

# **The Multilingual Home Literacy Environment**

A questionnaire study into the literacy behaviour of adolescents within multilingual families

Justine Griffioen

S1066325

Master's thesis General Linguistics

Supervisor: Dr. Gerrit Jan Kootstra

Second reader: Dr. Sharon Unsworth

6 October 2022

## Table of Contents

Abstract .....	3
1. Introduction .....	4
2. Literature review .....	8
2.1 The Home Literacy Environment .....	8
2.1.1 <i>The role of SES in the HLE of multilingual families</i> .....	10
2.2 Print exposure and reading comprehension .....	14
2.2.1 <i>The role of SES for reading proficiency</i> .....	17
2.3 How to study the HLE of multilingual adolescents? .....	21
3. Research question and hypotheses .....	24
4. Method .....	26
4.1 Respondents .....	26
4.2 Instruments .....	29
4.3 Procedure .....	32
4.4 Data processing and analysis .....	33
5. Results .....	36
5.1 Questionnaire analysis .....	36
5.2 Spearman Rank correlations and Mann-Whitney U tests .....	40
5.3 Summary of results .....	46
6. Discussion .....	47
6.1 Hypothesis 1 .....	47
6.2 Hypothesis 2 .....	50
6.3 Hypothesis 3 .....	52
7. Limitations and future directions .....	54
8. Conclusion .....	57
References .....	58
Appendix A: Ethical Permission .....	68
Appendix B: Definitions of the HLE categories .....	69
Appendix C: Parental and adolescent questionnaires .....	70
Appendix D: Interview questions .....	101
Appendix E: Transcriptions of the interviews .....	102
Recording Parent of P9 .....	102
Recording Parent of P17 .....	103

## **Abstract**

Language background appears to play an important role in the Dutch reading proficiency of adolescents within the Netherlands, which has been decreasing significantly between 2015 and 2018 (Gubbels, Van Langen, Maassen & Meelissen, 2019). Therefore, this thesis aimed to find out whether results from studies into the effects of socio-economic status (SES) on the Home Literacy Environment (HLE) of (younger) monolingual populations are replicable for (adolescent) multilingual populations, by comparing the HLE of multilingual families with different socio-economic backgrounds. A number of 17 adolescents of various language backgrounds aged 11 to 19 years old participated in the study. It was found that a higher average educational background of both parents in Dutch was associated with more print exposure for the child in the HL as reported by the parents. Moreover, a higher average educational background of both parents in Dutch was associated with a lower frequency of child literacy habits in Dutch as reported by the parents. Lastly, a better HL proficiency by the adolescent was associated with less Dutch use in the home as reported by both parents and adolescents. The implications of these results will be discussed in regard to the reviewed literature.

## 1. Introduction

Being literate can be viewed as one of the main contributors to academic success. Whereas learning how to read and write may take up a large part of our childhood lives, once we grow older, this may become less of a priority. The Dutch context may be highly relevant in this regard. Between 2015 and 2018, the average reading proficiency of 15-year-old students in the Netherlands decreased significantly, in contrast to the average of other participating European countries within the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) (Gubbels, Van Langen, Maassen & Meelissen, 2019). This average decrease seemed to be present for all levels within the Dutch secondary school system (except for vocational training). Moreover, higher educational background by the parents appeared to correlate with higher reading outcomes of their children. In addition, students with Dutch as their L1 scored significantly higher than students who spoke another language at home, with students speaking a non-European language at home scoring lower than those speaking another European language (Gubbels et al., 2019). Reading proficiency in the heritage language (HL) of the multilingual students was, however, not assessed. As the multilingual adolescent's linguistic repertoire is built up of multiple languages, it would be important to gain more insight into their HL reading proficiency as well.

As language backgrounds may differ widely between multilingual students, it would be difficult to test each student on their HL proficiency within mainstream education. Nonetheless, it may be relevant to do so. The standard for most European schools has been to teach in the official language of the country (Duarte, 2020). We could wonder whether, in this way, the potential of these multilingual pupils might be diminished. That is, it has been found that children who grow up bilingually actually know as many words in their two languages taken together, as a monolingual of the same age knows in their single language (Hoff, Core, Place, Rumiche, Señor & Parra, 2012). Moreover, providing a more multilingual schooling

environment could also be important for HL maintenance. That is, a study by Lee (2002) found that multilingual American students who valued HL maintenance scored better academically (as measured by the student's GPA) than their peers who did not. As stated by Cho (2015, p.30) regarding the American context: "Research documents a continuing pattern of decline in the use of HL and in HL competence among language minority groups, leading them to eventually lose their HL and become English monolinguals." If we want to support multilingual children in their academic pursuits, it is thus important that their HL is maintained.

Many factors can play a role in heritage language maintenance. On the one hand, external factors (outside of the home) can influence HL use, such as: the school environment, societal attitudes, language policies, language use with peers and the larger family, etc. Nonetheless, factors related to the home have been found to be the most important for HL maintenance (Brown, 2011). As the home is the place where the HL is firstly acquired, and there is often a lack of comprehensible HL input outside of the home, at least for minority languages, it follows that the home is also the place where the HL needs to be maintained. Family relationships thus play a crucial role in HL maintenance (Park & Sarkar, 2007). A study by Tannenbaum and Howie (2002), for instance, indicated that closer bonds within the family will lead to more HL maintenance. Moreover, support and involvement from parents have been found to be one of the most relevant factors for HL maintenance as well (Arriagada, 2005; Oh & Fuligini, 2010; Suarez, 2002, 2007).

To understand the role of the family in HL maintenance, it may be important to first consider language development in the L1. As found in monolingual samples, the home environment has been found to play an important role for L1 development as well (Scheele, Leseman, & Mayo, 2010). In particular, SES of parents can be a significant predictor of language outcomes. Children from high SES backgrounds tend to receive more language input in general, as well as the most effective input for learning a language (Hart & Risley, 1995).

An important part of this input are home literacy activities (e.g., shared book reading) due to their “use of a rich vocabulary, complex and information-dense sentences, and semantically interconnected discourse” (Scheele et al., 2010, p. 118). Next to this, high SES families have also been found to watch more educational programs and sing more songs with their children (Leseman, Mayo, & Scheele, 2009; Linebarger & Walker, 2004; Schön et al., 2008; Wright et al., 2001). However, it is important to note that these studies were mostly conducted within monolingual populations (Scheele et al., 2010). It would thus be important to investigate the home literacy activities within multilingual samples as well.

To summarize, Dutch reading proficiency levels of 15-year-old students in the Netherlands have been decreasing significantly, especially among multilingual students and students with lower educated parents (Gubbels, Van Langen, Maassen & Meelissen, 2019). Nonetheless, these results only draw a limited picture, as the HL of the multilingual students was not examined within the study, although the value that the multilingual student places on their HL has been found to directly impact their academic outcomes (Lee, 2002). Moreover, studies illustrating the effects of educational background by the parents on literacy activities within the home have mostly been performed with monolingual populations (Scheele et al., 2010). As a result, the effects of home literacy activities on the reading proficiency of the multilingual student in each of their languages remain to be studied.

In this thesis, we will thus investigate the home literacy environment (HLE) of multilingual adolescents by comparing multilingual families with different socio-economic backgrounds. Moreover, we will try to find out whether results from studies into the effects of SES on the HLE of (younger) monolingual populations are replicable for (older) multilingual populations, as language background appears to play an important role in the Dutch reading proficiency of multilingual adolescents within the Netherlands (Gubbels et al., 2019). As previous studies mostly investigated younger populations, we will firstly try to establish an age-

appropriate definition for the HLE within this study. Additionally, we will investigate the role of SES within multilingual families. Furthermore, we will elaborate on the relationships between L1 and L2 print exposure and reading comprehension as well as the role of SES for Dutch reading proficiency more specifically. Lastly, we will bring forward ideas of how the HLE can best be studied, after which we will present our research question and hypotheses.

## **2. Literature review**

### **2.1 The Home Literacy Environment**

The home literacy environment (HLE) has previously been conceptualized as “the exposure to reading materials, learning activities, such as storybook reading, and parents’ own literacy habits” (Willard, Agache, Jäkel, Glück, & Leyendecker, 2015, p. 876). The HLE has been an extensive topic of attention within language development research. As found by a meta-analysis from Dowdall et al. (2020), shared picture book reading interventions (targeting parents) appear to positively influence the language development of children aged 1 to 6 years old. A number of 19 studies were included in the analysis, using a variety of language assessment measures, such as the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT; Dunn & Dunn, 1981), the Expressive One Word Picture Vocabulary Test (EOWPVT; Gardner, 1990), and the MacArthurBates Communicative Development Inventory (CDI; Fenson et al., 2000). The study found a positive effect of the interventions on both productive and receptive language skills of the children. Next to storybook reading, the HLE also includes other types of language-related activities. For instance, children’s language development may also benefit from activities such as singing songs and watching educational television programs (Linebarger & Walker, 2004; Schön et al, 2008; Wright et al., 2001). Nonetheless, the role of language background was not explicitly investigated within all these studies, as they were either performed with monolingual participants or the role of HL reading proficiency was not included within the study.

When examining the HLE of multilingual families, however, similar patterns are visible. A study by Roberts (2008) found that storybook reading in the heritage language of the child (in this case Spanish or Hmong) and storybook reading in English were equally beneficial for English vocabulary acquisition in children aged 4 years old. Like previous studies, (an updated version of) the PPVT (Dunn & Dunn, 1997) was used, as well as a Spanish version of the test (Dunn, Padilla, Lugo, & Dunn, 1986). Moreover, weekly vocabulary tests were administered



which were more specifically related to the storybook they were either going to read, had just read, or just had received in-class instruction on. It was found that story-specific words were learned better than general vocabulary (as measured by the PPVT), suggesting that home storybook reading indeed aided the learning of these words, even when the book was read in the heritage language. Vocabulary learning in the L1 thus appears to aid L2 vocabulary learning of multilingual children when the words are contextualized within a story.

In addition, a study by Farver, Xu, Lonigan, and Eppe (2013) looking into 392 multilingual (English and Spanish) children aged on average 4 years old in the US, found that L2 literacy activities from the parents, such as reading and rhyming, improved the children's L2 vocabulary. L1 literacy activities, however, appeared to have a negative effect on L2 vocabulary development of the child. The authors explain this outcome with the time-on-task hypothesis (Rossell & Baker, 1996), as more time spent on HLE activities within either one of the languages would lead to improved preliteracy skills in that specific language. Interestingly, different language assessments were used than in the previous studies, namely: three subtests of the Stanford–Binet Intelligence Scale–4<sup>th</sup> Edition (Thorndike, Hagen, & Sattler, 1986) in order to test cognitive ability; the English and Spanish versions of the Preschool Language Scales (PLS-4; Zimmerman, Steiner, & Pond, 2002) to assess oral language; the Blending and Elision subtests from the Preschool Comprehensive Test of Phonological and Print Processing (P-CTOPPP; Lonigan, Wagner, Torgesen, & Rashotte, 2002) and the P-CTOPPP– Spanish (Lonigan, Farver, & Eppe, 2002) to measure phonological awareness and print knowledge. Moreover, three of the preliteracy skills investigated within the study were moderately (but significantly) associated across the two languages, which could again indicate transfer between the L1 and the L2 regarding these skills.

In short, the relationship between L1 literacy activities (the HLE) and L2 vocabulary learning remains unclear. Nonetheless, certain literacy skills may transfer between the L1 and

the L2. The HLE of multilingual families may thus indirectly impact L2 learning. A key factor which could impact the HLE of multilingual families is socio-economic status (SES). As mentioned before, children from high SES backgrounds tend to receive more language input in general, as well as the most effective input for learning a language (Hart & Risley, 1995). Consequently, already during preschool, the emergent literacy outcomes from children with a lower SES background appear to be lower than those of children with higher SES backgrounds (Korat & Haglili, 2007), thus putting children with lower SES backgrounds at a considerable disadvantage from an early age on. Therefore, the next section will illustrate the effects of SES in the HLE of multilingual families more specifically.

