil jij?"
        "Which colour do you want?"

Examples (55), (56), and (57) show how a child usually sticks to their own preferred language. In the first two examples, the teacher is unable to speak in Limburgish, so she speaks in Dutch with a Limburgish speaking child. In both cases, the children continue to reply in Limburgish. In (55), the teacher asks Funs in Dutch if he is going to eat at his grandma's home today. Funs replies in Limburgish that he is going to eat with his mother, to which the teacher replies happily. In (56), the teacher asks Daan in Dutch if the coat she found belongs to him. He tells her that he did not bring a coat with him, which the teacher repeats in Dutch, which the

boy confirms with a short "nee". In example (57), a Limburgish speaking teacher asks Nick whether he would like to paint. Nick did not notice what she said because she was at a distance, however, another teacher close to Nick did. The other teacher prefers speaking Dutch, Limburgish is not her first language, but she moved to Limburg many years ago. She repeats the question in Dutch, but when Nick does not respond, she asks it again in Limburgish, after which Nick does respond. The teacher then switches back to Dutch (presumably because she feels more comfortable speaking Dutch), but Nick sticks to Limburgish.

(55)   A teacher to Funs: "Ga jij vandaag bij oma eten?"
"Are you going to eat at grandma's place today?"
Funs to the teacher: "Nae, biej mama!"
"No, at mommy's!"
The teacher to Funs: "Oh, wat leuk!"
"Oh, how nice!"

(56)   A teacher to Daan: "Is dit jouw jas?"
"Is this your coat?"
Daan to the teacher: "Ich höb geine jas mitgenome."
"I did not bring a coat."
The teacher to Daan: "Oh! Heb je geen jas meegenomen?"
"Oh! Did you not bring a coat?"
Daan to the teacher: "Nee."
"No."

(57)   A teacher to Nick (at a distance): "Nick wils se auch verve of höbs se genne zin?"
"Nick do you want to paint too, or don't you feel like it?"
Another teacher to Nick in Dutch: "Wil je ook verven?"
"Do you also want to paint?"
The other teacher to Nick in Dutch: "Wat wil jij maken?"
"What do you want to make?"
The other teacher to Nick in Limburgish: "Zeg maar, waat wils diech verve?"
"Tell me, what would you like to paint?"
Nick to the other teacher in Limburgish: "Mit blauw"
"With blue."
The other teacher to Nick in Dutch: "Ja mit blauw, dat is prima, maar wat moet het worden? Een auto, een vlinder..."
"Yes, with blue, that's fine, but what should it be? A car, a butterfly..."
Nick to the other teacher in Limburgish: "Ich gao 'n beer make!"
"I am going to make a bear!"
The other teacher to Nick: "'n Peer?"
"A pear?"
The first teacher to the other teacher: "Nee, een beer!"
"No, a bear!"

The other teacher to the first teacher: "Oah, een beer!"
"Oh, a bear!"

Usually, teachers are quite consistent in their language choices and adapt to a child in individual conversation. In group conversations, teachers speak Dutch. Consequently, when a teacher switches from an individual Limburgish conversation to a Dutch group conversation, a teacher might diverge from the child's preferred language. In example (58), Ellen tells her teacher that she lost some blood from her finger after falling. The teacher repeats her utterance, in a surprised tone, and switches back to Dutch (underlined) when she says "that is not nice", while looking at the entire group. Similarly, in example (59), Alicia asks the teacher whether the children are allowed to go home. The teacher replies with "No, in a moment" in Limburgish, after switching to Dutch (underlined) while telling the entire class that they will have to wait a little while longer. Additionally, in example (60), Alicia tells the teacher she is tired, in Limburgish. The teacher repeats the question in Limburgish, but once she looks at the entire group, she switches to Dutch (the underlined part), and says it is because of the intense birthday celebrations.

(58)   Ellen to a teacher: "Kiek! Ich höb hiej gebloojd!"
        "Look! I have bled here!"
        The teacher to Ellen <u>and the class</u>: "Oeh! Höbs doe gebloojd? <u>Dat is naar…</u>"
        "Oh! Have you bled? That is not nice..."

(59)   Alicia to a teacher: "Gaon veer noe nao huis?"
        "Are we going home now?"
        The teacher to Alicia <u>and the class</u>: "Nae, dalijk! <u>Maar nog even wachten!</u>"
        "No, in a minute! <u>But wait for a little while longer!</u>"

(60)   Alicia to a teacher: "Ich bin meug!"
        "I am tired!"
        The teacher to Alicia <u>and the class</u>: "Bis se meug? <u>Dat komt door al dat verjaardag</u>
             <u>vieren!</u>"
        "Are you tired? <u>That's because of all the birthday celebrations!</u>"

4.4.3. Accommodation in language choice between children

As shown in subchapter 4.4.2, accommodation between teachers and children is usually asymmetrical, with teachers adapting to a child's language choice in individual conversations. Between children, several situations can occur. In a situation where a child speaking dialect sticks to dialect, a child speaking Dutch will not converge, as shown in example (61) where

Tom asks Ayesha (raised in Dari at home, but generally addressed in Dutch at the pre-school playground) in Limburgish to take a look. Instead of looking, Ayesha does not reply and walks away. In example (62), Tim tries to tell Maria (who speaks Dutch) a story in Limburgish. Instead of listening, she continuously interrupts him in Dutch. Likewise, it is not a given fact that children speaking Limburgish always converge to those who speak Dutch, as shown in example (63). Sem asks in Dutch where the blocks are. After I told him in Dutch where they were, Max confirmed it to Sem, in Limburgish.

(61)   Tom to Ayesha: "Kiek es!"
        "Take a look!"

(62)   Tim to Maria: "Ich woor dich gèt aan 't vertèlle. Veur waare mit de fiets van mama..."
        "I was telling you something. We were with mommy's bike..."
        Maria interrupts Tim: "Ja, maar ik [...]"
        "Yes, but I [...]"

(63)   Sem to me: "Waar zijn de andere blokken?"
        "Where are the other blocks?"
        Me to Sem: "Daar zijn de blokken."
        "The blocks are there."
        Max to Sem: "Dao ligke die jao!"
        "Yes, they are there!"

A Limburgish speaking child might converge to a conversational partner's Dutch, though. In examples (64) and (65), Tim and Maria (of example (62)) are playing together, but this time Tim speaks Dutch, like Maria does. This time, Maria listens attentively and engages in the conversation. In example (64), Tim explains in Dutch which toy truck serves which purpose. In example (65) he explains an imaginary schedule while playing. After going "to sleep", Tim and Maria wake up and follow the "schedule", starting with a swim. Also, in example (66), Hanne, a girl who speaks Limburgish, converges to Anna's Dutch. Anna asks in Dutch whether Hanne would like an ice cream, after which Hanne says thank you in Dutch.

(64)   Tim to Maria: "Die werken bij de container en die werken bij de Nora."
        "Those work at the container and those work at the Nora."

(65)   Tim to Maria: "Als we gaan slapen en dan wakker worden dan gaan we zwemmen."
        "When we are going to sleep and then wake up, we will go swimming."
        (A few moments later)
        Maria to Tim: "Het is ochtend!"
        "It is morning!"

Tim to Maria: "Het is ochtend!"
"It is morning!"
Maria to Tim: "Hee, zullen we gaan zwemmen?
"Hey, shall we go for a swim?"
Tim to Maria: "Jaaa!"
"Yeees!"
Maria to Tim: "Het is een mooie dag om te gaan zwemmen! De handdoek mee, en alles nog veel meer."
"It's a beautiful day to go swimming! [We'll bring] the towel, and everything a lot (sic) more."
Tim to Maria: "Alles nog veel meer!"
"Everything a lot (sic) more!"
Maria to Tim: "Jippie we gaan zwemmen!"
"Yay we're going to swim!"

(66)   Anna to Hanne: "Wil je ook een ijsje?"
"Do you also want an ice cream?"
Hanne to Anna: "Dankjewel!"
"Thank you!"

4.4.4. Interdialectal accommodation

Being from Midden-Limburg (Reuver), I could not discern the dialectal differences between Eijsden, Margraten, Cadier en Keer and the nearby city of Maastricht, yet several teachers did comment on interdialectal accommodation. As a consequence, I could not observe if and how interdialectal accommodation occurred between children, teachers, and children and teachers. Due to this, this section lacks observational data and is primarily based on reported behaviour by the teachers, except for example (70) where I could recognise the typical features of Tegelen. In example (67), the teachers were asked what their opinions are on the use of dialect and Dutch with the children. One teacher commented that she even accommodates to such an extent, that she unconsciously even starts speaking Maastrichtian with a child from Maastricht, instead of her own local dialect. She also explained in what way Maastrichts differs from her own dialect. In the example, she speaks both Dutch and Limburgish. All Limburgish parts are shown in italics.

(67)   A teacher: "Ja, en je hoorde zelfs vandaag, want ik betrapte me erop toen ik was aan het spreken, het Maastrichts. Meteen hè, *en den deis se det den duks veur de grap of zo, en den trèks se 't nog es extra laangk hè*, ja, dat zijn van die momenten [...] *Ich weit neet waat ['t kindj] zag, mer in ieder geval, ich dach och heur mich op z'n Mesjtreechs!"*

"Yes and even today you heard, because I noticed it when I was talking, Maastrichtian. Immediately, right, and then you often do it for fun, and you make [your vowels] extra looong, right, yes, those moments. [...] I don't know what [the child] said, but anyway, I thought, oh wow, suddenly I am speaking Maastrichtian!"