### *2.1.1 The role of SES in the HLE of multilingual families*

SES appears to play a significant role in the HLE of multilingual families. Scheele et al. (2010), for instance, investigated the bilingual language development of 162 three-year-old children, from Dutch, Moroccan-Dutch, and Turkish-Dutch backgrounds with different SES in the Netherlands. The bilingual participants had a lower SES background on average in comparison to the Dutch participants, with the Moroccan-Dutch participants having the lowest SES. SES was measured by means of the highest attained educational level of both parents and their current job level. Nonverbal intelligence was measured by means of Raven's Coloured Progressive Matrices (CPM; Raven, 1995). L1 and L2 vocabulary were measured by means of the receptive vocabulary test of the Diagnostic Test of Bilingualism of the national educational testing service (Verhoeven, Narrain, Extra, Konak, & Zerrouk, 1995). The HLE was measured by means of a questionnaire based on the Early Childhood version of the HOME observation scheme by Bradley and Caldwell (1984) and questionnaires used in previous research (e.g., Leseman & Van den Boom, 1999). It was found that the Moroccan-Dutch and Turkish-Dutch parents read much less to their children than the Dutch parents. However, the Turkish-Dutch participants did provide more home literacy activities than the Moroccan-Dutch parents.

Nonetheless, both bilingual groups were found to be less proficient in both of their languages in comparison to the monolingual group in their single language, as language input at home had to be divided over two languages (cf. Hoff et al., 2012). Moreover, the role of SES was more apparent in the monolingual group than in the bilingual groups, as higher SES was found to lead to significantly more L1 input for the Dutch group, whereas this was not visible for the bilingual groups. Interestingly, higher SES was significantly linked to more L2 input in the Moroccan-Dutch group, which could partly be explained by their lack of a formal written form of Tarifit-Berber. That is, as higher educated parents tend to provide more literate language activities to their child, only materials written in the L2 Dutch would be available for this purpose (Scheele et al., 2010).

Another study which included the role of SES within the HLE is a study by Kalia and Reese (2009), who investigated the HLE of 50 children of about 4 years old in Bangalore in India. The official languages spoken here are Kannada and English, although the parents in the study reported speaking a wide array of Indian languages at home: Hindi, Tamil, Malayalam, Telugu, Bengali, Kannada, Urdu, Marathi, Gujrati, and Thulu. The children attend English-medium schools, which follow the three-language formula: until the first grade the children receive print exposure in English only, from the first grade onwards they will also learn oral and written Hindi and from the eighth grade they will learn oral and written Kannada. Instruction in all subjects is in English. Like previous studies, receptive English vocabulary knowledge was assessed using the PPVT-III (Dunn & Dunn, 1997), and phonological awareness was assessed by means of two subtests of the P-CTOPPP (Lonigan, Burgess, Anthony, & Barker, 1998). Emergent literacy was assessed by means of Clay's Concepts About Print Test (1979). Additionally, parents filled out a questionnaire about their HLE, including questions about their educational background and income and the 'Children's Title Checklist for India (CTCL-I)' as adapted from the Children's Title Checklist by Sénéchal, LeFevre, Hudson, and Lawson (1996).

The checklist only consisted of English books as: the number of indigenous Indian books was found to be lower in general; indigenous Indian books were found to be less child-friendly (according to libraries and bookstores), and; Indian middle-class parents read more frequently in English, whereas grandparents usually read the indigenous Indian books to their grandchildren. The variable book-reading practices consisted of these CTCL-I scores, the number of books present in the home and the frequency of book reading. The authors found that the children's receptive vocabulary in English was predicted by English book-reading practices and the amount of English parents spoke with their child. Moreover, as less than one third of the parents actually mostly spoke English to their child at home, it appeared that English book-reading practices could compensate for the low degree of English spoken by the parents on children's receptive vocabulary knowledge in English (as apparent from the PPVT scores). The HL was spoken to children at home by 44% of the parents in the study, but the direct role of the HL on the English language proficiency of the children was not investigated. That is, HL print exposure was not examined independently within the study, as the variable book-reading practices consisted of the CTCL-I scores (which only included English books) and the number of books and frequency of book reading, which appeared to be language independent. Like studies into monolingual language development, higher educated mothers within the study read more often to their children than lower educated mothers, illustrating the relevance of socio-economic background for multilingual language development as well.

As apparent from the previously mentioned studies, most research on the HLE of multilingual families is focused on younger children. Thus, only little attention has been drawn to the literacy activities of adolescents in multilingual families (Van Kruistum, Van Rooijen, Leseman & De Haan, 2009). This is also visible in the way the HLE has been previously conceptualized as "the exposure to reading materials, learning activities, such as storybook reading, and parents' own literacy habits" (Willard et al., 2015, p. 876), which emphasizes the

aim of learning how to read, which is less applicable to adolescents. As illustrated in a literature review of 92 articles by Dixon and Wu (2014), the home literacy environment for younger children is often very different from that of adolescents, as adolescents are mostly able to independently choose and carry out their literary activities. As pointed out by the review, HL literacy activities were often more connected to activities outside of the school environment, such as reading shopping lists, helping with bills, doing homework in the HL and watching videos with HL subtitles (Cruickshank, 2004). Moreover, a study into adolescent Korean girls in the US revealed that HL literacy activities were mostly related to reading specific stories or religious texts in their HL Korean (Joo, 2009).

As the available literature is relatively scarce and outdated, it would be important to shed some more light on this topic. Moreover, whereas SES has been considered regarding HLE studies regarding younger children, this has yet to be researched in the context of the adolescent HLE. The Home Literacy Environment in the present study can thus be defined as: “the exposure to reading materials in each language within the home, both in offline and online contexts, and both parents’ and children’s own literacy habits”. Moreover, the role of L1 input through the HLE will also be taken into account, in order to investigate the role of HL proficiency for L2 proficiency, especially regarding L2 reading proficiency. That is, we might wonder to what extent Dutch reading proficiency of multilingual adolescents with Dutch as an L2 can still be improved by stimulating the amount of L1 input in the HLE during adolescence. Therefore, the following section will elaborate on the specific factors that may impact L2 reading comprehension as well as aim to illustrate how these are interlinked.

## **2.2 Print exposure and reading comprehension**

Print exposure can be viewed as one of the main determiners of reading comprehension. According to Stanovich and Cunningham (1993), print exposure can, for example, be beneficial for vocabulary growth and increases in general knowledge. Whereas for younger children print exposure will mostly be determined by the literacy behaviour of their parents, for adolescents this is more self-driven, based partly on their own reading abilities (Mol & Bus, 2011). A study by Erbeli, Van Bergen, and Hart (2020) indeed found that teenagers who were more skilled at reading had had more print exposure than those who were less skilled at reading. The authors investigated the English reading comprehension and print exposure of 910 twins of about 12 years old. By looking at twins, environmental effects could potentially be isolated from genetic effects. Print exposure was measured by means of the Author Recognition Test (ART). In this print exposure checklist, names of famous authors are used as an objective way to measure an individual's literacy environment (Mol & Bus, 2011). Interestingly, print exposure was only rated by the adolescents themselves, whereas the authors indicate that "ideally, ratings would have been obtained from multiple informants across different contexts (e.g., parents and teachers)" (Erbeli et al., 2020, p.1559). Furthermore, whereas the study included the race and ethnicity of the participants, it was not stated whether the students were multilingual. It was thus unclear whether the print exposure that was accounted for in the study was only in English or comprised the print exposure of the participants within other languages as well.

In a study by Sparks, Patton, Ganschow, and Humbach (2012), on the other hand, the effect of L1 print exposure on L2 reading comprehension was investigated. The participants were on average 6 years old at the start of the study and 16 years of age at the end of the study. The study took place in the United States and all the participants within the study were native English speakers. The L2 in the study was either Spanish, French, or German. L1 print exposure was, again, measured by means of the Author Recognition Test (ART), but also the Magazine

Recognition Test (MRT) and the Cultural Literacy Test (CLT). The findings of the study suggest that students who have more L1 print exposure perform better at L2 reading comprehension as well. According to the authors, this can be explained by the idea that “strong L1 reading achievement and frequent L1 print exposure (reading volume) may serve to increase students’ metalinguistic awareness.” (Sparks et al., 2012, p. 498).

To be able to read, a person needs to be able to decode words and know the meaning of a certain number of words. According to Zipke (2007, p.377) the metalinguistic knowledge needed to understand a text would thus be defined as “understanding the multiple meanings of words and sentences; ease in manipulating the order of words within sentences or phrases; and flexibility in reprocessing ambiguous sentences”. In a study by Zipke (2007) 105 students from the US aged 12-13 had to solve a number of riddles in English. Moreover, a reading comprehension and vocabulary test were administered. The study found a link between reading comprehension and metalinguistic awareness as the riddle task demanded students to be flexible in their comprehension of homonyms and garden-path sentences and their ability to change word order. The better the students performed at this task, the higher their reading comprehension scores. Higher metalinguistic awareness might thus also improve L2 reading comprehension, as metalinguistic awareness transcends the linguistic knowledge in the L1.

A study by Van Gelderen, Schoonen, Stoel, De Glopper, and Hulstijn (2007) looked at the relationship between L1 reading comprehension and L2 reading comprehension, also called the ‘transfer hypothesis’. The transfer hypothesis states that readers can transfer their L1 reading comprehension skills to their L2. These skills include reading strategies and metacognitive knowledge. 389 Dutch students participated in the study and were followed for a period of three years (from age 13-14 onwards). The L1 in the study was Dutch and the L2 was English, although these were not necessarily the L1 and L2 for all the students. All students did speak Dutch fluently, as most of them had been enrolled in primary education in the Netherlands.

English was a compulsory subject for all the students in secondary education. The study found high correlations between L1 and L2 reading comprehension and effects of metacognitive knowledge on both L1 and L2 reading comprehension. However, according to the authors, metacognitive knowledge should not be regarded as a mediating factor between L1 and L2 reading comprehension, as it encompasses more components than solely L1 reading experience. Moreover, the authors point to the similarity in test designs (e.g. both L1 and L2 tests provided similar answering formats and used texts of the same genre and for the same target age group) as one of the main reasons for the strong relationships found between L1 and L2 reading comprehension, as previous studies which used less similar test designs found lower correlations between these variables.

Moreover, a study by Van den Bosch, Segers, and Verhoeven (2020) did look into participants with a different L1 background. The authors compared the Dutch reading comprehension of a group of monolingual Dutch vs bilingual Turkish-Dutch participants between 6 and 8 years of age. Nonverbal reasoning skills were assessed by means of the Raven's Coloured Progressive Matrices (Raven, 1965), which was similar across groups. SES, as based on parent's educational level, appeared to be significantly different across groups, as the bilingual group had lower SES than the monolingual group (similar to the study by Scheele et al., 2010). Furthermore, decoding skills were assessed via a word reading test and a pseudoword reading test (Verhoeven & Keuning, 2017); Dutch vocabulary knowledge was measured by means of a Dutch receptive vocabulary test from the set of instruments for developmental language disorders (T-TOS; Verhoeven, Keuning, Horsels, & Van Boxtel, 2013); Turkish vocabulary knowledge was measured by means of a translation of the Dutch version of the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (Dunn & Dunn, 2007); and reading comprehension was assessed by means of the Cito reading comprehension test (Cito B.V., 2014). Lastly, language exposure at home (in the different languages) was measured via a questionnaire administered



to the bilingual group. The authors found that, on average, the bilingual group scored lower on reading comprehension than the native Dutch readers. However, when taking into account the L1 vocabulary scores from the L2 Dutch readers, these effects would diminish over time. That is, the reading comprehension performance of L2 Dutch readers with higher vocabulary scores in their L1 increased more than the reading comprehension of the native Dutch readers. Moreover, the L2 Dutch readers with higher vocabulary scores in both their L1 and Dutch scored on par with their monolingual counterparts within a couple of years' time. However, as the authors argued, L1 vocabulary is plausibly linked to a number of home literacy activities and resources, which may partly account for these outcomes as well.