During one of the observation days, a teacher from Tegelen (Northern Limburg) recognised my Reuverian (Middle Limburg) dialect with influences from Roermond as being close to her own dialect (Reuver and Tegelen are separated by only 10 kilometres). As shown in example (68), she liked hearing a dialect close to her own, she even repeated "Oppe Ruiver", the local way of pronouncing "in Reuver", and in example (69) she states that, even though she moved to Southern Limburg, she consciously tries not to learn Maastrichtian. Additionally, as shown in example (70), she speaks her own dialect with the children (features which are specifically Tegelian are shown in italics in Limburgish and non-italic in the English translation). Even though 75 kilometres separate Tegelen and Eijsden-Margraten, the children did not seem to mind and react in a similar fashion as they would to hearing their own dialect.

(68)   Me to a teacher: "Ich woeën oppe Ruiver!"
         "I live in Reuver!"
         The teacher to me: "Oh, heerlijk! Oppe Ruiver! Ich kóm oet Tegele!
         "Oh, how great! Oppe Ruiver! *I am from Tegelen!"*

(69)   The teacher to me: Ich probeer mich bewös gèn Mesjtreechs aan te liere!"
         "I consciously try not to learn Maastrichtian!"

(70)   The teacher to John: "Kóm mèr, zètte *we* die *heej beej* de bank."
         "Come here, we *will put those* here next *to the couch."*

4.4.5. Accommodation in Friesland

As mentioned by an *SFBO* employee in a telephone interview, teachers at pre-school playgrounds connected to the *SFBO* converge towards children contentwise. The employee reported that teachers repeat, confirm and add things to children's utterances and make frequent use of CDS. Regarding language choice, they do not accommodate to children. Rather, they maintain their own language choice, as stipulated in the *SFBO*'s language policy. Whenever a child speaks Frisian with a Dutch teacher, the Dutch teacher will reply in Dutch. Likewise, whenever a child speaks Dutch with a Frisian speaking teacher, the teacher will reply in Frisian. According to the *SFBO*, such an approach is beneficial because it facilitates linking Dutch words and constructions to their Frisian equivalents.

5. Analysis

In this chapter, the aforementioned results will be synthesised and analysed, effectively combining the five main topics of chapter 2 (language socialisation, multilingualism, language policy, linguistic accommodation, and the usage-based perspective) in order to show these topics are interdependent on each other and how they are relevant for each different 'group' (specifically: teachers, children with Limburgish, Dutch, and another language as their first language) which will be discussed in this chapter, in order to illustrate what the multilingual landscape of the pre-school playgrounds looks like and consequently explain how the multilingual landscape impacts the social order for every group.

Regarding social order, as mentioned by Duncan (2017): "[…] human communication in society is an attempt to create symbols whose use is believed to uphold social order" (12) and "[h]ierarchy [and social order are] expressed through the symboli[s]ation of superiority, inferiority, and equality, and of passage from one to another" (Ibidem 2008: 14), additionally, a theory of social action can be found in symbolic forms, relationships, and most importantly here, interactions (Ibidem 2017: 12). Consequently, through the language practices (and language choices) in specific activities with specific persons, social order can be created and upheld. Vega (2008) mentions that one of the effects of a bilingual environment is that "[...] bilingualism can actually impede group relations by the presence of in-groups and out-groups [...]" (193). Bilingualism can serve as a group marker in those cases. Moreover, "[b]ilingualism does not contribute to the cementing of social relationships if one group does not partake in bilingualism (i.e., the high-status group) on one side. On the other, the bilingual group can benefit from access to the resources of the group with whom it shares a language" (Ibidem 2008: 193). Illustrating that social order and inequality related to language use arises through language practices, Fields (1997) mentions that "[...] from a biological perspective, languages are equal, but the social context where communication takes place renders them unequal". Therefore, social order is achieved through language socialisation and teachers' language practices, creating a hierarchy which children will subsequently pick up on and behave accordingly.

In 5.1, the bilingual landscape for teachers will be discussed, in 5.2, the bilingual landscape for children with Dutch as a first language will be discussed, and in 5.3 the same will be done for the bilingual landscape for children with Limburgish as their first language, whereas in 5.4, an analysis of the multilingual landscape for children who have a first language other than Dutch or Limburgish will be provided.

5.1. The bilingual landscape for teachers

At the pre-school playgrounds in Eijsden-Margraten, teachers socialise children through their language practices. In doing so, they show children how to become competent members in society (Ochs & Schieffelin 2001: 2). Consequently, young children undergo language socialisation at the pre-school playgrounds and learn through teachers' language practices what the social order is like. In a multilingual environment, like these pre-school playgrounds, the use of more than a single language is rarely a neutral decision. Rather, it is a "a value-laden, ideologically charged, discursively elaborated process" (Garrett 2007: 252) which possibly results in the restriction of a certain language to a specific domain, group or individual, genre, environment, or activity (Garrett 2011: 516).

Concretely for the pre-school playgrounds in Eijsden-Margraten, this means that Dutch is the language in which teachers socialise children in such a way that Dutch serves as the language in which teachers address the entire group, and that everyone should pay attention. It is the language for group communication, giving group instructions (in instruction songs, for instance), and is used in an educational context which is hierarchically defined. In group communication in the circle, for instance, teachers take the lead in conversations and address the entire group in Dutch, for instance when asking a question or giving an instruction, as shown in example (2) (chapter 4.1.1, page 21). Although an exception was found when a teacher addressed an entire group of Limburgish speaking children in Limburgish, as evidenced in example (4) (chapter 4.1.1, page 21), however, groups in which every child speaks Limburgish were almost non-existent. On the other hand, in individual communication, teachers speak Limburgish with a Limburgish speaking child, and Dutch with a Dutch speaking child or a child with any other first language. In group activities like the circle or while eating, a teacher can address the entire group in Dutch, but might receive a Limburgish response from a child. Since this entails a switch from group communication to individual communication, teachers often switch from Dutch to Limburgish too to address the child individually, however, in some cases in which all children are paying attention to the teacher, the teacher might decide to stick to Dutch while replying.

Consequently, regarding language choice, teachers usually converge to a child's language. This convergence is usually asymmetrical in individual conversations between teacher and child, a teacher adapts to the child's preferred language, and not the other way around. Even in group activities such as the circle, teachers might switch to a group conversation which they speak Dutch to an individual one in Limburgish with a child, and converge to the child's language choice. For the social order, the fact that teachers adapt to a

child's language implies that, at least in individual conversations, both languages are equal and can be used equally, regardless of the language a child speaks. Teachers also like that they are still allowed to speak Limburgish, recognising that it creates less distance between a teacher and child than speaking Dutch (examples (30) and (31), chapter 4.2, page 28), which means that they too are aware that consciously speaking Dutch individually elevates them above the children in the social order, which they avoid. In individual conversation, though, this means that in-groups and out-groups are created, since several "groups" are addressed in different languages, individually, which is reflected in Fields (1997), leading to different resources being available to different groups (Vega 2008: 193).

When the entire class pays attention to that conversation (and the conversation remains a group conversation), teachers might reply in Dutch, which can be clarified in the following way: "[...] a speaker's choice to converge toward one conversational partner may inadvertently entail divergence from another. Bilingual and bidialectical individuals face such dilemmas daily, particularly when interacting with monolingual individuals who speak different languages" (Dragojevic, Gasiorek & Giles 2015: 17). Teachers effectively avoid diverging in language choice from the entire group when they pay attention, and decide not to converge with the Limburgish speaking child. In these cases, addressing the single child with the attention of the entire group in Limburgish entails exposing the Dutch speaking children to a language they are never addressed in and not used to, which would be a stronger way of diverging from the group's language choices, whereas Limburgish speaking children are frequently addressed in Dutch too by the teachers, so addressing them in Dutch (which is not their preferred language, but they are used to being addressed in it in group communication) constitutes divergence, but to a lesser extent. Quite possibly, teachers are not even aware that addressing Limburgish speaking children in Dutch in these circumstances entails divergence too, since it is such an entrenched pattern which has become a convention at pre-school playgrounds. Teachers, as shown in example (32) (chapter 4.2, page 29), think Dutch speaking children might have trouble understanding Limburgish, but vice versa, the case of Limburgish speaking children having trouble understanding Dutch is not considered. The language policy also supports this language choice, since individual communication with attention of the entire group could be considered group communication too, in which Dutch is the preferred language (Spelenderwijs 2015: 11). If a teacher cannot speak Limburgish, convergence towards a Limburgish speaking child is obviously impossible. In these cases, the teacher will speak Dutch, and the Limburgish speaking child sticks to Limburgish, effectively creating a conversation where the preferred language of both speakers is maintained. For the social order, this means that both interlocutors are still

equal, because one is not consciously enforcing a certain language choice on the other (the teacher, for instance, simply does not have the means to adapt to the child's language choice, therefore it is not a conscious decision to impose a hierarchy). The teachers mention that they generally have a positive attitude towards the usage of Limburgish at the pre-school playgrounds and happily speak Limburgish with children who are raised in Limburgish (see examples (30) and (31), chapter 4.2, page 28). In some cases, parents even explicity requested the teachers to speak Limburgish with their children (who stick to speaking Dutch), to which teachers comply (see examples (33) and (36), chapter 4.2, pages 29 and 30, respectively).