The results of these studies thus illustrate the relevance of taking into account the L1 print exposure, reading comprehension, and vocabulary, as well as metalinguistic awareness of children and adolescents when investigating L2 reading comprehension. That is, more L1 print exposure and better L1 reading comprehension can aid L2 reading comprehension for adolescents who grew up monolingually, and higher L1 vocabulary can support L2 reading comprehension for multilingual children. It would thus be relevant to investigate these factors for multilingual adolescents as well. Moreover, SES can play an important role in this as well. Therefore, the next section will illustrate the role of SES for reading proficiency in adolescents and explain how SES will be operationalized within this study.

### ***2.2.1 The role of SES for reading proficiency***

As mentioned in the introduction of this thesis, Dutch reading proficiency levels are decreasing (Gubbels, et al., 2019). The Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) found that higher educational background by parents correlated with higher reading outcomes of their children. In addition, students with Dutch as their L1 scored significantly higher than students who spoke another language at home, with students speaking a non-European language at home scoring lower than those speaking another European language.

However, the authors note that there may be covariance between factors, such as educational level of the parents. That is, only 4% of the Dutch participants' parents reported a low educational background (both parents finished primary school and/or preparatory secondary vocational education [vmbo]). In contrast, for students speaking another European language at home this was reported by 9% of the parents, and for those speaking a non-European home language this was 21% (Gubbels, et al., 2019).

Educational background of parents is often used as an indicator of SES. However, other markers have also been used, such as markers of affluence or deprivation (De Cat, 2021). As pointed out by De Cat (2021, p. 303) "it appears SES interacts in complex ways with quantitative aspects of language exposure and with different aspects of language competence." Therefore, the way SES is operationalized has to be specified to the research question at hand. In this study, SES will be operationalized as the average educational background of both parents in each of their languages. That is, if educational background is used as an indicator of SES, this should be taken into account for each of a person's languages (e.g., someone graduated primary school in English, but university in Korean) as there may be a link between the educational level of a person in one of their languages and the language exposure they may provide in that language within the HLE of their child.

Indeed, a study by Hoff, Burridge, Ribot and Giguere (2018) found that the language in which the mother had received their higher education degree was associated with the language development of their child. The study included 92 English-Spanish bilingual children, who were followed between the ages of 2.5 and 5, and their mothers, whose L1 was Spanish and who had immigrated to the US on average about 12 years ago. Every six months, interviews were administered and children's language skills were assessed. The study found that educational background of the mother in each language was only related to the language skill of the child in that specific language. This thus suggests that maternal educational background may enhance

the language proficiency of the mother in which the education was received, which would in turn benefit the language proficiency of the child in that specific language.

In the case of multilingual families, at least one of the parents has usually been born in another country in which they may have been enrolled in education. For instance, if parents have a lower average SES in Dutch, but a higher average SES in the HL, this could mean that both parents moved to the Netherlands at a later age, after finishing education in their country of origin. In this case, parents might provide more literacy activities in the HL than in Dutch. If parents, on the other hand, have a higher average SES in Dutch and a lower SES in the HL, this could mean that both parents moved to the Netherlands at a younger age. So, parents might provide more literacy activities in Dutch than in the HL. If parents have a higher average SES in Dutch and a higher SES in the HL, this could mean that one of the parents was born in the Netherlands and the other was born in another country and both followed education in their respective countries, or they live in a country where both languages are official languages of the country. This could mean that the HLE would be more mixed in terms of language use in the HL or Dutch, but following Hoff et al. (2018) the language provided by each of the parents in the language in which they completed their education would benefit the proficiency of the child in that specific language. If parents have a lower average SES in Dutch and a lower SES in the HL, this could mean that one of the parents was born in the Netherlands and the other was born in another country, but neither has followed much education in their respective countries. Again, this could mean that the HLE would be more mixed in terms of language use in the HL or Dutch. It should however be noted that educational systems around the world differ a lot, which makes the variable of SES even more complex. However, taking into account the educational background of the parent in each of their languages draws at least a more complete picture of an individual's SES.

As the PISA study illustrates, it can thus be difficult to isolate the effects of SES from those of language background. Are adolescents scoring lower on Dutch reading proficiency assessments because of their bilingualism or because of their lower SES background? Or is it potentially a combination of both? In this study we do not aim to fully separate these effects, which is why no monolingual control group will be included within the study. The aim of the study is to describe the experiences of multilingual families with different socio-economic and language backgrounds to gain better insight in the differences in the HLE between different types of multilingual groups. In the following section we will elaborate on how we aim to study these differences.

### **2.3 How to study the HLE of multilingual adolescents?**

As previous research has already investigated the HLE for monolingual children and younger age groups, it would be interesting to see how these findings would extend to bilingual adolescents. Since adolescence can be perceived as a period for discovery and identity formation outside of the family home (Erikson, 1972), the heritage language could potentially lose some of its importance in the life of the child, depending on its use outside of the home. Given that this is also the period during which language proficiency will most likely be the most developed (Oh & Fuligni, 2010), examining this period of time could provide us with a good insight into the personal motivations underlying the HL use of the child, as lower language proficiency could potentially be ruled out as a cause for not using the language. Parents, on the other hand, may have very different beliefs and attitudes concerning HL use, which may conflict with those of the adolescent.

Furthermore, as questionnaires concerning the bilingual language experience of children have mostly been focused on younger children, they are therefore always administered to their parents (Unsworth, 2019). However, it may be relevant to also investigate this topic during adolescence, as the child's own perspective can also be included. On the one hand, self-report questionnaires can be an ideal way to measure constructs which would otherwise cost a lot more effort to assess. For language proficiency, for instance, self-report has found to be a relatively accurate measure. On the other hand, they can be quite controversial as well, for instance, due to social desirability biases or lack of knowledge on the measured construct by the participant (Unsworth, 2019). Indeed, parental questionnaires may be affected by socially desirable answers or inaccurate ratings of HL use within the home (Scheele et al., 2010). A study by Brown (2011), for instance, indicated that "a comparison of the parent interviews with those of their children revealed that what the parents said they did for their children's HL and what their children said actually happened at home were often quite different." (Brown, 2011, p. 35). The

current study will thus investigate the experiences of both parents and adolescents independently of one another.

When it comes to print exposure, self-report questionnaires have been found to be somewhat inaccurate as well, as parents who value book reading highly may overestimate how long they read to their children (DeBaryshe, 1995). Moreover, as mentioned in section 2.2, Erbeli et al. (2020) also indicated that their study would have been improved by including print exposure ratings by people from different contexts in the life of the child. Nevertheless, a study by Mol and Bus (2011) found self-report questionnaires about print exposure to be equally reliable to previously mentioned print exposure checklists (such as the ART) when the questionnaire included a larger number of questions related to the HLE. Moreover, the number of books available at home has also been found to be a more reliable and easier measure to study print exposure. An important limitation of the study by Mol and Bus (2011) was that children with low SES backgrounds were studied a lot less (in the youngest age group), because print exposure checklists were presumably not suitable enough for children with differing socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds. Additionally, they would not be able to account for print exposure in the L1, as the checklist would have to be adapted for that language. The current study will therefore operationalize print exposure by the number of books present in the home in each language.

Buvanewari and Padakannaya (2017), on the other hand, created an HLE questionnaire for Tamil-speaking kindergarten children of middle socio-economic status who were enrolled in English medium education in India. The questionnaire consisted of five categories and included specific items of previous questionnaires that were selected “based on their relevance to the five dimensions of home literacy environment” (Buvanewari & Padakannaya, 2017, p.7). The five dimensions were: the physical (literacy) environment, parent literacy habits, child literacy habits, parent-child interaction for language and literacy activities, and parental beliefs

(for their definitions, see Appendix B). Moreover, each questionnaire item was rated by a number of judges on a five-point Likert scale in order to establish content validity and internal consistency. The questionnaire could thus be viewed as a reliable tool for investigating multilingual children's HLE. In the methodology section, it will be explained how the questionnaire will be implemented within the current study.

The aim of our study thus is twofold. Firstly, we want to investigate how findings of previous research on the HLE regarding monolingual children and younger age groups would extend to bilingual adolescents. Secondly, following the studies by Brown (2011) and Erbeli et al. (2020) this study aims to improve validity by including reports from both the adolescent as well as the parent(s). In the following chapter our research question and hypotheses will be presented.

### 3. Research question and hypotheses

As discussed in the previous chapter, L1 print exposure, reading comprehension, and vocabulary, as well as metalinguistic awareness can collaboratively impact L2 reading comprehension. The HLE in this study is therefore defined as “the exposure to reading materials in each language within the home, both in offline and online contexts, and both parents’ and children’s own literacy habits”. Previous research indicated that SES can impact the HLE of multilingual families significantly. However, this was also partly language dependent. Furthermore, to be able to study the HLE in the most valid way both parents and adolescents will have to report on language and literacy activities within the home. The research question which thus arises is: to what extent does SES impact the Home Literacy Environment of adolescents from multilingual families within the Netherlands according to parents and adolescents?

We can hypothesize the following answers to this question as based on our literature review. Firstly, as was found in the studies by Scheele et al. (2010) and Kalia and Reese (2009), multilingual parents with a higher socio-economic background provide more or participate in longer home literacy activities with their children than multilingual parents with a lower socio-economic background. That is, Turkish-Dutch families who were higher in SES than the Moroccan-Dutch participants (on average) provided more home literacy activities than the Moroccan-Dutch participants. Moreover, Kalia and Reese (2009) found that higher educated mothers (which is a proxy for SES) read more often to their children than lower educated mothers.

Secondly, multilingual parents with a higher socio-economic background may distribute the language input for their children between the HL and Dutch differently than multilingual parents with a lower socio-economic background. Again, the study by Scheele et al. (2010) supports this hypothesis, as Moroccan-Dutch parents with a higher socio-economic background



provided more L2 Dutch input. This did, however, not apply to the Turkish-Dutch group, which would indicate that this may be language dependent as well. Moreover, socio-economic background did not appear to affect L1 input with the bilingual groups, indicating that this would stay the same for families with different SES backgrounds. The difference we hypothesize would thus be that multilingual families with a higher socio-economic background may provide more L2 input of Dutch than lower SES multilingual families, but this may be language dependent as well. That is, the lack of a formal written form of Tarifit-Berber could have also lead Moroccan-Dutch parents to resort to Dutch literacy materials (Scheele et al., 2010).

Lastly, self-reported home literacy activities of parents and children of multilingual families within the Netherlands will differ from parental reports of these activities. Following DeBaryshe (1995), parents who value book reading highly may (potentially subconsciously) overestimate the time spend on reading to their children. Therefore, self-report questionnaires for print exposure have found to be somewhat inaccurate. Moreover, a study by Brown (2011), found differences between self-reported home literacy activities between parents and their children.

## 4. Method

### 4.1 Respondents

Adolescents who were speakers of at least one HL next to Dutch and their parents/caretakers (of whom at least one was a native HL speaker) were recruited for the study. The adolescents were aged 11 to 19 years old at their moment of participation in the study. The languages that were spoken at the homes of the adolescents were Dutch (5), English (6), Spanish (2), Turkish (2), German, Bulgarian, Arabic, Hindi and Filipino. The languages that were spoken at the homes of the parents were Dutch (6), English (5), French (2), Arabic, Tigrinya, Bulgarian, Spanish, Ukrainian and Hindi. Participants have been recruited via the snowball sampling method, through social media (e.g., LinkedIn) and multilingual networks, such as multilingual primary and secondary schools (e.g., international schools). The data of our participants is presented in Table 1 down below. Note that only the adolescents are defined as ‘participant’ in this study, whereas both adolescents and parents are referred to as ‘respondents’, that is, since the parents mostly answered questions about their (adolescent) child.

Four of the parents that took part in the study were the parents of four adolescents that participated in the study. Both parent and adolescent filled out the questionnaire for participants 1, 2, 7 and 9 (P1, P2, P7 and P9). The data for participants 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10 and 11 (P3, P4, P5, P6, P8, P10 and P11) was only reported by the adolescent. The data for participant 12 until 17 (P12 - P17) was only reported by the parent. As socio-economic background was only measured via the parents, and most parents and adolescents who filled out the questionnaire did not belong to the same family, we only have this data for the adolescents of whom the parents completed the questionnaire. Two of the parents unfortunately only partly filled out the questionnaire, as well as one of the adolescents. We decided to still include these respondents, as some of their data was still useful for the research. Socio-economic background in the study was defined as

the educational background of each parent/caretaker in each of their languages. This could either be none (1), primary school (2), secondary school (3), secondary vocational education (4) or higher vocational education/university (5).

**Table 1**

*Background characteristics of the participants.*

<b>Participant number</b>	<b>Age</b>	<b>Language background of the adolescent</b>	<b>Educational background parent (SES)</b>
P1	11	Dutch, Hindi, English	<u>Caretaker 1:</u> Dutch = 1, Hindi = 3, English = 5 <u>Caretaker 2:</u> Dutch = 1, English = 5, Hindi = 5
P2	16	Dutch, English, Bulgarian, Spanish	<u>Caretaker:</u> Dutch = 1, Bulgarian = 5
P3	16	English, Dutch	No information
P4	15	Turkish, English, Dutch, German	No information
P5	15	English, Dutch, Turkish, Spanish	No information
P6	18	Dutch, English	No information
P7	19	English, Dutch	<u>Caretaker 1:</u> Dutch = 5, English = 5 <u>Caretaker 2:</u> Dutch = 2, English = 5
P8	16	Filipino, English, Spanish, Japanese	No information
P9	14	Dutch, Spanish	<u>Caretaker 1:</u> Dutch = 1, Spanish = 4 <u>Caretaker 2:</u> Dutch = 1, Spanish = 5
P10	16	Arabic, English, Dutch, Bosnian	No information

P11	16	English, Dutch, German, French	No information
P12	11	English, Dutch	<u>Caretaker 1:</u> Dutch = 1, English = 5 <u>Caretaker 2:</u> Dutch = 5, English = 1
P13	14	Arabic, English, Dutch	No information
P14	18	Tigrinya, Amarna, Dutch	No information
P15	16	French, Dutch, English	<u>Caretaker 1:</u> Dutch = 5, French = 5 <u>Caretaker 2:</u> Dutch = 5, French = 3
P16	16	French, Dutch, English, Latin	<u>Caretaker 1:</u> Dutch = 5, French = 5 <u>Caretaker 2:</u> Dutch = 4, French = 5
P17	16	Ukrainian, Russian, English, Dutch	<u>Caretaker 1:</u> Dutch = 1, Ukrainian = 5, English = 4 <u>Caretaker 2:</u> Dutch = 1, Ukrainian = 5, English = 3

## 4.2 Instruments

Two ‘Multilingual Home Literacy Environment’ questionnaires were created in Qualtrics (Qualtrics, 2022a). One was to be filled out by the adolescent, and one by one of the parents/caretakers. In this way, the home literacy and language use practices of both parent and child could be examined from both perspectives. The questionnaires were anonymized by means of a random ID with a number of 10 digits to minimize the chance of participants having the same ID (Qualtrics, 2022b). The parent and child were linked based on birth date and language background of the child, and if needed the age of the child coming to the Netherlands. After downloading the data, the random IDs of the parent and child would be linked so their personal information (birth date) could be deleted. The questionnaires were approved by the Ethics Assessment Committee Humanities of the Faculty of Arts of the Radboud University under research project code 2022-4596 (see Appendix A).

The questionnaires were based on the Quantifying Bilingual Experience questionnaire (Q-BEx; De Cat et al., 2021), the HLE questionnaire by Buvaneswari and Padakannaya (2017) and the Daily Communication Questionnaire by Mayo and Leseman (2006). As not all of the questions of the Q-Bex were relevant for this research, only a selection of categories was included, namely: questions regarding language proficiency (e.g., “How well does your child speak these languages for their age?”), richness of the linguistic experience (e.g., regarding language exposure and use), attitudes and satisfaction with the child’s language proficiency (e.g., “It is important to me that my child is able to write in this language.”) and SES (e.g., “Select your highest attained level of education in each of these languages.”). These factors were deemed relevant in order to see whether differences in multilingual literacy experiences between families with different SES could also be linked to different self-reported language proficiency levels between the languages. Moreover, the Q-BEx was also adaptable to children

and caregivers, which was the most relevant for this research, in order to be able to evaluate and compare the views of both parent and child.

Secondly, categories from the HLE questionnaire by Buvaneswari and Padakannaya (2017) were adapted to fit the adolescent population. As questions from both the HLE questionnaire by Buvaneswari and Padakannaya (2017) and the Daily Communication Questionnaire by Mayo and Leseman (2006) were suited to a much younger population, none of the questions themselves were taken from these questionnaires. Only the five dimensions of the HLE were used as a framework for our Home Literacy Environment variable. Regarding the physical (literacy) environment, questions were posed regarding the number of books within the home as a measure for print exposure in each language. Secondly, questions were asked regarding parent and child literacy habits (e.g., “How often do you read in these languages”), and parent-child interaction for language and literacy activities (e.g., “How often do you help your child with their homework via each of these languages?”). Thirdly, parental and adolescent’s beliefs were included in the questionnaire. Both parent and adolescent were asked to rate statements regarding their language attitudes and preferences on a scale from not important to very important (including a neutral and not applicable option). Parents were asked about their personal literacy beliefs for themselves (e.g., “It is important to me to be able to speak this language”) and their literacy beliefs for their children (e.g., “It is important to me to that my child is able to speak this language”). The adolescents also answered questions about personal literacy beliefs for themselves, as well as their parents’ literacy beliefs for them (e.g., “It is important to my parent/caretaker that I am able to speak this language”).

The questionnaires were piloted by 4 university students of whom 3 were raised in a multilingual environment (Dutch-Greek, Dutch-Spanish and Dutch-Pulaar) in order for the pilot to be the most realistic. They were asked to fill out the questionnaires with their language experiences at this age in mind. So for the parent questionnaire they were asked to pretend to

be their parents when they were 12-18 years old and still lived at home, and for the adolescent questionnaire they were asked to pretend they were between 12-18 years old again and still lived at home. They timed how long it took for them to fill out the questionnaires to be able to validate if the questionnaires were doable in the proposed time frame and they provided feedback on aspects they found unclear or did not understand. After this pilot, the duration was set to 10-15 minutes per questionnaire.

The parental questionnaire and the adolescent questionnaire had a similar structure built up of a number of blocks and only differ in a small number of ways (see Appendix C). The first block consisted of information about the research and ended with a question related to the age of the participants. Following this, the respondents gave their informed consent for participating in the research. After this, the questionnaire started out with ten background questions, including (limited) personal information about the adolescent and their language background. This block was followed by nine questions related to language use and exposure of the adolescent in their heritage language(s) and Dutch. After this, eight questions were presented on language proficiency of the adolescent in each of their languages. Then, followed 12 questions related to the Home Literacy Environment of the adolescent. Following this, nine questions regarding language attitudes and preferences were presented. Additionally, the parental questionnaire concluded with two questions about the educational background of the parents/caretakers. After this was a possibility for the respondent to leave a comment or question about the questionnaire and to leave their email address if they wanted to win a gift card. The parental questionnaire was a bit longer than the adolescent questionnaire, with 11 questions regarding language exposure and use and 17 questions for the Home Literacy Environment. Some of these questions were deemed too difficult and/or irrelevant to be answered by the child and were thus left out of the adolescent questionnaire.

### **4.3 Procedure**

To fill out the questionnaire, parents and adolescents could click on a link to open the questionnaire. When disregarding three extreme outliers, parents who completed the questionnaire would take on average 16 minutes to fill out the questionnaire, in contrast to adolescents who would take an average of 22 minutes. Whereas some of the parents received an e-mail from their child's school and most likely filled out the questionnaire at home, some of the adolescents were asked to fill out the questionnaire by their teacher during class. However, this was not the case for all the respondents. Parents and adolescents were instructed to fill out the questionnaire independently of one another, so they were not allowed to discuss their answers.

Lastly, a follow-up interview was performed by phone with two of the parents (of P9 and P17) to elaborate on some of the questions from the questionnaire, e.g., about social media use (see Appendix D and E). The interview that was conducted consisted of questions regarding the HLE of the participants and was adapted to the participant where needed. For the parent of P9, the questions were translated to Spanish and the answers were translated by a native Spanish speaker at a later moment. The interview for P17 was conducted in English. P9 had been living in the Netherlands since the age of 12. P17 had been living in the Netherlands from age 15. Both families had fled their countries of origin and had been living in the Netherlands ever since.



#### **4.4 Data processing and analysis**

As the study is questionnaire-based, the study is quantitative in nature. Our main variable categories were the following:

- Background variables: variables pertaining to the language background and home environment of the child
- Level of multilingualism: the language exposure, use, and proficiency in all languages spoken by the child
- SES: the average educational background of caregiver 1 and 2 (or just caregiver 1, in case there was only one) in either Dutch or their (other) Home Language(s)
- Home literacy environment: the exposure to reading materials in each language within the home, both in offline and online contexts, and both parents' and children's own literacy habits

Prior to analysing the data, Cronbach's Alpha analyses were performed to check the internal consistency of the variables within our questionnaire. These analyses included the data from all the 21 respondents about the 17 participants included in the study, except for the analyses over variables that were based on questions that were only answered by one of the groups. Furthermore, correlational analyses have been performed to investigate if there were any associations between our variables. These analyses included the data from the parents who completed the questionnaire for eight of our participants. Furthermore, Mann-Whitney U tests were performed to analyse the differences between the parental and adolescent reports of literacy activities within the home. These analyses included the data from all participants who answered these questions. The results from these analyses will be discussed in the following chapter. Prior to reading the results, is important to note that some of the variables ended up only being included in the Cronbach's Alpha analyses (as can be seen in Table 3), because they were deemed less relevant for answering our specific research questions. These variables were:

language use outside of the home, language proficiency in comparison to multilingual peers in the Netherlands, and adolescent beliefs.

**Table 2**

*Question numbers per variable.*

<b>Variable number</b>	<b>Question number (parental questionnaire)</b>	<b>Variables</b>
1	Q15_1, Q16_1, Q17_1, Q18_1, Q20_1	Dutch language use at home
2	Q15_2, Q16_2, Q17_2, Q18_2, Q20_2	Home language use at home
3	Q21_1, Q22_1, Q23_1	Dutch language use outside the home
4	Q21_2, Q22_2, Q23_2	Home language use outside the home
5	Q26_1, Q27_1, Q28_1, Q29_1	Dutch language proficiency
6	Q26_2, Q27_2, Q28_2, Q29_2	Home language proficiency
7	Q30_1, Q31_1, Q32_1, Q33_1	Dutch language proficiency in comparison to multilingual peers in the Netherlands
8	Q30_2, Q31_2, Q32_2, Q33_2)	Home language proficiency in comparison to multilingual peers in the Netherlands
9	Q35_1, Q36_1	Dutch print exposure (PE)
10	Q35_2, Q36_2	HL print exposure (PE)
11	Q37_1, Q38_1, Q39_1, Q40_1, Q41_1	Dutch Parent literacy habits (PL)
12	Q37_2, Q38_2, Q39_2, Q40_2, Q41_2	HL Parent literacy habits (PL)

13	Q42_1, Q43_1 Q44_1, Q45_1, Q46_1, Q47_1	Dutch Child literacy habits (CL)
14	Q42_2, Q43_2 Q44_2, Q45_2, Q46_2, Q47_2	HL Child literacy habits (CL)
15	Q48_1, Q49_1, Q50_1	Dutch Parent-Child Interaction for language and literacy activities (PCI)
16	Q48_2, Q49_2, Q50_2	HL Parent-Child Interaction for language and literacy activities (PCI)
17	Q51_1, Q52_1, Q53_1, Q54_1, Q55_1, Q56_1	Dutch Parental beliefs (PB)
18	Q51_2, Q52_2, Q53_2, Q54_2, Q55_2, Q56_2	HL Parental beliefs (PB)
19	Q43_1, Q44_1, Q45_1, Q46_1, Q47_1, Q48_1	Dutch Adolescent beliefs (AB)
20	Q43_2, Q44_2, Q45_2, Q46_2, Q47_2, Q48_2	HL Adolescent beliefs (AB)

## 5. Results

### 5.1 Questionnaire analysis

To establish the internal consistency of our data Cronbach's Alpha analyses were performed on our variables (see Table 3). If the variable consisted of questions that were answered by both groups, the answers of both parents and adolescents were taken together. In these cases, we assumed that internal consistency would apply independently of whether the question was answered by a parent or an adolescent. All questions which were answered by only a small number of participants were not included in the analysis. This was the case if the participant, for instance, had more than two siblings or spoke more than two languages. This process was applied to all the following analyses.