A lot of the teachers' behaviour is also reflected in *Spelenderwijs'* language policy and their own opinions on multilingualism. As mentioned in *Spelenderwijs'* language policy, "[w]e use the Dutch language in our communication, especially in group activities. In places where a regional language [like Limburgish] is spoken, this regional language will primarily be used in communication with an individual child" (Spelenderwijs 2015: 11) and with a focus on Dutch, *Spelenderwijs* mentions[1] that they intend to increase children's chances in primary school (Wouterse 2016: 1). Consequently, teachers at pre-school playgrounds generally have a positive attitude towards the usage of Limburgish. They recognise that speaking Limburgish actually has a function ("decreasing the distance between child and teacher"). Additionally, they also mention that they are happy that they can still speak it at this level. However, they generally acquiesce in the prescribed language policy of *Spelenderwijs*. Two out of three teachers in an interview mentioned that someone has probably done research on the current language policy, justifying it to be the way it currently is (see examples (42) and (43), chapter 4.3, page 32). They also echo that, in some cases, it is preferable to speak Dutch, especially with children raised in a language other than Limburgish or Dutch, and children with a language deficit, since addressing them in Limburgish as well would only overcomplicate their already difficult learning process (see examples (38), (39), and (40), chapter 4.3, pages 31 and 32). Contrastingly, scientific research has shown that children can keep their languages separated, and that bilingual language acquisition does not cause confusion (Byers-Heinlein & Lew-Williams 2013: 97), however the teachers generally do not know about this.

Seen from a usage-based perspective, through their language practices, teachers socialise children in the language they are addressed in. Frequent exposure to teachers' language practices lead to entrenchment: children discover what 'normal' behaviour is (or: a 'normal language choice' for a specific child), and what 'deviant' behaviour is. Subsequently,

---

[1] Although they do not elaborate on how recommending Dutch to be used in group communication and the regional language in individual communication contributes to reaching their goal.

since the experiences with language socialisation practices are shared within the several groups discussed in this chapter, they become shared conventions. By frequently experiencing a teacher's language practices, for instance in the circle, those patterns and language choices will become entrenched, and consequently children are socialised in the usage of Dutch in group communication, instructions and individual communication for those who cannot speak Limburgish, and Limburgish in individual communication, but exclusively for those who speak Limburgish. Similarly, the aforementioned dichotomy of language choice in individual communication has also been observed during other activities, such as colouring, as shown in examples (17) and (18), in chapter 4.1.4, on page 25. Here, the teacher addresses Aziz (who speaks Arabic) in Dutch, and Max (who speaks Limburgish) in Limburgish.

In comparison to the results from the Frisian interview questionnaire, as reported by an *SFBO* employee, Frisian teachers stick to their preferred language, either Frisian or Dutch, even if a child speaks another other language, essentially leading to a situation in which language choices are maintained between teachers and children. Consequently, as reported, children at Frisian pre-school playgrounds are socialised in the usage of Dutch and Frisian in every activity, with every person, in both group communication and individual communication. In essence, both languages are used equally. For the social order in Friesland, interpreting from the reported behaviour by the *SFBO*, this means that most likely no (or, to a lesser extent) in-groups and out-groups are created based on language choice, since all children acquire both languages and can use them equally in all activities. By making both languages equally available and using them equally in all contexts, social equality is maintained. This is also stipulated in the *SFBO*'s language policy, which states that language choice should be linked to specific teachers instead of group communication or individual communication, with Frisian speaking teachers speaking Frisian and Dutch speaking teachers speaking Dutch.

The only situations where the Frisian language is not used with children is when a child of migrants will only be staying for a short amount of time in Friesland, or when a child has been diagnosed with a language deficit. Teachers and parents are also frequently informed about the advantages of bilingual education, which is, as reported by the *SFBO*, largely met with positive responses (Sintrum Frysktalige Berne-opfang 2010).

5.2. The bilingual landscape for Dutch speaking children

All children at the pre-school playgrounds in Eijsden-Margraten are socialised through teachers' language practices, in doing so, children learn how to become competent members in society (Ochs & Schieffelin 2001: 2). Becoming a competent member in society also entails

acquiring knowledge of (the use of) language, its functions, social distribution, and interpretations in various socially specified situations (Ibidem). Crucially, teachers' language practices vary per "group" of children. Children with Dutch as their first language are socialised by the teachers in the usage of Dutch, in both group communication and individual communication, and during every activity. In brief, the Dutch speaking children are not directly exposed to the Limburgish language by the teachers, and thus whenever a teacher speaks Limburgish, the Dutch speaking children know they are not being addressed.

Teachers who can speak Limburgish readily converge to Dutch when speaking with a Dutch child. Amongst children, the picture is slightly more complicated. Whenever Dutch speaking children engage in a conversation, both can simply keep on speaking Dutch. However, when a Limburgish speaking child speaks Limburgish with a Dutch speaking child, the Dutch speaking child will not converge. One of the options is that Dutch children keep on talking in Dutch, after which the Limburgish speaking child might converge asymetrically upwards to Dutch, as attested in examples (64), (65), and (66) (chapter 4.4.3, pages 38 and 39). Another option is that both children maintain their languages and play with each other (observed in example (63), chapter 4.4.3, page 38), or, in the worst case scenario, communication might fail, for instance in example (61) (chapter 4.4.3, page 38), when a Limburgish speaking child addresses a Dutch speaking child in Limburgish, and the Dutch child does not notice (s)he is being addressed. Since the children raised in Dutch can always stick to their own language, and teachers adapt to them, the group of the Dutch speaking children generally is the group which has to accommodate the least. In these cases, the Dutch speaking children are higher in the social order, since they speak the high-status language (which is the language of instruction and group communication, too), and Limburgish is only used by and with Limburgish speaking children (by teachers and Limburgish speaking children) in an individual context. Therefore, the social and educational context where communication takes place renders both languages unequal, the Dutch group does not partake in the bilingualism, and Limburgish speaking children are lower in the social order – they are the ones who occasionally adapt.

As mentioned by the teachers, although they value the possibility to still speak Limburgish, contrasting with primary school (example (30), chapter 4.2, page 28), and are aware that both languages have different functions (example (31), chapter 4.2, page 28), they opt to speak Dutch with Dutch speaking children. In some cases because children are not raised in Limburgish at home (example (32), chapter 4.2, page 29), in others because some children have a language deficit, and according to them, teaching them Limburgish as well might overcomplicate their language learning process, and speaking Dutch is good preparation for

primary school (see examples (38), (39), and (40), chapter 4.3, pages 31 and 32). This fits in with the language policy as described by *Spelenderwijs*: "[d]e Nederlandse taal gebruiken wij als voertaal, in het bijzonder bij activiteiten in groepsverband. Daar waar naast de Nederlandse taal een streektaal veelvuldig gesproken wordt, kan deze naast de Nederlandse taal gebruikt worden. De streektaal wordt voornamelijk gebruikt in communicatie met het individuele kind" (Spelenderwijs 2015: 11), which can be translated as "[w]e use the Dutch language as the language of communication, especially in group activities. In places where a regional language coexists with Dutch, this regional language can be used. The regional language will especially be used in communication with an individual child", with the overall aim of *Spelenderwijs'* method being: "[...] het vergroten van de kansen van kinderen op een succesvolle schoolloopbaan" (Wouterse 2016: 1) ("[...] increasing the children's chances of a successful educational career"). Raising a child in Dutch does not mean that the child will not know any Limburgish words, however. For instance, as shown in example (35) (chapter 4.2, page 30), a mother who can speak Limburgish consciously raises her daughter in Dutch, however, in some emotional moments, she resorts to Limburgish words, one of them being "sjat" ("treasure", "darling"). The little girl, after most likely having heard this word many times, repeats it, even though her mother does not want her to learn Limburgish.

The "sjat" example can be aptly clarified with a usage-based approach. Since, according to usage-based theory, frequent exposure leads to entrenchment, the little girl has acquired the word "sjat" because she has heard her mother use it so often when adressing her specifically when leaving her child at the pre-school playground to go to work, regardless of it being a Limburgish word. Likewise, children also learn in which language they are addressed during which activity at the pre-school playgrounds. After solely being exposed to the Dutch language, this knowledge becomes entrenched in Dutch speaking children and they will know about the convention that the Dutch language is used to address them, both in individual and group communication, and in any activity, whereas they will know that they will not be addressed in Limburgish. They are not used to being addressed in Limburgish, consequently, whenever a Limburgish speaking child "breaks" their convention and addresses them in Limburgish, communication might fail, they might for instance not notice that they are being addressed, or stick to Dutch and play along when they do notice that they are being addressed. This means that, generally, Dutch is higher in the social order, since Limburgish is restricted to fewer social contexts and less important educational activities, and for a higher chance of success in a conversation, the Limburgish speaking children adapt to the Dutch speaking ones.

5.3. The bilingual landscape for Limburgish speaking children

In a sense, the bilingual landscape for Limburgish speaking children is more diverse, since they are actively exposed to both languages. As mentioned before, teachers' language practices vary per group and activity. Consequently, the Limburgish speaking children are socialised in the usage of Limburgish in individual conversations, whereas the Dutch language serves as the language in which teachers address the entire group – including the Limburgish children – and that everyone should pay attention. Dutch is the language for group communication, giving group instructions (in instruction songs, for instance), and is used in an educational context which is hierarchically defined. Therefore, it is higher in the social order, too, since this allows Dutch to be used in more social contexts and to be the high-status language. In group communication Limburgish speaking children have to adapt to follow instructions while Dutch speaking children do not. Limburgish children, however, often change group communication into individual communication. Whenever a teacher addresses the group in Dutch, Limburgish speaking children can reply individually, after which a teacher converges to their language choice and replies in Limburgish as well. Therefore, in individual conversation this means that in-groups and out-groups are created, since several "groups" are addressed in different languages, individually, which is reflected in Fields (1997), leading to different resources being available to different groups (Vega 2008: 193). However, it also means that, in individual conversations with teachers, even in the circle, both languages are used equally and are equal in the social order, in this case.