The first two variables were Dutch and HL use at home (Q15-20 of the parental questionnaire, see Appendix C). The questions had an ordinal scale with five levels ranging from (almost) never (1) to (almost) always (5). The raw alpha that was found for both Dutch and HL use at home was 0.93, so the internal consistency of these variables was excellent. Variables three and four were Dutch and HL use outside of the home (Q21-23 of the parental questionnaire, see Appendix C). The questions had an ordinal scale with five levels ranging from (almost) never (1) to (almost) always (5). The raw alpha that was found for Dutch language use outside of the home was 0.94 and for HL use outside of the home it was 0.8, so the internal consistency of these variables was excellent and good, respectively.

Variables five until eight were Dutch and Home language proficiency (Q26-33 of the parental questionnaire, see Appendix C). This was both answered in relation to the adolescent's age (v5 and v6) and in comparison to multilingual peers of the same age (v7 and v8). The questions had an ordinal scale with four levels ranging from not well (1) to very well (4). The

raw alpha that was found for Dutch language proficiency (v5) was 0.92 and for HL proficiency (v6) it was 0.84, so the internal consistency of these variables was excellent and good, respectively. The raw alpha that was found for Dutch language proficiency (v7) was 0.95 and for HL proficiency (v8) it was 0.86, so the internal consistency of these variables was excellent and good, respectively.

Variables nine and ten are Dutch and HL print exposure as part of the Physical (literacy) Environment (PE) (Q34-36 of the parental questionnaire, see Appendix C). The questions had an ordinal scale with five levels ranging from none (1) to more than 100 (5). The raw alpha that was found for Dutch print exposure was 0.85 and for HL print exposure it was 0.93, so the internal consistency of these variables was good and excellent, respectively.

Variables 11 and 12 are Dutch and HL parental literacy habits (PL) (Q37-41 of the parental questionnaire, see Appendix C). The questions had an ordinal scale with five levels ranging from (almost) never (1) to every day (5). They were only answered by the parents. The raw alpha that was found for Dutch parental literacy habits was 0.87 and for HL parent literacy habits it was 0.75, so the internal consistency of these variables was good and acceptable, respectively. Variables 13 and 14 are Dutch and HL child literacy habits (Q42-47 of the parental questionnaire, see Appendix C). The questions had an ordinal scale with five levels ranging from (almost) never (1) to every day (5). The raw alpha that was found for Dutch child literacy habits was 0.85 and for HL child literacy habits it was 0.76, so the internal consistency of these variables was good and acceptable, respectively.

Variables 15 and 16 are Dutch and HL parent-child interaction for language and literacy activities (PCI) (Q48-50 of the parental questionnaire, see Appendix C). The questions had an ordinal scale with five levels ranging from (almost) never (1) to every day (5). The raw alpha

that was found for Dutch PCI was 0.82 and for the HL PCI it was 0.48, so the internal consistency of the variables was good and unacceptable, respectively.

Variables 17 and 18 are Dutch and HL parental beliefs (Q51-56 of the parental questionnaire, see Appendix C). They only included answers by the parents. The questions had an ordinal scale with four levels ranging from not important (1) to very important (4) and 0 for no opinion. The raw alpha that was found for Dutch parental beliefs was 0.84 and for HL parental beliefs it was 1, so the internal consistency of the variables was good and excellent respectively. Variables 19 and 20 are Dutch and HL adolescent beliefs (Q43-48 of the adolescent questionnaire, see Appendix C). They only included answers by the adolescents. The questions had an ordinal scale with four levels ranging from not important (1) to very important (4) and 0 for no opinion. The raw alpha that was found for Dutch adolescent beliefs was 0.63 and for HL adolescent beliefs it was 0.96, so the internal consistency of the variables was questionable and excellent, respectively.

**Table 3**

*Raw alpha and related hypotheses per variable.*

<b>Variable number</b>	<b>Variables</b>	<b>Raw alpha</b>	<b>Hypothesis</b>
1	Dutch language use at home	0.93	H2, H3
2	Home language use at home	0.93	H2, H3
3	Dutch language use outside the home	0.94	Not included
4	Home language use outside the home	0.80	Not included
5	Dutch language proficiency	0.92	H2

6	Home language proficiency	0.84	H2
7	Dutch language proficiency in comparison to multilingual peers in the Netherlands	0.95	Not included
8	Home language proficiency in comparison to multilingual peers in the Netherlands	0.86	Not included
9	Dutch print exposure (PE)	0.85	H1, H3
10	HL print exposure (PE)	0.93	H1, H3
11	Dutch Parent literacy habits (PL)	0.87	H1, H2
12	HL Parent literacy habits (PL)	0.75	H1, H2
13	Dutch Child literacy habits (CL)	0.85	H1, H3
14	HL Child literacy habits (CL)	0.76	H1, H3
15	Dutch Parent-Child Interaction for language and literacy activities (PCI)	0.82	H1, H3
16	HL Parent-Child Interaction for language and literacy activities (PCI)	0.48	H1, H3
17	Dutch Parental beliefs (PB)	0.82	H2
18	HL Parental beliefs (PB)	1	H2
19	Dutch Adolescent beliefs (AB)	0.63	Not included
20	HL Adolescent beliefs (AB)	0.96	Not included

## 5.2 Spearman Rank correlations and Mann-Whitney U tests

As our sample sizes for both groups were quite small, no normality test could be performed, since these are sensitive to sample size and normality would be assumed quite easily. Therefore, non-parametric tests were performed for all the following analyses. Our results should thus be interpreted carefully.

*H1: Multilingual parents with a higher socio-economic background will provide more or participate in longer home literacy activities with their children than multilingual parents with a lower socio-economic background.*

If we look at our first hypothesis, we expected that higher SES would be associated with the provision of more and/or longer home literacy activities. As all our participants had at least one caregiver with a higher educational background in either one of their languages (see Table 1), it was not possible to use this data for our analyses. Therefore, the average educational background of caregiver 1 and 2 (or just caregiver 1, in case there was only one) in either Dutch or their (other) Home Language(s) was used as a proxy for SES. As our data was ordinal in nature and SES was only reported by the parents, Spearman's rank correlations were performed on the data from the parents who completed the questionnaire for eight of our participants. The data from parents who did not complete the full questionnaire were not included in the analyses, as the questions about SES were at the end of the questionnaire.

Firstly, a Spearman's rank correlation was computed to assess the relationship between SES and print exposure in both languages. There was a significant positive correlation between SES in Dutch and print exposure in the HL,  $r(6) = .73, p = .040$ . So, a higher average educational background of both parents in Dutch was associated with more print exposure for the child in the HL as reported by the parents. The relationship between SES in Dutch and print exposure in Dutch was, however, not significant,  $r(6) = .07, p = .875$ . Moreover, the relationship between



SES in the HL and print exposure in Dutch was not significant either,  $r(6) = -.18, p = .669$ , as well as the relationship between SES in the HL and print exposure in the HL,  $r(6) = -.01, p = .988$ .

Secondly, a Spearman's rank correlation was computed to assess the relationship between SES and parent literacy habits (PL) in both languages. There was no significant correlation between the SES in Dutch and parent literacy habits in Dutch,  $r(6) = -.22, p = .595$ ; between the SES in Dutch and parent literacy habits in the HL,  $r(6) = .30, p = .471$ ; between the SES in the HL and parent literacy habits in the HL,  $r(6) = -.66, p = .074$ ; and neither between the SES in the HL and parent literacy habits in Dutch,  $r(6) = .43, p = .285$ .

Thirdly, a Spearman's rank correlation was computed to assess the relationship between SES and child literacy habits (CL) in both languages. There was a significant negative correlation between SES in Dutch and child literacy habits in Dutch,  $r(6) = -.77, p = .027$ . So, a higher average educational background of both parents in Dutch was associated with a lower frequency of child literacy habits in Dutch as reported by the parents. Moreover, there was no significant correlation between SES in Dutch and child literacy habits in the HL,  $r(6) = .42, p = .302$ ; between SES in the HL and child literacy habits in Dutch,  $r(6) = -.05, p = .908$ ; and between SES in the HL and child literacy habits in the HL,  $r(6) = -.27, p = .518$ .

Lastly, a Spearman's rank correlation was computed to assess the relationship between SES and parent-child interaction (PCI) for both languages. There was no significant correlation between SES in Dutch and PCI in Dutch,  $r(6) = -.13, p = .762$ ; between SES in Dutch and PCI in the HL,  $r(6) = -.47, p = .238$ ; between SES in the HL and PCI in the HL,  $r(6) = -.69, p = .061$ ; and neither between SES in the HL and PCI in Dutch,  $r(6) = -.08, p = .849$ .

*H2: Multilingual families with a higher socio-economic background may provide more L2 input of Dutch than lower SES multilingual families, but this may be language dependent as well.*

For our second hypothesis, we expected that multilingual families with a higher SES provided more L2 input of Dutch than lower SES multilingual families, but this could be language dependent as well. Again, only the data was used from the parents who completed the questionnaire for eight of our participants, since we had SES data for only these participants. A Spearman's rank correlation was computed to assess the relationship between SES and language use at home. There was no significant correlation between SES in Dutch and Dutch language use at home,  $r(6) = .44, p = .272$ ; between SES in Dutch and HL use at home,  $r(6) = -.08, p = .854$ ; between SES in the HL and Dutch language use at home,  $r(6) = .04, p = .919$ ; and neither between SES in the HL and HL use at home,  $r(6) = -.50, p = .204$ . Moreover, the sample size of the parents is too low to examine whether this would indeed be language dependent.

As L2 input would be very much dependent on the language proficiency of the adolescent and the parents, this would be important to take into account as well. The language proficiency of the adolescents was reported by almost all the respondents, therefore all these respondents were included in the analysis. A Spearman's rank correlation was computed to assess the relationship between language proficiency of the adolescent and language use at home. There was a significant negative correlation between HL proficiency and Dutch language use at home,  $r(18) = -.66, p = .001$ . A better HL proficiency by the adolescent was thus associated with less Dutch use in the home as reported by both parents and adolescents. There was no significant correlation between Dutch language proficiency and Dutch language use at home,  $r(18) = .20, p = .392$ ; between Dutch language proficiency and HL use at home,  $r(18) = -.19, p = .413$ ; and neither between HL proficiency and HL use at home,  $r(18) = .39, p = .091$ .

Although language proficiency was not reported for the parents, the literacy habits of the parents were reported. Again, only the data was used from the parents who completed the questionnaire for eight of our participants, since we only had this data for these participants. A Spearman's rank correlation was computed to assess the relationship between parent literacy habits and language use at home. There was no significant correlation between parent literacy habits in Dutch and HL use at home,  $r(6) = .49, p = .217$ ; between parent literacy habits in Dutch and Dutch use at home,  $r(6) = .15, p = .720$ ; between parent literacy habits in the HL and HL use at home,  $r(6) = .21, p = .620$ ; and neither between parent literacy habits in the HL and Dutch use at home,  $r(6) = .41, p = .310$ .

Moreover, parental beliefs could also impact the use of Dutch in the home. Again, only the data was used from the parents who completed the questionnaire for eight of our participants, since we only had this data for these participants. A Spearman's rank correlation was computed to assess the relationship between parental beliefs and language use at home. There was no significant correlation between parental beliefs about Dutch and HL use at home,  $r(6) = .30, p = .469$ ; between parental beliefs about Dutch and Dutch use at home,  $r(6) = -.01, p = .988$ ; between parental beliefs about the HL and HL use at home,  $r(6) = -.42, p = .297$ ; and neither between parental beliefs about the HL and Dutch use at home,  $r(6) = .42, p = .304$ .

*H3: Self-reported home literacy activities of parents and children of multilingual families within the Netherlands will differ from parental reports of these activities.*

For our third hypothesis, we expected that reports of home literacy activities by parents would differ from children's reports of these activities. For the following analyses, all participants who answered these questions were included in the analyses. As our data is ordinal in nature a Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to determine whether there was a difference between print exposure in both languages as reported by the parents and the adolescents, respectively. The results indicate a non-significant difference between print exposure in the HL as reported by parents and print exposure in the HL as reported by adolescents,  $W = 28$ ,  $p = .301$ . Furthermore, the results indicate a non-significant difference between print exposure in Dutch as reported by parents and print exposure in Dutch as reported by adolescents,  $W = 286$ ,  $p = .195$ . Thus, no significant differences were found between the adolescent and parent reports regarding print exposure in the HL and Dutch, respectively.

Moreover, a Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to determine whether there was a difference between parent-child interaction (PCI) as reported by parents and PCI as reported by adolescents. The results indicate a non-significant difference between PCI in the HL as reported by parents and PCI in the HL as reported by adolescents,  $W = 35$ ,  $p = .687$ . Furthermore, a Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to determine whether there was a difference between PCI in Dutch as reported by parents and PCI in Dutch as reported by adolescents. The results indicate a non-significant difference between PCI in Dutch as reported by parents and PCI in Dutch as reported by adolescents,  $W = 46.5$ ,  $p = .590$ . Thus, no significant differences were found between the adolescent and parent reports regarding PCI in the HL and Dutch, respectively.

Thirdly, a Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to determine whether there was a difference between child literacy habits (CL) as reported by parents and CL habits as reported

by adolescents. The results indicate a non-significant difference between CL habits in the HL as reported by parents and CL habits in the HL as reported by adolescents,  $W = 21$ ,  $p = .099$ . Furthermore, a Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to determine whether there was a difference between CL habits in Dutch as reported by parents and CL habits in Dutch as reported by adolescents. The results indicate a non-significant difference between CL habits in Dutch as reported by parents and CL habits in Dutch as reported by adolescents,  $W = 47.5$ ,  $p = .531$ . Thus, no significant differences were found between the adolescent and parent reports regarding CL habits in the HL and Dutch, respectively.

Lastly, a Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to determine whether there was a difference between language use in the home as reported by parents and language use in the home as reported by adolescents. The results indicate a non-significant difference between HL use at home as reported by parents and HL use at home as reported by adolescents,  $W = 45$ ,  $p = .965$ . Furthermore, a Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to determine whether there was a difference between Dutch use at home as reported by parents and Dutch use at home as reported by adolescents. The results indicate a non-significant difference between Dutch use at home as reported by parents and Dutch use at home as reported by adolescents,  $W = 43$ ,  $p = .415$ . Thus, no significant differences were found between the adolescent and parent reports regarding language use at home in the HL and Dutch, respectively.

### 5.3 Summary of results

In summary, a significant positive correlation was found between SES in Dutch and print exposure in the HL,  $r(6) = .73, p = .040$ . So, a higher average educational background of both parents in Dutch was associated with more print exposure for the child in the HL as reported by the parents. Moreover, a significant negative correlation was found between SES in Dutch and child literacy habits (CL) in Dutch,  $r(6) = -.77, p = .027$ . So, a higher average educational background of both parents in Dutch was associated with a lower frequency of child literacy habits in Dutch as reported by the parents. Lastly, a significant negative correlation was found between HL proficiency and Dutch language use at home,  $r(18) = -.66, p = .001$ . A better HL proficiency by the adolescent was thus associated with less Dutch use in the home as reported by both parents and adolescents. In the following chapter, the implications of these results will be discussed regarding the previously reviewed literature and the interviews that were conducted with some of the respondents.

## 6. Discussion

The research question which has been discussed in this thesis was: to what extent does SES impact the Home Literacy Environment of adolescents from multilingual families within the Netherlands? To answer this question two HLE questionnaires were constructed in Qualtrics (Qualtrics, 2022a) and distributed digitally to multilingual parents and adolescents. As our sample size was quite small, no strong conclusions can be drawn based on our data. Nevertheless, we will discuss the outcomes of our analyses in the light of the reviewed literature as well as the interviews that were performed to investigate suggestions for follow-up research. The interviews should be viewed as extra information to support our questionnaire results and should not be interpreted as separate results as they were not systematically analysed (due to their small sample size).

### 6.1 Hypothesis 1

*Multilingual parents with a higher socio-economic background will provide more or participate in longer home literacy activities with their children than multilingual parents with a lower socio-economic background.*

Firstly, a significant positive correlation was found between SES in Dutch and print exposure in the HL. So, a higher average educational background of both parents in Dutch was associated with more print exposure for the child in the HL as reported by the parents. This result partly supports our hypothesis regarding more home literacy activities, as print exposure was defined by the amount of books that were present in the home in either language which were appropriate for the child and the parent(s) respectively, and more books written in the HL were thus present when parents had a higher average SES in Dutch. On the other hand, this was not the case for the number of Dutch books that were present in the home, or for parents with a

higher average SES in the HL. As a higher average educational background of both parents in Dutch could mean that either 1) one of the parents is Dutch; 2) both parents have moved to the Netherlands at a younger age; or 3) both parents are Flemish, these results could be interpreted in different ways. For the first instance, it could be that the non-Dutch parent may read more than the Dutch parent and therefore owns more books in the HL and provides them for their child as well. For the second instance, this could mean that both parents prefer to read in their HL and therefore also provide books in the HL to their child. For the third instance, the parents may prefer to read in French rather than Flemish and therefore read in French and provide French books for their child as well. In all these cases, it could be that the adolescent themselves also prefers to read in the HL and therefore owns more books in the HL. Still, this is of course highly speculative. Moreover, the question arises why a higher average educational background of both parents in the HL was not associated with more print exposure for the child in the HL as reported by the parents. It could be that the HL does not provide options for print exposure due to it being an oral language, as in the case of Tarifit-Berber (Scheele et al., 2010), or that books in the HL are less accessible in the Netherlands.

Secondly, a significant negative correlation was found between SES in Dutch and child literacy habits (CL) in Dutch. So, a higher average educational background of both parents in Dutch was associated with a lower frequency of child literacy habits in Dutch as reported by the parents. This result only partly undermines our hypothesis, as the variable child literacy habits mostly consisted of the habits as performed by the adolescent itself (e.g., reading, writing, doing homework, and doing multi-media activities) and it is only related to the child literacy habits in Dutch. Parents could have still provided the home literacy activities in Dutch, but the adolescent may have decided not to participate. Moreover, this result did not appear for parents with a higher average SES in the HL and for CL in the HL. A higher average educational background of both parents in the HL was not associated with the frequency of child literacy



habits in Dutch or the HL as reported by the parents, which could also be explained by the nature of the CL variable as explained before. Moreover, a higher average educational background of both parents in the HL would also not be associated with the frequency of child literacy habits in Dutch, as this would indicate a lower average educational background of both parents in Dutch and thus a language barrier to provide any CL in Dutch to the adolescent. Furthermore, we would expect that parents with a higher average educational background of both parents in the HL would provide more CL in the HL, but this could also be more limited by external factors, as e.g., homework would mostly be in Dutch.

Thus, higher SES (in Dutch) was associated with more print exposure (in the HL) in multilingual families. This is in line with the results from Scheele et al. (2010) (with regard to younger children), who found that Turkish-Dutch families who were higher in SES than the Moroccan-Dutch participants (on average) provided more home literacy activities than the Moroccan-Dutch participants. It is, however, important to note that the SES-effect was only found for Dutch. This appears to be inconsistent with results from Hoff et al. (2018) who found that SES in a specific language is related to language use in that specific language. In contrast, the current study found that SES in a specific language can transfer to more print exposure in another language. The question arises to what extent this difference can be attributed to the current sample. Whereas Hoff et al. (2018) studied a very specific sample regarding language background, which was also large in size, the current sample was small and was very diverse with regard to language backgrounds. So, the HLE context would differ a lot between the families in the current study. Nonetheless, an SES-effect was found, which underlines the importance of this factor. The fact that the effect was only found for Dutch is more difficult to explain and will thus require more research.

## 6.2 Hypothesis 2

*Multilingual families with a higher socio-economic background may provide more L2 input of Dutch than lower SES multilingual families, but this may be language dependent as well.*

No significant correlations were found between SES and language use at home. On the other hand, as mentioned previously, many factors may affect the language input provided in the home by the parents, such as language proficiency of the adolescent. A significant negative correlation was found between HL proficiency and Dutch language use at home. A better HL proficiency by the adolescent was thus associated with less Dutch use in the home. Moreover, there was no significant correlation between Dutch language proficiency and HL use at home, so Dutch proficiency was not associated with HL use in the home. Although we cannot conclude how this would differ for specific languages, the data does suggest that if the adolescent has a higher HL proficiency, less Dutch would be spoken in the home. Moreover, the Dutch language proficiency of the adolescent does not appear to be related to the amount of HL spoken at home.

These outcomes make sense, because when less Dutch is spoken in the home, the HL would naturally be spoken more, which could in turn improve HL proficiency. Moreover, it would make sense for families with parents who have a lower Dutch proficiency, such as refugees who came to the Netherlands at a later age. That is, if parents are not very proficient in Dutch, the parent and adolescent would most likely use the HL to converse, leading to less Dutch being used in the home. If the adolescent, on the other hand, is more proficient in Dutch, this would not change the situation regarding the HL spoken in the home, since the parents would still not be able to speak Dutch and the HL would still be used as the main language of communication. The same was indeed stated by the refugees that were interviewed for this thesis:

“We mostly talk Spanish in the asylum, here there are many people that come from the war. There are many Syrians, Afghans, Iraqis, so their language is different from ours. There is only one other family that speaks Spanish. So we mainly talk Spanish with them, but apart from that not much. I work every morning, I just finished, and my bosses are Dutch, so they talk to me in Dutch, which I don’t know much, I’m not going to lie. My kids yes, we go to the doctor’s, my kids understand Dutch, good, good. They translate it for me, ‘Dad, he is saying this, he is saying that’. We practice Spanish only here in the apartment.” – parent of P9.

“Sometimes when we go to the market my daughter tries to use Dutch, because for me I can sometimes understand when they say something, but it is hard to say something for me, I just know like just some words, like ‘Ik wil het’.” [Researcher: ‘So she can help you a bit?'] ‘Yeah, but if they tell something more I need to change to English, because my Dutch is very limited, but at least I try to speak some Dutch. And if I can’t understand it, I use Google translate and try to at least remember some important words.” – parent of P17

Moreover, these results may also support current trends that were observed regarding Dutch reading proficiency levels among adolescents. As previously discussed, the average reading proficiency of 15-year-old students in the Netherlands decreased significantly between 2015 and 2018. Students with Dutch as their L1 scored significantly higher than students who spoke another language at home, with students speaking a non-European language at home scoring lower than those speaking another European language (Gubbels et al., 2019). Although the HL proficiency level of these students was not assessed, it could be assumed that if these students are reported to speak another language at home, their HL proficiency would be good enough to converse with their parents in their HL and less Dutch might be used in the home. Consequently, Dutch reading proficiency levels may lag behind those of their monolingual peers. However, this would also be very much dependent on the language proficiency levels of the parents in all their languages.

### **6.3 Hypothesis 3**

*Self-reported home literacy activities of parents and children of multilingual families within the Netherlands will differ from parental reports of these activities.*

No significant differences were found between the parent and adolescent reports regarding print exposure, parent-child interaction, and child literacy habits within the home. As discussed previously, DeBaryshe (1995) found that parents who value book reading highly may overestimate the time spend on reading to their children. Moreover, a study by Brown (2011), found differences between self-reported home literacy activities between parents and their children. These differences were not found within the current study, which may have multiple causes. For instance, the study by DeBaryshe (1995) was focused on parents reading to their children, whereas within this study reading to children and reading alone (by the adolescent) were included within the same question. These constructs could thus not be analysed separately.