Children generally stick to their own preferred language. When a teacher cannot speak Limburgish, a child will usually stick to Limburgish anyway, in which case both language choices are maintained. Likewise, in conversations between children, the same might occur, due to which communication might fail in some cases. However, if accommodation in language choice occurs between children, it is in an asymmetrical manner: Limburgish speaking children will always switch to Dutch, and not the other way around, once again underlining the difference in social order: the higher-status Dutch speaking group does not partake in bilingualism, while the Limburgish group occasionally has to. They do not always do this, but if one group accommodates to the other, it is a one-way process.

Teachers have a positive attitude towards speaking Limburgish with Limburgish speaking children, however, as mentioned in *Spelenderwijs'* language policy, its usage remains largely restricted to individual communication (Spelenderwijs 2015: 11) amongst those who are rasied in Limburgish. In some cases, parents mention that their children, who were raised in Limburgish at home, refuse to speak it and rather speak Dutch (examples (34) and (35),

chapter 4.2, page 30). The same applies for some teachers, who consciously avoid speaking Limburgish, even though they can (example (29), chapter 4.2, page 28). In some cases, parents (explicitly asked to) stick to Limburgish even though the children reply in Dutch (examples (33) and (36), chapter 4.2, pages 29 and 30, respectively). Teachers mention raising a child bilingually is important, and are happy that it is still allowed at pre-school playgrounds, since, in primary school, speaking Dutch is the norm (example (31), chapter 4.2, page 28). Some parents also avoid raising their children in Limburgish, since they believe a monolingual approach creates a good foundation for primary school (examples (34) and (35), chapter 4.2, page 30).

Children nearing the age of 4 also get to spend a few hours at the local primary school, to grow accustomed to change. This also entails growing accustomed to the different language practices at primary schools, of which some traces can be observed at pre-school playgrounds, as demonstrated in example (1) (chapter 1, page 3). In this example, the knowledge that Dutch should be spoken at primary schools seems to become entrenched. Applying a usage-based perspective, the knowledge that Limburgish is spoken in individual communication and Dutch in group communication becomes entrenched, and ultimately, a shared convention. In most cases, for instance in the circle, which is a group activity, they stick to speaking Limburgish, but they do not break the conventions, since the most common response is to reply individually to a teacher's question in Limburgish. Likewise, they will also discover that a teacher will switch and reply individually in Limburgish, too, effectively rendering both languages equal in individual communication.

5.4. The multilingual landscape for non-Dutch and non-Limburgish speaking children

Children growing up with a language other than Dutch or Limburgish are socialised in the usage of Dutch in both group communication and individual communication. For these children, a pre-school playground is an area of 'Second language (L2) socialistion', defined by Duff (2011) as the process in which non-natives acquire competence in an L2 and become members of the society in which this language is spoken (564). They also discover that the Limburgish language is not used in communication with them.

In communication with them, total convergence is impossible, since the teachers are not able to speak the languages they speak (such as Dari, Turkish or Arabic). Therefore, teachers consciously speak Dutch with them. Likewise, the children prefer speaking the little Dutch they know over expressing themselves in their first language, supposedly because they are aware no

one can understand their first language. Amongst children, however, these children tend to play alone more. Whenever a Limburgish speaking child addresses them in Limburgish, they often do not feel like they are being addressed, and communication often fails. Whenever a child raised in another language truly befriends a Dutch speaking child, convergence often occurs towards the Dutch language, the language these children are socialised in to use, both in group communication and individual communication. Even though they are usually a lot quieter in Dutch, whenever a family member comes and picks them up at the end of another day, they seem to be quite talkative in their native language.

The home languages of these children are at the bottom of the social order, since they cannot use it in any situation at the pre-school playgrounds because nobody understands them. They quickly notice this and prefer to speak the little Dutch they have acquired so far over their home languages, in which they are most likely more competent at this stage.

Even though Limburgish can be used in individual communication (Spelenderwijs 2015: 11), teachers consciously avoid doing so with children raised in another language. They mention that it is beneficial to immediately offer the correct words in Dutch ("Zeker de allochtone kindjes, ja, [het is nuttig om] dan meteen het goede Nederlandse woord benoemen (example (39), chapter 4.3, page 41) and that these children already have a tougher task remembering words ("Ga je ze nu alleen maar dialect aanbieden, dan moeten ze straks nog een keer omschakelen, en ze hebben al zo'n moeite met woorden op te slaan en woorden te onthouden" (example (40), chapter 4.3, page 32). Focusing on Dutch, as mentioned by the teachers, will also help them and increase their chances in their later education, which is one of the goals of *Spelenderwijs'* current language policy (Wouterse 2016: 1). Therefore, in a sense, since they are socialised in the usage of Dutch in all contexts, they discover that they do not have to adapt to another child's Limburgish utterances, meaning that they too will discover that they do not have to partake in the bilingualism at the pre-school playgrounds and are socialised in a language which is higher in the social order.

From a usage-based perspective, the knowledge that these children are addressed in Dutch, both in individual communication and group communication, becomes entrenched due to frequent exposure to this pattern. Likewise, for these children, the knowledge that they will not be addressed in the Limburgish language, and that nobody else speaks their language, becomes entrenched as well. This leads to the convention that all communication with them occurs in Dutch, and consequently, they might not notice that they are being addressed when a Limburgish speaking child breaks this convention and addresses them in Limburgish, and from

a productive viewpoint, leading them to prefer to speak the little Dutch they know at this point, instead of their first language in which they have acquired more skills at this point.

6. Conclusion

The main goal in this research is to provide an accurate analysis of the multilingual landscape of the pre-school playgrounds in Eijsden-Margraten. Based on the collected fieldwork data, this thesis attempts to answer three main research questions, which are repeated below:

(i) What does the multilingual landscape at pre-school playgrounds in Eijsden-Margraten look like for all actors (teachers, children and parents)? Concretely, what does 'a multilingual environment at pre-school playgrounds' actually mean for a specific individual or group, which differences are there in language use between different 'groups', when is which language used by whom, with whom, and in which activities?

(ii) To what extent is social inequality present at pre-school playgrounds in Eijsden-Margraten?

(iii) What are the similarities and differences between the observations from this research and the information provided by the *SFBO* about the Frisian situation? That is, how do the aforementioned 'multilingual landscape' and 'social (in)equality' differ at these playgrounds, where a firm pro-bilingual language policy is in place?

6.1. Eijsden-Margraten's pre-school playgrounds

The "multilingual landscape" mentioned in this thesis consists of teachers who speak Limburgish and / or Dutch, and children who speak Limburgish and / or Dutch and / or have another first language. Since not all children are (equally) exposed to all of these languages at the playgrounds, "multilingual landscape" certainly does not mean "uniform landscape". Teachers socialise specific groups of children through their language practices in different ways.

Concretely, children with Dutch as their first language are socialised by the teachers in the usage of Dutch, in both group communication and individual communication, and during every activity. Teachers do not expose them to the Limburgish language, so whenever a teacher speaks Limburgish, the Dutch speaking children know they are not being addressed. Additionally, teachers who speak Limburgish as their first language readily converge to Dutch when speaking with a child speaking Dutch. Amongst children, the picture is slightly more complicated. Whenever Dutch speaking children engage in a conversation, both can simply keep on speaking Dutch. However, when a Limburgish speaking child speaks Limburgish with

a Dutch speaking child, the Dutch speaking child will not converge. If accommodation occurs between Limburgish and Dutch speaking children – which does not always occur – then it is a one-way process: the Limburgish speaking child will accommodate asymmetrically to the Dutch speaking child. All-in-all, since teachers usually accommodate to children and speakers of Limburgish accommodate to speakers of Dutch, Dutch speaking children do not partake in the bilingualism as active speakers (they merely do as listeners). This behaviour is also reinforced by the language policy at the pre-school playgrounds, which states that Dutch is the main language to be used by teachers, except for individual conversations, which can be held in the regional language (Limburgish). Consequently, the Limburgish langauge is restricted to the individual, informal domain.

For the children growing up with Limburgish, this means that they are socialised in the usage of Dutch in educational contexts in activities which are hierarchically defined. Dutch is the language of instruction (instruction songs, for instance, are sung in Dutch), while Limburgish is restricted to the individual conversations. Since the Dutch language is used in more contexts, and more important social contexts (such as group communication and instructions), it is the language with higher status. Reaffirming the high status of the Dutch language, a teacher mentioned that in the circle, she consciously speaks Dutch with the entire group since some children probably do not understand Limburgish, a thought which has become so entrenched that it has become a shared convention, and the opposite case is not even considered: speaking Dutch in group communication constitutes divergence from the Limburgish speaking children too. Teachers mention that they value the possibility to still speak Limburgish at the pre-school playgrounds (as opposed to the primary schools), however, in their linguistic practices, they apply a clear hierarchical distinction in which children are socialised. Additionally, as mentioned before, if accommodation amongst children occurs, it is a one-way and asymmetric process: once again reaffirming the higher position in the social order of the Dutch speaking children, who are exempted from exposure to Limburgish, and effectively rendering both languages unequal.

Finally, the children with another first language, such as Spanish, Italian, or Dari, are socialised in the usage of Dutch in all situations, much like the Dutch speaking children. They too discover at the pre-school playgrounds that they are exempted from the exposure to Limburgish and that they are excluded from that language: conversations in Limburgish are not meant for them. Their home languages are at the bottom of the social order: since nobody, or only one or two other children can speak their first language, they are quick to discover this. Underlining the difference in social order, they usually prefer to accommodate to a Dutch

speaking child with their lower competence in Dutch at this point, than trying to get a message across in their first language. Vice versa, the Dutch speaking children do not attempt to communicate with them with words of, or in their first languages. These language practices are reinforced by teachers' views on multilingualism and by the language policy, too: the current language policy states that Dutch is to be used in group communication and the regional language can be used in individual communication. However, teachers avoid exposing them to Limburgish since, in their view, doing so would overcomplicate their already tough situation in which they have to acquire Dutch and their home language, thus Dutch is used in individual communication too.

All-in-all, the five main topics used in exploring the multilingual pre-school playgrounds are interdependent and lead to the same result: Dutch is the language highest in the social order, since it is the language used in most social and educational activities, group communication, instruction, and is hierarchically defined, unlike Limburgish, which is used in less important individual conversations. Accommodational behaviour points into the same direction: teachers adapt to children, but if accommodation occurs between languages, speakers of Limburgish adapt to speakers of Dutch, and never vice versa. This inequality reflected in teachers' views on multilingualism and the language policy: although they value speaking Limburgish and mention that it is useful for decreasing the distance between teacher and child, they mention that speaking Dutch is important for more societal reasons: for primary school, because some children will need to go through speech therapy, or because some children, in their view, already carry the "burden" of acquiring two languages. All the other home languages are the lowest in the social order: those languages are not used unless a family member of a child is present, nobody accommodates to other languages, there is no concrete language policy for these languages. From a usage-based perspective, this inequality has become so entrenched that it has become a shared, unnoticed convention, an unquestioned norm. Consequently, children are quick to discover that both languages are unequal, with Limburgish as a language lower in the social order, which works exclusively: it is only for the Limburgish speaking children.

6.2. Friesland's *SFBO* pre-school playgrounds

On the other hand, in Friesland, as mentioned by an *SFBO* employee in a telephone interview, at the Frisian pre-school playgrounds connected to the *SFBO*, both Frisian and Dutch are used, in both individual and group communication. Here, according to the answers provided by the *SFBO*, a teacher consciously sticks to his / her own preferred language in every situation, with

every child, regardless of their first language (some rare exceptions would be children with a linguistic deficit, or migrant children who will only stay in Friesland for a short period). Consequently, both languages are used equally and all children are said to be exposed to both languages, making them equal in the social order. During a day on which only Frisian speaking teachers are present, several activities (reading, for example) will be held in Dutch. Aside of the Dutch and Frisian speaking children, children raised with another language living in Friesland are exposed to both languages at pre-school playgrounds as well, as reported by the *SFBO*. They mentioned that first language is no reason not to expose them to the Frisian language.

In Friesland, a strict language policy exists for the pre-school playgrounds connected to the *SFBO*. The *SFBO* connects the use of a specific language (either Frisian or Dutch) to a specific teacher, and not the communicative situation (group or individual communication). In doing so, both languages are equal and can be used equally and actively with all children. At *SFBO*-pre-school playgrounds, about 60% to 70% of all input is in Frisian. Additionally, as a part of their language policy, the *SFBO* actively provides information about multilingualism for teachers and parents, for instance by organising specific 'parent evenings' on multilingualism and providing concise and easy to read information on the advantages and added value of being multilingual (Sintrum Frysktalige Berne-opfang 2010). In doing so, teachers and parents are provided with accurate knowledge about the choice for this specific language policy and its advantages, and common rumours about multilingualism can be debunked professionally.

7. Discussion and future research

One of the difficulties in analysing the "multilingual landscape" was defining "multilingual", since this refers to three or more languages, only two languages – Dutch and Limburgish – are actively used at the pre-school playgrounds in Eijsden-Margraten, and for instance Dutch speaking children might *hear* Limburgish, but not *speak* it, which might make their environment at pre-school playgrounds monolingual. In order to overcome this, I have chosen to focus on *passive* exposure: the presence of a specific language which is frequently used in the room, even if they do not use it actively or if nobody speaks it with a specific group was enough to still let it count in the used terminology. Therefore, a teacher's multilingual landscape is actively and passively bilingual: they frequently hear and use both Dutch and Limburgish. Dutch speaking children's multilingual landscape is actively monolingual – they only use Dutch – but passively bilingual: they frequently hear Limburgish in the room too. Limburgish speaking children are actively in a bilingual setting too: they mainly speak Limburgish, but Dutch too, and both languages are used actively with them as well. Finally, children with a different home language are in a multilingual environment: actively they can only use Dutch, but they know another language which they can use at pre-school playgrounds when a family member picks them up, and they are passively exposed to Limburgish too.

In addition to a (solved) definition difficulty, this research has some limitations too. Perhaps the main limitation is that the comparison to the Frisian *SFBO* situation had to be based on a questionnaire instead of actual ethnographic research. Therefore, it might be interesting to actually conduct fieldwork there and see how it holds up against the results of this questionnaire. Additionally, since I speak a dialect from Middle Limburg, was unable to discern between the subtle differences of the Eijsden, Margraten, and Cadier and Keer dialects compared to the Maastricht dialect, there might have been a lot more to add to the subchapter on interdialectal accommodation, yet another possibility for future research aimed at determining the (perceived) dominance of certain dialects. Although these two points provide interesting avenues for conducting future research, one of the main interesting points for future research, based on the reports sent to the municipality of Eijsden-Margraten as well, are the instruction songs. During the observational period, the municipality was informed about the existence and especially function of instruction songs, sung solely in Dutch. As a consequence, instruction songs in the dialect of Eijsden were created by Ton Custers of *Hastijns* and sung by Edith Rutten. These have been implemented at pre-school playgrounds. The interesting aspect of this is that, in doing so, several rooted conventions have effectively been broken: Limburgish is inclusively used in

hierarchically defined and important group communication aimed at everyone to which everyone has to listen and act accordingly. Especially from a usage-based perspective it would be interesting to see whether and what long-term consequences this has: perhaps it is a first step towards a new convention: an equal, inclusive usage of Limburgish and equality of both languages in the social order.

8. References

Agirdag, O., Van Avermaet, P., & Van Houtte, M. (2013). School segregation and math achievement: A mixed-method study on the role of self-fulfilling prophecies. *Teachers College Record*, 115(3), 1-50.

Backus, A. (2016). Usage-Based Approaches to Knowledge. https://mystudy.uvt.nl/it10. vakzicht?taal=N&pfac=FGW&vakcode=880030

Baquedano-López, P. B. L. Ó. & Figueroa, A. M. (2011). Language Socialization and Immigration. *The handbook of language socialization*, 536-563. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Bialystok, E., & Craik, F. I. (2010). Cognitive and linguistic processing in the bilingual mind. *Current directions in psychological science*, 19(1), 19-23.

Bialystok, E. (2009). Bilingualism: The good, the bad, and the indifferent. *Bilingualism: Language and cognition*, 12(1), 3-11.

Bialystok, E., & Martin, M. M. (2004). Attention and inhibition in bilingual children: Evidence from the dimensional change card sort task. *Developmental science*, 7(3), 325-339.

Bourhis, R. Y., & Giles, H. (1977). The language of intergroup distinctiveness. In H. Giles (Ed.), *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations* (pp. 119–135). London, UK: Academic Press

Bourhis, R. Y. (1979). Language in ethnic interaction: A social psychological approach. *Language and Ethnic Relations*, 117-141. Oxford: Pergamon.

Brown, R., & Bellugi, U. (1964). Three processes in the child's acquisition of syntax. *Harvard educational review*, *34*(2), 133-151. Cambridge: Harvard Education Publishing Group

Bybee, J. L., & Beckner, C. (2010). Usage-based theory. In B. Heine & H. Narrog (Eds.), T*he Oxford handbook of linguistic analysis*, 827-854. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bybee, J. (2006). From usage to grammar: The mind's response to repetition. *Language*, 82 (4), 710-733.

Byers-Heinlein, K., & Lew-Williams, C. (2013). Bilingualism in the early years: What the science says. *LEARNing Landscapes*, *7*(1), 95-111.

Cooper, R. P., & Aslin, R. N. (1990). Preference for infant-directed speech in the first month after birth. *Child development*, *61*(5), 1584-1595.

Costa, A., Hernández, M., & Sebastián-Gallés, N. (2008). Bilingualism aids conflict resolution: Evidence from the ANT task. *Cognition*, 106(1), 59-86.

Council of Europe. (2017). Reservations and Declarations for Treaty No.148 - European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages. Online: http://www.coe.int/en/web/conventions /full-list/-/conventions/treaty/148/ declarations

Custers, T. & Rutten, E. (2016). Smäokelik ëte. Online: https://www.eijsden-margraten.nl/inwoners/liedjes-in-het-dialect/

De Houwer, A. (2009). *Bilingual first language acquisition*. Bristol: Channel View Publications

Dragojevic, M., Giles, H., & Gasiorek, J. (2015). Communication accommodation theory. *The international encyclopedia of interpersonal communication*.