Additionally, no significant differences were found between the parent and adolescent reports regarding HL (or Dutch) use in the home. Ratings of HL use within the home may thus actually be quite accurate, as adolescents and parents were more or less aligned in their reports. This contrasts with Scheele et al. (2010), who argued that parental questionnaires may be negatively affected by socially desirable answers or inaccurate ratings of heritage language use within the home. Although adolescents may also provide inaccurate ratings of HL use within the home, it would be still more logical to assume that if two parties provide similar reports, that this would be more accurate than if only one party reported it. As was stated by Erbeli et al. (2020), the best way to gather information (regarding print exposure) would be “from multiple informants across different contexts (e.g., parents and teachers)” (Erbeli et al., 2020, p.1559) rather than just by adolescents, which could also be applied to reports of language use within the home. For future research, it might thus be useful to include a questionnaire for teachers or neighbours to be able to provide perspectives from multiple contexts. As the current

study was also limited by a number of methodological issues, these will be discussed in the following chapter, as well as potential solutions.

## **7. Limitations and future directions**

Firstly, an issue with the questionnaire itself was that the information about socio-economic background was only asked to the parents. Although this made sense at the time of creating the questionnaire, in practice this was problematic since not all the parents of every adolescent filled out the questionnaire. The latter was also problematic regarding informed consent, as some of the adolescents who filled out the questionnaire could not give informed consent because of their age. Moreover, the educational background of the students themselves was not collected. For future research, it would thus be necessary to either gather SES data from both parents and adolescents or to only target the parents and make sure they let their child fill out the other questionnaire, since this may be more reliable than the other way around. The previous issues also relate to recent research about the diverse ways of operationalization and the factors involved within SES-research (De Cat, 2021). It is hard to conclude whether our results are in line with the previously discussed literature, since SES was studied in a different way. In future research, the interaction of SES with other HLE-related variables should thus be studied more extensively.

Secondly, some of the variables that were included in the questionnaire ended up not being used in the analyses due to time constraints of the study. For future research it may be relevant to also include the language use of the adolescents outside of the home (e.g., with peers) in order to investigate how this would impact the L2 input provided by the parents within the home. Moreover, adolescent literacy beliefs may influence the time adolescents spend on home literacy activities. Additionally, the language proficiency of the parents would also need to be reported.

Thirdly, the response rates for the questionnaires (and interviews) were low, but there may be several causes for this issue. Whereas some people might have just clicked on the

questionnaire out of curiosity rather than being part of the target group, it may have also been the case that the threshold to participate was too high. That is, since there was a lot of information at the start of the questionnaire as well as an informed consent procedure, people may have clicked away. Especially for people with lower socio-economic backgrounds or low Dutch or English proficiency, this may have been too big of an obstacle to participate in the research. Although we tried to follow the ‘Factsheet Simple language for low-literates’ from the Dutch foundation for Reading and Writing (e.g., putting each sentence on a new line) (Stichting Lezen en Schrijven, 2021), it was difficult to formulate some of the information in a less complicated manner. It would thus be important for future research to investigate how the questionnaire can be made more accessible to this group of people. A trade-off would need to be made between providing the information in the best way possible and making it succinct enough to be able to keep people’s attention for the entirety of the questionnaire. Regarding the interviews, these could only be performed with respondents of the questionnaire who were willing to leave their email address. Therefore, only a limited number of people could be contacted to do a follow-up interview.

Lastly, our sample was quite small and included a variety of language backgrounds. Although this can make the interpretation of our results more complex, it is important to do research with diverse types of multilingual families. That is, most research is still done with Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich and Democratic (WEIRD) people (Arnett, 2008), so a lot of information of ‘non-WEIRD’ people remains unknown. For this study specifically, we have been able to reach non-Western populations, but still mostly highly educated people. The HLE of lower educated families still needs to be investigated in future research to gain better insight into the potential of these adolescents. That is, as mentioned previously, the emergent literacy outcomes from children with a lower SES background already appear to be lower than those of children with higher SES backgrounds from a very early age on (Korat & Haglili,

2007). So, for Dutch reading proficiency levels to improve in adolescents within the Netherlands, not only reading outcomes, but the HLE of the student would need to be monitored longitudinally from preschool onwards as well. Moreover, future research could also help to indicate how useful HLE questionnaires could be for adolescents.



## 8. Conclusion

In conclusion, the current study aimed to shed light on the importance of doing research with populations which are less easily accessible. The goal of this study was to examine the role of SES within the Home Literacy Environment of adolescents from multilingual families and to investigate this from both the perspective of the adolescent as well as the parent(s). We found that a higher average educational background of both parents in Dutch was associated with more print exposure for the child in the HL as reported by the parents. This result was not found when both parents had a higher average educational background in the HL and for print exposure in Dutch. Moreover, a higher average educational background of both parents in Dutch was associated with a lower frequency of child literacy habits in Dutch as reported by the parents. This result was not found when both parents had a higher average educational background in the HL and for child literacy habits in the HL. Lastly, a better HL proficiency by the adolescent was associated with less Dutch use in the home as reported by both parents and adolescents. This result was not found for Dutch language proficiency and HL use at home.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the current sample was small and very diverse in terms of language backgrounds. So, the HLE context would differ a lot between these families. In future research, it would be important to study a larger sample so that different language groups can be studied independently from one another in order to be able to separate SES effects from language effects. Moreover, this type of research would have more language-dependent implications, which could provide more insight into the language-specific HLE contexts of these families and thus provide opportunities for policies to tackle the lower Dutch reading proficiency for multilingual adolescents within the Netherlands.

## References

- Arnett, J. J. (2008). The neglected 95%: Why American psychology needs to become less American. *American Psychologist*, 63(7), 602–614. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.7.602>
- Arriagada, P. A. (2005). Family context and Spanish-language use: A study of Latino children in the United States. *Social Science Quarterly*, 86(3), 599-619. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0038-4941.2005.00320.x>
- Bradley, R. H., & Caldwell, B. M. (1984). The HOME inventory and family demographics. *Developmental Psychology*, 20(2), 315–320. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.20.2.315>
- Brown, C. L. (2011). Maintaining Heritage Language: Perspectives of Korean Parents. *Multicultural Education*, 19(1), 31-37. Retrieved from: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ986889>
- Buvaneswari, B., Padakannaya, P. (2017). Development of a home literacy environment questionnaire for Tamil-speaking kindergarten children. *Lang Test Asia*, 7(14). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-017-0047-y>
- Cho, G. (2015). Perspectives vs. Reality of Heritage Language Development: Voices from Second-Generation Korean-American High School Students. *Multicultural Education*, 22(2), 30-38. Retrieved from: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1065385>
- Cito B.V. (2014). *Begrijpend lezen 3.0 voor groep 4* [Reading Comprehension 3.0 for second grade]. Arnhem, the Netherlands: Cito B.V.
- Clay, M. M. (1979). *The early detection of reading difficulties: A diagnostic survey with recovery procedures*. Exeter, NH: Heinemann Educational Books.

- Cruickshank, K. (2004). Literacy in Multilingual Contexts: Change in Teenagers' Reading and Writing, *Language and Education*, 18(6), 459-473. DOI: 10.1080/09500780408666895
- DeBaryshe, B. D. (1995). Maternal belief systems: Linchpin in the home reading process. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* 16(1), 1–20. doi:10.1016/0193-3973(95)90013-6
- De Cat, C. (2021). Socioeconomic status as a proxy for input quality in bilingual children? *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 42(2), 301-324.
- De Cat, C., Kaščelan, D., Prévost, P., Serratrice, L., Tuller, L., & Unsworth, S. (2021). *Quantifying Bilingual EXperience (Q-BEx): questionnaire manual and documentation*. [DOI 10.17605/OSF.IO/GB9M7](https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/GB9M7)
- Dixon, L., & Wu, S. (2014). Home language and literacy practices among immigrant second-language learners. *Language Teaching*, 47(4), 414-449. [doi:10.1017/S0261444814000160](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444814000160)
- Dowdall, N., Melendez-Torres, G. J., Murray, L., Gardner, F., Hartford, L., & Cooper, P. J. (2020). Shared picture book reading interventions for child language development: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Child development*, 91(2), 383-399. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13225>
- Duarte, J. (2020). Translanguaging in the context of mainstream multilingual education. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 17(2), 232-247. DOI: [10.1080/14790718.2018.1512607](https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2018.1512607)
- Dunn, L. M., & Dunn, L. M. (1981). Manual for the peabody picture vocabulary test-revised. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.

- Dunn, L.M., Padilla, E.R., Lugo, D.E., & Dunn, L.M. (1986). Test de Vocabulario en Imágenes Peabody (TVIP) [Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test]. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.
- Dunn, L.M., & Dunn, L.M. (1997). Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test— Third edition. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.
- Dunn, D. M., & Dunn, L. M. (2007). Peabody picture vocabulary test, Fourth Edition, manual. Minneapolis, MN:NCS Pearson, Inc.
- Erbeli, F., Van Bergen, E., & Hart, S. A. (2020). Unraveling the relation between reading comprehension and print exposure. *Child development*, *91*(5), 1548-1562.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13339>
- Erikson, E. H. (1972). *Childhood and society*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books.
- Farver, J. A. M., Xu, Y., Lonigan, C. J., & Eppe, S. (2013). The home literacy environment and Latino head start children's emergent literacy skills. *Developmental Psychology*, *49*(4), 775. DOI: [10.1037/a0028766](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028766)
- Fenson, L., Pethick, S., Renda, C., Cox, J. L., Dale, P. S., & Reznick, J. S. (2000). Short-form versions of the MacArthur communicative development inventories. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, *21*(1), 95–116. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716400001053>
- Gardner, M. F. (1990). Expressive One-word picture vocabulary test, revised: EO-WPVT-R: Novato, California: Academic Therapy Publications.
- Gubbels, J., Van Langen, A. M. L., Maassen, N. A. M., & Meelissen, M. R. M. (2019). *Resultaten PISA-2018 in vogelvlucht*. Universiteit Twente.  
<https://doi.org/10.3990/1.9789036549226>

- Hart, B., & Risley, T. R. (1995). *Meaningful differences in the everyday experience of young American children*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.
- Hoff, E., Burrige, A., Ribot, K. M., & Giguere, D. (2018). Language specificity in the relation of maternal education to bilingual children's vocabulary growth. *Developmental Psychology*, *54*(6), 1011–1019. doi: 10.1037/dev0000492
- Hoff, E., Core, C., Place, S., Rumiche, R., Señor, M., & Parra, M. (2012). Dual language exposure and early bilingual development. *Journal of child language*, *39*(1), 1-27. doi:10.1017/S0305000910000759
- Joo, H. (2009). Literacy practices and heritage language maintenance: The case of Korean-American immigrant adolescents. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* *19*(1), 76–99. <https://doi.org/10.1075/japc.19.1.05joo>
- Kalia, V., & Reese, E. (2009). Relations between Indian children's home literacy environment and their English oral language and literacy skills. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, *13*(2), 122-145. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888430902769517>
- Korat, O. & Haglili, S. (2007). Maternal evaluations of children's emergent literacy level, maternal mediation in book reading, and children's emergent literacy level: A comparison between SES groups. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *39*(2), 249–276. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10862960701331993>
- Lee, S. K. (2002). The significance of language and cultural education on secondary achievement: A survey of Chinese-American and Korean-American students. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *26*(2), 327-338. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2002.10668714>

Leseman, P. P. M., Mayo, A. Y., & Scheele, A. F. (2009). Old and new media in the lives of young disadvantaged bilingual children. In Bus, A. G. & Neuman, S.

B. (Eds.), *Multimedia and literacy development* (pp. 135–155). New York: Routledge

Leseman, P. P. M., & Van den Boom, D. C. (1999). Effects of quantity and quality of home proximal processes on Dutch, Surinamese–Dutch and Turkish–Dutch pre-schoolers' cognitive development. *Infant and Child Development*, 8(1), 19–38.