Duff, P. A. (2007). Second Language Socialization. *The handbook of language socialization,* 564-586. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Duranti, A. (1997). The Scope of Linguistic Anthropology. *Linguistic anthropology*, 1-22. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Fernald, A. (1985). Four-month-old infants prefer to listen to motherese. *Infant behavior and development*, *8*(2), 181-195.

Cornips, L. M. E. A., Francot, R., van den Heuij, K., Blom, E., Heeringa, W., Buchstaller, I., & Siebenhaar, B. (2017). Inter-individual variation among young children growing up in a bidialectal community: the acquisition of dialect and standard Dutch vocabulary. In *Language variation European Perspectives VIII. Studies in Language Variation. Selected papers from the Eight International Conference on Language Variation– European Perspectives VI.* (Vol. 8, pp. 85-98). John Benjamins.

Garrett, P. B. (2011). Language Socialization and Language Shift. *The handbook of language socialization*, 515-535. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Garrett, P. B. (2007). Language socialization and the (re) production of bilingual subjectivities. *Bilingualism: A social approach*, 233-256. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Giles, H. (2008). *Communication accommodation theory*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Godley, A. J., Sweetland, J., Wheeler, R. S., Minnici, A., & Carpenter, B. D. (2006). Preparing teachers for dialectally diverse classrooms. *Educational Researcher*, 35(8), 30-37.

Haugen, E. (1966). Dialect, language, nation. *American anthropologist*, 68(4), 922-935.

Ibbotson, P. (2013). The scope of usage-based theory. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 4, 255, 1-15. http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00255

Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns* (No. 4). University of Pennsylvania Press.

Narayan, C. R., & McDermott, L. C. (2016). Speech rate and pitch characteristics of infant-directed speech: Longitudinal and cross-linguistic observations. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 139(3), 1272-1281.

Montrul, S. A. (2008). *Incomplete acquisition in bilingualism: Re-examining the age factor* (Vol. 39). John Benjamins Publishing.

Moore, L. (2011). Language Socialization and Repetition. *The handbook of language socialization*, *71*, 209-226. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (2001). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories and their implications. *Linguistic anthropology: A reader*, 2001, 263-301. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Ochs, E. (1986). Introduction. *Language socialization across cultures*, 1-13. New York: Cambridge University Press

Ochs, E. (1974). Again and again: The pragmatics of imitation in child language. *Unpublished manuscript*.

Pinker, S. (1994). *The language instinct*. New York: Wm. Morrow.

Schaerlaekens, A. M. (2008). *De taalontwikkeling van het kind*. Wolters-Noordhoff.

Schmid, H. J. (2015). A blueprint of the entrenchment-and-conventionalization model. *Yearbook of the German Cognitive Linguistics Association*, 3(1), 3.

Schmid, H. J. (2014). A framework for understanding linguistic entrenchment and its psychological foundations in memory and automatization. Entrenchment, memory and automaticity. *The psychology of linguistic knowledge and language learning*. Boston: APA and Walter de Gruyter.

Sintrum Frysktalige Berne-opfang. (2010). Meartaligens – Wichtige knipsels. Online: http://www.sfbo.nl/frysk/meartaligens_wichtigeknipsels.php

Spelenderwijs. (2015). Pedagogisch Beleidsplan. Online: https://www.spelenderwijs.nl/files/ 2306/pedagogisch +beleidsplan+spelenderwijs_def_april2015.pdf

Tomasello, M. (2000). First steps towards a usage-based theory of language acquisition. *Cognitive Linguistics,* 11 (1-2), 61-82.

Van Avermaet, P., Pulinx, R., & Sirens, S. (2014). Conflicts and contradictions in language policy and practice: How monolingual policie may hamper students' school success. Online: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303511713_Conflicts_and_contradictions_in_language_policy_and_practice_How_monolingual_policies_may_hamper_students'_school_success

Wouterse, M. (2016). Speelplezier Speel-leerwijzer voor- en vroegschoolse educatie. Heerlen: Speelpleziermethodiek

Wouterse-Schmitz, M. (2005). Speelplezier. Heerlen: Consent Onderwijsbegeleiding- en Innovatie.

Appendix 1: Summary in Dutch

Kinderen uit de omgeving Eijsden-Margraten komen op de peuterspeelzalen in de gemeente in aanraking met een meertalige omgeving. Er wordt namelijk Nederlands en Limburgs gesproken, en daarnaast zijn er ook een aantal kinderen die van huis uit een andere taal meekrijgen. Het doel van deze scriptie is een antwoord te geven hoe dit meertalige landschap eruit ziet voor leerkrachten, Limburgssprekende kinderen, Nederlandssprekende kinderen en kinderen met een andere thuistaal en in welke mate er sprake is van sociale ongelijkheid. De data van de peuterspeelzalen in Eijsden-Margraten komen voort uit etnografisch veldwerk verricht tussen februari 2016 en juni 2016 in Cadier en Keer, Eijsden en Margraten, en worden gekoppeld aan literatuur over taalsocialisatie, meertaligheid, taalbeleid, (talige) accommodatie en usage-based literatuur. Daarnaast zal er op basis van gerapporteerd gedrag uit een interview met een medewerker van de *Sintrum Frysktalige Berne-opfang* (*SFBO)* gepoogd worden een inkijk te geven in hoeverre deze meertalige omgeving verschilt van die op de Friese peuterspeelzalen aangesloten bij de *SFBO*.

Uit de conclusie blijkt dat het Nederlands de taal in de hoogste sociale orde is in Eijsden-Margraten. Kinderen worden onder andere gesocialiseerd in het gebruik van het Nederlands in groepscommunicatie, belangrijke sociale en educationele activiteiten die hierarchisch bepaald zijn en instructies. Ook in het taalbeleid wordt er expliciet een belangrijkere rol ("groepscommunicatie") aan het Nederlands toegekend, wat weer terug te vinden is in het asymmetrische accommodatiegedrag: als het gebeurt, past een Limburgstalig kind zich aan een Nederlandstalig kind aan, en niet andersom. De Nederlandstaligen doen dus niet mee met de tweetaligheid. Het Limburgs is slechts beperkt tot individuele communicatie en bevindt zich dus lager in de sociale orde. Ten slotte bevinden de talen van anderstalige kinderen zich onderaan in de sociale orde: zij kunnen hun thuistalen niet inzetten op de peuterspeelzalen. In Friesland, zoals uit een telefonisch interview blijkt, zijn beide talen daarentegen gelijk en ze worden ook gelijkwaardig in alle contexten ingezet, zoals vermeld door een medewerkster van de *SFBO*. Daardoor worden kinderen hierarchisch gelijkwaardig in beide talen gesocialiseerd en worden de talen ook hierarchisch gelijkmatig ingezet.

Appendix 2: Overview of a typical daily programme at pre-school playgrounds

1e en 2e dag

Tijd	Activiteiten
8.45 uur	**Spelinloop met ouders** Een leidster speelt mee en een leidster staat de ouders te woord.
9.30 uur	**Thematische activiteiten in de grote groep.** *Liedje zingen om de kinderen in de halve kring te verzamelen* *1e dag voorbeeldspel* **Begrippen: kneden, balletje, rolletje(slang)** *Grote groepsactiviteit* Maak vooraf zoutdeeg. Boetseer, al vertellend, met zoutdeeg het jongetje Amir. Benoem tijdens het boetseren hoofd, buik etc. Zing weer het liedje over het lichaam. Zet het popje neer en vertel dat Amir gaat boetseren. Ga kneden, maak bolletjes, duw ze plat, maak rolletjes, benoem wat u doet en de ontstane vormen. Speel met een rolletje dat het een slang is en voer de slang. *2e dag gezamenlijk net-alsofspel* Herhaling van het spel en liedje van gisteren. Daarna gezamenlijk zingen en net-alsof uitbeelden
9.45 uur	**Begeleide activiteiten in een kleine groep.** *Ingepland begeleide activiteit* Attendeer de kinderen op de mogelijkheid het materiaal te pakken tijdens spelen-werken. *1e en 2e dag.* <table><tr><td>*In het atelier*</td><td>*Aan de exploratiebak*</td></tr><tr><td>Spelen met zoutdeeg (zonder vormpjes e.d. !). Noteer voor de ouders op een kaartje de woorden: kneden, balletje en rolletje. Plak het kaartje op een stokje en duw het in een balletje deeg.</td><td>Manipuleren en praten met: allerhande ballen in de met ballen gevulde zand-watertafel (zonder water!). Benoem: *bal, rond rollen.*</td></tr></table>
10.00 uur	**Zingen 'Smakelijk eten', eten en drinken en praten** U benoemt en beschrijft handelingen, voorwerpen, bijvoeglijke naamwoorden zoals drinken, inschenken, boterham met...., lekker, honger etc.
10.20 uur	**Toiletronde** (u benoemt en beschrijft handelingen en voorwerpen).
10.30 uur	**Vrij spelen binnen en/of buiten** U speelt mee, leest voor aan individuele kinderen en aan kleine groepjes. Geef ballen bij het buitenspel en benoem rollen, ballen etc.
11.30 uur	**Zingen en bewegen aan de hand van liedjeskaarten uit de algemene liedjes/ versjesdoos.** O.a. nieuw liedje met bewegingen herhalen.
11.45 uur	De ouders halen de kinderen op.
Opmerkingen:	

Appendix 3: E-mail between the municipality of Eijsden-Margraten and *Spelenderwijs*

Beste [contactpersoon van Spelenderwijs],

Via mijn collega [...] heb ik uw gegevens door gekregen. Ik begreep dat [zij] u al kort heeft verteld over een onderzoek van de Universiteit Maastricht ism het Meertens Instituut naar het gebruik van dialect op peuterspeelzalen en het effect daarvan op taalgebruik door kinderen. De Gemeente Eijsden-Margraten zou graag dit onderzoek voor een periode van 3 maanden willen laten uitvoeren op een aantal peuterspeelzalen. Onze gemeente zou daarmee de eerste gemeente zijn waar een dergelijk onderzoek plaatsvindt.

In de bijlage treft u de onderzoeksopdracht, die de inhoud van het onderzoek wat duidelijker omschrijft. Er is inmiddels een student gevonden die vanaf 15 februari 2016 beschikbaar is om met het onderzoek te starten.

De vraag richting peuterspeelzalen is vooral gericht op het verlenen van medewerking en het toestaan van de aanwezigheid van een student gedurende de dag. Er wordt verder niets verwacht van inzet qua uren of inhoudelijk. Wellicht dat een aantal begeleiders wel geïnterviewd worden, maar meer tijdsbesteding zal het voor de begeleiders niet in beslag nemen.

Ik zou graag met u in overleg gaan of u positief staat tegenover dit onderzoek, welke voorwaarden er vanuit u worden gesteld en of het onderzoek daadwerkelijk plaats kan vinden.

Ik hoor graag van u.

Hartelijke groet,

[...]

Beleidsmedewerker Kunst & Cultuur
Gemeente Eijsden-Margraten

Appendix 4: Scans of language policy at Eijsden-Margraten's pre-school playgrounds

Pedagogisch beleidsplan Spelenderwijs.
www.spelenderwijs.nl/files/2306/pedagogisch+beleidsplan+spelenderwijs>
→ _def_april2015.pdf

spelenderwijs

6. Personeel

6.1. Gekwalificeerde en geschoolde pedagogisch medewerkers

De pedagogisch medewerkers in de groepen beschikken over een voor de werkzaamheden passende beroepskwalificatie in overeenstemming met de collectieve arbeidsovereenkomst kinderopvang.

Alle pedagogisch medewerkers, de stagiaires, vrijwilligers en ander ondersteunend personeel zijn bij aanvang van het dienstverband in bezit van een geldig VOG (Verklaring omtrent gedrag). Deze verklaringen worden continu gescreend.

De kwaliteit van het pedagogisch handelen van de pedagogisch medewerkers en de deskundigheid die daarvoor nodig is wordt bevorderd door het structureel aanbieden van scholing. Elkaar feedback geven in het samenwerken, collegiaal overleg en ondersteuning door de leidinggevende/pedagoog zijn middelen die bijdragen tot het waarborgen van de kwaliteit van handelen. Onze pedagogisch medewerkers zijn geschoold in het observeren, signaleren en het formuleren van de hulpvraag.

6.2. Nederlands als voertaal

We verwachten van onze pedagogisch medewerkers, vrijwilligers en stagiaires dat ze de Nederlandse taal goed beheersen.
We besteden bij Spelenderwijs veel aandacht aan de taalontwikkeling. Wij stimuleren actief taalgebruik omdat het belangrijk is dat jonge kinderen vroeg leren communiceren. De Nederlandse taal gebruiken wij als voertaal, vooral bij groepsactiviteiten.
Daar waar naast de Nederlandse taal een streektaal gesproken wordt, wordt de streektaal voornamelijk gebruikt in de communicatie met het individuele kind.

6.3. Gedragscode pedagogisch medewerkers

Van de pedagogisch medewerker wordt, op basis van zijn beroepsuitoefening gevraagd een professionele relatie aan te gaan met de kinderen en hun opvoeders. De medewerker draagt in deze de zorg voor de juiste combinatie van professionele afstand en betrokkenheid ten opzichte van kinderen en opvoeders.
Bij het ontwikkelen van deze beroepshouding willen we ons bij Spelenderwijs laten leiden door een zogenaamde gedragscode.
Binnen onze stichting hanteren we het protocol: *'Gedragscode pedagogisch medewerker'*.
De gedragscode heeft betrekking op:

- De omgang van de pedagogisch medewerker in relatie tot kind en opvoeder.
- De wijze waarop de pedagogisch medewerker het kind benadert in het lichamelijk contact met het kind.
- De rol van de pedagogisch medewerker in het begeleiden van de seksuele ontwikkeling van het kind.

5. Voertaal

In onze peuterspeelzalen besteden wij veel aandacht aan de taalontwikkeling.
Om te leren communiceren en in de toekomst te lezen en schrijven, helpen wij kinderen hun woordenschat te vergroten.
Wij stimuleren actief taalgebruik. De Nederlandse taal gebruiken wij als voertaal, in het bijzonder bij activiteiten in groepsverband.
Daar waar naast de Nederlandse taal een streektaal veelvuldig gesproken wordt, kan deze naast de Nederlandse taal gebruikt worden.
De streektaal wordt voornamelijk gebruikt in communicatie met het individuele kind.
Vanzelfsprekend dienen onze pedagogisch medewerksters, vrijwilligers en stagiaires de Nederlandse taal goed te beheersen.

6. Ouders

Het pedagogisch klimaat in de peuterspeelzaal is niet los te zien van dat van de thuissituatie. Beide zijn van grote invloed op de ontwikkeling.
Daarom hechten we veel waarde aan overleg en afstemming met ouders. We informeren ouders over het reilen en zeilen in de peuterspeelzaal en over de belevenissen en ontwikkeling van het kind. We spelen in op situaties en gebeurtenissen thuis.
We kennen geen standaard voor de omgang met ouders, omdat we iedere ouder zien als uniek mens.
We gaan respectvol met ouders om en verwachten ook respect van hen. Positief of negatief, we horen graag wat ouders vinden van onze dienstverlening.
We streven naar een open en oprechte communicatie. Op die manier werken we aan het opbouwen van vertrouwen.

Appendix 5: Transcript of teachers' opinions on multilingualism and language policy

IK: Gino Morillo Morales
L1:   Leerkracht 1.
L2:   Leerkracht 2.
L3:   Leerkracht 3.
Datum: 26 mei 2016
Tijd: 12:30

Nederlands – *Limburgs*
[Onderbreking door tekst eronder] Onderbrekende uiting (<) korte pauze.

No.	Spreker	Tekst
1.	IK	Hoe gaat het qua taal in de kring? Welke keuzes moeten jullie maken? Dus welke taal wordt er gesproken in het algemeen en waar is dat op gebaseerd?
2.	L1	We doen de opening in het Nederlands. [Als we aangesproken worden in het dialect gaan we over in het dialect, worden we aangesproken in het Nederlands, dan geven we antwoord in het Nederlands, maar het gebeurt ook heel vaak, als ik iets spontaan wil zeggen, dat het gewoon dialect [[wordt.
3.	L2	] Ja.
4.	L3	]] Dialect.
5.	IK	Uhu. Maar vanwaar dan die opening in het Nederlands? Want de spontaniteit gebeurt dan in het dialect.
6.	L1	Omdat we in het Nederlands moeten openen. Dat hoort bij het programma. Dat staat uh... (<) ergens geschreven.
7.	L3	Het is ook een stimulans voor de Nederlandse taal, voor de woorden. Kindjes die al een taalachterstand hebben, moeten we het Nederlands aanleren. Omdat ze al moeite hebben met de taal, dan zitten we met dialect én Nederlands
8.	L1	De buitenlandse ook.
9.	L3	Zeker de allochtone kindjes, ja, dan meteen het goede Nederlandse woord benoemen.
10.	IK	Hoe kijken jullie daar zelf tegenaan? Vinden jullie het iets positiefs dat het in het Nederlands moet? Of zou er ook bijvoorbeeld wat variatie in moeten zijn?
11.	L1	Ik denk dat we daarom ook zelf al de variatie ook al handhaven. Dat we niet écht heel consequent Nederlands spreken.
12.	L3	Ik betrap me er zelf wel eens op dat ik zoiets heb van, oh ja, ik moet [verdergaan in het Nederlands. De voertaal is vaak toch wel dialect. Dus ja, we zijn er wel bewust mee bezig. Met die wisseling dan. En spontane momenten, dan schakel je al over [naar het dialect].
13.	L2	Ja, ja.
14.	IK	Dus, in de zin van, als het individueel wordt, dan wordt het dialect.
15.	L3	Afhankelijk van de taal die het kind spreekt. Als het een Nederlands kindje is [dan is het in het Nederlands. Maar, ja, als het een dialect kindje is dan is het in het, ja, dialect.
16.	IK	Ja, natuurlijk.

17.	L1	Ja, en je hoorde zelfs vandaag, want ik betrapte me erop toen ik was aan het spreken, het Maastrichts. Meteen hè, *en den deis se det den duks veur de grap of zo, en den trèks se 't nog es extra laangk hè*, ja, dat zijn van die momenten.
18.	IK	Haha, ja, ik heb het nog niet echt in de gaten, Maastrichts, Eijsdens, voor mij is het nog wel lastig om te onderscheiden!
19.	L1	Ja, ja.
20.	L3	Ja, oké.
21.	L1	*Ich weit neet waat d'r* [het kind] *zag, mer in ieder geval, ich dach och heur mich op z'n Mesjtreechs!*
22.	IK	*lacht* ja, ja.
23.	L3	Ja.
24.	IK	Jullie zeiden dat het goed is om Nederlands te spreken, vooral ook voor de anderstalige kinderen die er zijn.
25.	L3	Zéker. Ja, maar ook voor kindjes die (<) een taalachterstand hebben. Kijk, die krijgen dadelijk logopedie misschien, is ook allemaal Nederlands. Ga je ze nu alleen maar dialect aanbieden, dan moeten ze straks nog een keer omschakelen, en ze hebben al zo'n moeite met woorden op te slaan en woorden te onthouden. Evengoed ook kindjes uit Eijsden hoor, niet alleen allochtone kindjes. Zeker kindjes die moeite hebben met de spraak en de taal. Vooral die kindjes.
26.	L1	Ja, ik denk (<) ik denk dat het in het onderzoek helemaal *lacht* [Ja, voor het onderzoek wel.
27.	L3	] (Onverstaanbaar)
28.	IK	*lacht*
29.	L3	*Jao, mer zo is 't os waal* [altied uhh... Sinds Spelenderwijs, zo is het ons wel altijd voorgehouden. Dus dat doen we dan heel braaf.
30.	L1	*] Nae nae, ja ja. Zo waor 't biej os*
31.	IK	Ja, ja. Maar op zich, jullie kijken er wel positief tegenaan, tegen dat beleid? Komt er een bepaalde emotie daarbij, of...?
32.	L1	Nee, nee.
33.	L3	Kijk, als ze nu zeiden jullie mogen alléén nog maar Nederlands spreken... [Dan weet ik het niet. Maar nu, zeker in de vrijere momenten...
34.	L1	] Nee, nee, *dat deed ich neet*.
35.	L1	Ja, maar je gaat er ook vanuit, je krijgt het opgelegd en je denkt, iedereen weet waar hij mee bezig is, dat zal wel ergens onderzocht zijn [, dat zal wel eh... een goeie reden hebben dat dat zo moet.
36.	L3	] onderbouwd zijn.
37.	L3	Ze kiezen voor die methodiek. Spelenderwijs, dan. Met een bepaalde achterliggende gedachte, ja, ja.
38.	L1	Dan ga je jezelf er niet meer in verdiepen, van, is dat écht goed of hoort dat écht zo, of als ik het anders zou doen, bijvoorbeeld in het dialect, heeft dat meerwaarde of is dat verkeerd, of... Nee, je denkt inderdaad, je krijgt het zo voorgelegd dus dat is onderzocht, onderbouwd, dus dat is goed zo, dat hoort zo.
39.	L3	En zeker omdat er toen ook die pilot was hè, ja [daar ga je gewoon in mee.
40.	L1	] Jao.
41.	IK	Oké... Bedankt (er kwam meer, maar dat was alleen een afsluiting. Ik heb de opname hier gestopt)

Appendix 6: Interview questions of the *SFBO* interview

Geachte heer, mevrouw,

Voor mijn stage aan het Meertens Instituut heb ik veldwerk verricht op peuterspeelzalen in de gemeente Eijsden-Margraten. Tijdens het onderzoek heb ik onderzocht in welke interacties en contexten het Nederlands wordt gebruikt, in welke het dialect en welke positie een andere taal heeft (bijvoorbeeld Turks of Spaans). Ik zou u graag een vragenlijst willen voorleggen om meer inzicht te krijgen in de situatie op de Friese peuterspeelzalen, om zo een vergelijking te kunnen maken met de peuterspeelzalen uit mijn onderzoek. Uw antwoorden zou ik dan graag willen verwerken in een verslag voor de gemeente Eijsden-Margraten en het uiteindelijke stageverslag voor mijn stage aan het Meertens Instituut.

Alvast bedankt,

Gino Morillo Morales

Vragenlijst:

Situatie voor vragen 1-3d: er is een groepsgesprek gaande in de kring waarbij een leerkracht de vraag stelt wat iedereen in het weekend heeft gedaan.

1. Welke taal wordt er in een groepsgesprek (zoals de kring) gebruikt door de leerkracht?

2. In welke taal reageert een Friestalig kind dan?

3a. Als een Friestalig kind in het Fries zou reageren op de leerkracht, hoe gaat de leerkracht hiermee om? (Wordt het kind gecorrigeerd, of gaat de leerkracht erin mee?)

3b. Als een Friestalige leerkracht op het kind uit 3a. weer in het Fries reageert, blijft het dan een groepsgesprek? (Praten andere kinderen ook mee? Of wordt het een individueel gesprek?).

3c. Als een Friestalig kind in het Nederlands zou reageren, hoe gaat het kind hiermee om? (Zijn de uitingen van het kind even uitbundig als in het Fries?)

3d. Als een Friestalige leerkracht op het kind uit 3c. weer in het Nederlands reageert, blijft het dan een groepsgesprek? (Praten andere kinderen ook mee? Of wordt het een individueel gesprek?)

3e. Als een Friestalige leerkracht Fries spreekt, maar een Friestalige leerling spreekt Nederlands terug, hoe gaat de leerkracht hiermee om? (door blijven spreken in het Fries of naar Nederlands?)

De volgende vraag gaat over de instructieliedjes op de peuterspeelzaal. Met deze liedjes geeft een leerkracht aan dat zij een bepaalde handeling verwachten van de kinderen (dat ze bijvoorbeeld gaan eten, of opruimen).

4. In welke taal worden deze liedjes gezongen op de Friese peuterspeelzalen?

5a. Zingen Friestalige en bijvoorbeeld Turkstalige kinderen mee als dit in het Nederlands is?

5b. Zingen Nederlandstalige en bijvoorbeeld Turkstalige kinderen mee als dit in het Fries is?

De volgende vragen (6-9) gaan over kinderen die met een andere thuistaal dan het Fries of Nederlands opgroeien.

6a. In welke taal spreken leerkrachten met kinderen met een andere taalachtergrond?

6b. In welke taal spreken Friestalige kinderen met kinderen met een andere taalachtergrond?

6c. In welke taal spreken Nederlandstalige kinderen met kinderen met een andere taalachtergrond?

7a. In hoeverre worden zij blootgesteld aan het Fries?

7b. Door wie?

7c. En in welke activiteit? (Bijvoorbeeld in de kring, vrij spelen, of tijdens het eten?)

8. Wat gebeurt er wanneer zij in een taal worden aangesproken die zij niet gewend zijn?

9. Hoe is hun situatie op de peuterspeelzaal? (Zoeken zij vooral vriendjes met dezelfde thuistaal? Of is de thuistaal niet van belang?)

De volgende vragen (10-12) gaan over taalbeleid.

10a. Is er een expliciet geformuleerd taalbeleid op de peuterspeelzalen?

10b. Betreft dat taalbeleid ook het Fries?

10c. Hebben het Nederlands en het Fries duidelijk verschillende functies binnen dit taalbeleid?

11. Hoe wordt er gekeken naar andere talen binnen het taalbeleid?

12. Zijn leerkrachten zich bewust van het voorgeschreven taalbeleid?

De volgende vragen (13-14) gaan over meertaligheid.

13. Hoe kijken leerkachten over het algemeen tegen meertaligheid op de peuterspeelzaal aan? (Positief, als een meerwaarde? Negatief, als een obstakel?)

14. Hoe denken leerkrachten over het blootstellen van kinderen aan verschillende talen? (Bijvoorbeeld: hoe denken leerkrachten erover om Fries te spreken met kinderen met een taalachtergrond anders dan het Fries en Nederlands).

De volgende vragen (15-19) gaan over talige accommodatie op de peuterspeelzalen.

15. Is de talige accommodatie op de peuterspeelzalen symmetrisch of asymmetrisch tussen leerkrachten en leerlingen? (Passen beide groepen zich in een gesprek even veel aan elkaar aan?). Hoe?

16. Is de talige accommodatie op de peuterspeelzalen symmetrisch of asymmetrisch tussen Friestaligen en Nederlandstaligen? (Passen beide groepen zich in een gesprek even veel aan elkaar aan?). Hoe?

17. In een 2x2-tabel zoals hieronder, met 'Friestaligen/Nederlandstaligen' en 'leerkracht/leering' als variabelen, wie past zich het meeste aan? Wie het minste?

Friestalige leerkracht	Nederlandstalige leerkracht
Friestalig kind	Nederlandstalig kind

18. Wat gebeurt er wanneer een Friestalig kind Fries spreekt met een Nederlandstalige leerkracht die geen Fries kan?

19. Vindt er ook accommodatie plaats binnen bepaalde varianten van het Fries?

De volgende vragen (20-22b) gaan over routines die plaatsvinden op de peuterspeelzaal.

20. Is er een duidelijk (= vaak herhaald) verschil tussen het gebruik van het Nederlands en het Fries? (Is het Fries bijvoorbeeld écht typisch voor een situatie en het Nederlands voor een andere situatie?)

21. Gebruiken de Nederlandstalige kinderen soms toch bepaalde Friese woorden die bijvoorbeeld vaak door ouders of leerkrachten herhaald worden?

22a. Is er een verschil tussen het Nederlands en het Fries hoe het gebruikt wordt op de peuterspeelzaal en op de basisschool?

22b. Zijn kinderen zich hier bewust van?