[https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1522-7219\(199903\)8:1<19::AID-ICD187>3.0.CO;2-7](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1522-7219(199903)8:1<19::AID-ICD187>3.0.CO;2-7)

Linebarger, D. L., & Walker, D. (2004). Infants' and toddlers' television viewing and language outcomes. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 48(5), 624–645.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764204271505>

Lonigan, C. J., Burgess, S. R., Anthony, J. L. and Barker, T. A. (1998). Development of phonological sensitivity in 2- to 5-year-old children. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90(2), 294–311. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.90.2.294>

Lonigan, C. J., Farver, J. M., & Eppe, S. (2002). *Preschool Comprehensive Test of Phonological & Print Processing: Spanish version (P-CTOPPPS)*. Tallahassee, FL: Authors

Lonigan, C., Wagner, R., Torgesen, J., & Rashotte, C. (2002). *Preschool Comprehensive Test of Phonological & Print Processing*. Tallahassee, FL: Authors

Mayo, A. Y., & Leseman, P. P. M. (2006). *Dagelijkse Informele Educatie: Gezinsvragenlijst [Daily Informal Education: Family Questionnaire]*. Utrecht: Universiteit Utrecht: Langeveld Instituut.

- Mol, S. E., & Bus, A. G. (2011). To read or not to read: a meta-analysis of print exposure from infancy to early adulthood. *Psychological bulletin*, *137*(2), 267-296.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021890>
- Oh, J. S., & Fuligni, A. J. (2010). The role of heritage language development in the ethnic identity and family relationships of adolescents from immigrant backgrounds. *Social Development*, *19*(1), 202–220. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9507.2008.00530.x>
- Park, S. M. & Sarkar, M. (2007). Parents’ Attitudes Toward Heritage Language Maintenance for Their Children and Their Efforts to Help Their Children Maintain the Heritage Language: A Case Study of Korean-Canadian Immigrants. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *20*(3), 223-235. DOI: 10.2167/lcc337.0
- Qualtrics (2022a). Provo: Utah, USA.
- Qualtrics (2022b). Accessed 12<sup>th</sup> of April 2022. [<https://www.qualtrics.com/support/survey-platform/common-use-cases-rc/assigning-randomized-ids-to-respondents/>].
- Raven, J. C. (1995). *Coloured progressive matrices (CPM)*. Oxford: Oxford Psychologists.
- Raven, J.C. (1965). *Guide to using coloured progressive matrices, sets a, AB and B*. London, UK: BHK Levis &Co.
- Roberts, T. A. (2008). Home storybook reading in primary or second language with preschool children: Evidence of equal effectiveness for second-language vocabulary acquisition. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *43*(2), 103-130.  
<https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.43.2.1>

- Rossell, C., & Baker, K. (1996). The educational effectiveness of bilingual education. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 30(1), 7–74. Retrieved from:  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/40171543>
- Scheele, A., Leseman, P., & Mayo, A. (2010). The home language environment of monolingual and bilingual children and their language proficiency. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 31(1), 117-140. doi:10.1017/S0142716409990191
- Schön, D., Boyer, M., Moreno, S., Besson, M., Peretz, I., & Kolinsky, R. (2008). Songs as an aid for language acquisition. *Cognition*, 106(2), 975–983.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2007.03.005>
- Sénéchal, M., LeFevre, J., Hudson, E. and Lawson, P. (1996). Knowledge of storybooks as a predictor of young children's vocabulary. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 88(3), 520–536.
- Sparks, R. L., Patton, J., Ganschow, L., & Humbach, N. (2012). Do L1 reading achievement and L1 print exposure contribute to the prediction of L2 proficiency? *Language Learning*, 62(2), 473-505. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2012.00694.x>
- Stanovich, K. E., & Cunningham, A. E. (1993). Where does knowledge come from? Specific associations between print exposure and information acquisition. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 85(2), 211-229. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.85.2.211>
- Stichting Lezen en Schrijven. (2021, February). Factsheet Eenvoudige taal voor laaggeletterden [Factsheet Simple language for low-literates]. Retrieved from:  
<https://www.lezenenschrijven.nl/wat-doen-wij/oplossing-voor-je-vraagstuk/factsheet-eenvoudige-taal>



- Suarez, D. (2002). The paradox of linguistic hegemony and the maintenance of Spanish as a heritage language in the United States. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 23(6), 512-530. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434630208666483>
- Suarez, D. (2007). Second and third generation heritage language speakers: HL scholarship's relevance to the research needs and future directions of TESOL. *Heritage Language Journal*, 5(1), 27-49.
- Tannenbaum, M. and Howie, P. (2002) The association between language maintenance and family relations: Chinese immigrant children in Australia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 23(5), 408–424.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01434630208666477>
- Thorndike, R. L., Hagen, E. P., & Sattler, J. M. (1986). *Stanford–Binet Intelligence Scale (4th ed.)*. Itasca, IL: Riverside.
- Unsworth, S. (2019). Quantifying Language Experience in Heritage Language Development. In Schmid, M. S., & Köpke B. (Eds.), *The oxford handbook of language attrition* (Ser. Oxford handbooks in linguistics) (pp. 434–445). Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198793595.013.34
- Van den Bosch, L. J., Segers, E., & Verhoeven, L. (2020). First and second language vocabulary affect early second language reading comprehension development. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 43(3), 290-308. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9817.12304>
- Van Gelderen, A., Schoonen, R., Stoel, R., De Glopper, K., & Hulstijn, J. (2007). Development of adolescent reading comprehension in language 1 and language 2: A longitudinal analysis of constituent components. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(3), 477–491. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.99.3.477>

- Van Kruistum, C. J., Van Rooijen, M., Leseman, P. P. M., & De Haan, M. J. (2009). Adolescents' leisure time reading: Why the rich become richer and the poor become poorer. In *EARLI Conference*.
- Verhoeven, L. & Keuning, J. (2017). The nature of developmental dyslexia in a transparent orthography. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 22(1), 1–17.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2017.1317780>.
- Verhoeven, L., Keuning, J., Horsels, L., Van Boxtel, H. (2013). *Testinstrumentarium Taalontwikkelingsstoornissen T-TOS* [set of instruments developmental language disorders]. Arnhem, the Netherlands: Cito
- Verhoeven, L., Narrain, G., Extra, G., Konak, O. A., & Zerrouk, R. (1995). Diagnostische Toets Tweetaligheid (DTT) [Diagnostic Test of Bilingualism]. Arnhem, The Netherlands: Cito.
- Willard, J., Agache, A., Jäkel, J., Glück, C., & Leyendecker, B. (2015). Family factors predicting vocabulary in Turkish as a heritage language. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 36(4), 875-898. doi:10.1017/S0142716413000544
- Wright, J. C., Huston, A. C., Murphy, K. C., St. Peters, M., Pinon, M., Scantlin, R., Kotler, J. (2001). The relations of early television viewing to school readiness and vocabulary of children from low-income families: The early window project. *Child Development*, 72(5), 1347–1366. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.t01-1-00352>
- Zimmerman, I., Steiner, V., & Pond, R. (2002). *Preschool Language Scale* (4th ed.). San Antonio, TX: Psychological Corp.

Zipke, M. (2007). The role of metalinguistic awareness in the reading comprehension of sixth and seventh graders. *Reading Psychology*, 28(4), 375-396.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/02702710701260615>

# Appendix A: Ethical Permission

## Ethische Toetsingscommissie Geesteswetenschappen

Faculteit der Letteren en Faculteit der Filosofie, Theologie en Religiewetenschappen

Radboud Universiteit  
Faculteit der Letteren  
t.a.v. dr. G.J. Kootstra  
Erasmusplein 1  
6525 HT NIMEGEN

*Bezoekadres*  
Erasmusplein 1  
6525 HT Nijmegen

*Postadres*  
Postbus 9103  
6500 HD Nijmegen



*Datum*  
18 maart 2022

*Ons kenmerk*  
22U.004651

*Contactgegevens*  
T: (024) 361 58 14  
E: [etc-gw@ru.nl](mailto:etc-gw@ru.nl)

*Betreft*  
Toetsing onderzoeksproject 2022-4596

[www.ru.nl/etcgw](http://www.ru.nl/etcgw)

Geachte heer Kootstra,

Hierbij deel ik u mee dat de Ethische Toetsingscommissie Geesteswetenschappen van de Faculteit der Letteren en de Faculteit der Filosofie, Theologie en Religiewetenschappen (ETC-GW) uw aanmelding van het onderzoeksproject *SES and the Multilingual Home Literacy Environment* (dossiernummer 2022-4596) heeft behandeld en op 18 maart 2022 tot het volgende oordeel is gekomen:

De commissie geeft haar goedkeuring aan dit onderzoeksproject.  
Deze goedkeuring is geldig voor een periode van vijf jaar (van 18 maart 2022 tot 18 maart 2027).

Namens de commissie wens ik u veel succes met de uitvoering van het onderzoek. Ik maak u erop attent dat eventuele wijzigingen in het onderzoeksproject (op voor ETC-GW relevante punten) opnieuw door de ETC-GW getoetst dienen te worden.

Met vriendelijke groet,

ValidSigned door Marcel Becker  
op 18-03-2022

dr. M.J. Becker  
Voorzitter van de Ethische Toetsingscommissie Geesteswetenschappen  
Faculteit der Letteren en  
Faculteit der Filosofie, Theologie en Religiewetenschappen

## **Appendix B: Definitions of the HLE categories**

*Physical (literacy) environment (PE)*: It is defined as the availability of literary resources and space at home.

*Parent literacy habits (PL)*: It refers to the habits of parents related to reading and writing. The biggest influence on a child's reading is the parent's personal love for reading. A parent or caregiver who demonstrates the joy of reading has the biggest influence on a child's reading ability and lifelong interest in reading.

*Child literacy habits (CL)*: It refers to the duration of engagement and participation by the child during shared interactions between the parent and the child. It also refers to the child's engagement in a wide variety of home literacy activities such as reading, play based activities, pretend reading and writing activities.

*Parent-child interaction for language and literacy activities (PCI)*: It refers to the activities intended to foster adult-child interactions that encourage children's active participation in reading, writing and language activities and in so doing, enhance their language and print literacy development. It includes activities such as shared reading, drawing together, writing activities, meaningful conversational exchanges between parent and child, and language activities that parents establish, in order to support the child's literacy development

*Parental beliefs (PB)*: They include the parents' attitudes knowledge and goals related to language and literacy activities. Parents have differing views about children's early literacy development and these beliefs are related to home literacy practices.

## Appendix C: Parental and adolescent questionnaires

# de Meertalige Leesomgeving (voor ouders/verzorgers)

### INFORMATIE OVER HET ONDERZOEK

De Meertalige Leesomgeving

#### Inleiding

Wij vragen u en uw kind om mee te doen aan een wetenschappelijk onderzoek.

Meedoen is vrijwillig.

Voordat u beslist of u wilt meedoen, krijgt u uitleg over het onderzoek.

Lees deze informatie rustig door.

Mocht u vragen hebben, dan kunt u die stellen via email: [justine.griffioen@ru.nl](mailto:justine.griffioen@ru.nl).

U kunt dan de vragenlijst invullen nadat u antwoord heeft gekregen op uw vraag.

#### Beschrijving en doel van het onderzoek

In dit onderzoek kijken we naar het taalgebruik en het leesgedrag van uw kind.

Dus: welke talen spreekt uw kind? En hoeveel leest uw kind in elke taal?

Het meeste onderzoek over dit onderwerp is gedaan met eentalige gezinnen.

Daarom willen wij dit onderzoeken bij meertalige jongeren.

Hiermee bedoelen we jongeren die thuis een andere taal of andere talen spreken dan het Nederlands.

Het gaat hierbij om meertalige jongeren tussen de 12 en 18 jaar oud.

Welke talen zij spreken, maakt hierbij niet uit, maar de talen moeten wel een geschreven vorm hebben.

#### Wat wordt er van u en uw kind verwacht?

In dit onderzoek gaan u en uw kind afzonderlijk een online vragenlijst invullen.

We zijn namelijk benieuwd naar het perspectief van zowel u als uw kind.

Dit duurt ongeveer 10-15 minuten.

1 ouder/verzorger vult een vragenlijst in over uw kind. Hiernaast is er een andere vragenlijst die uw kind zelf in moet vullen.

Mocht u meerdere kinderen hebben die in de doelgroep vallen en die mee willen doen, dan vult u de vragenlijst 2 keer in: 1 keer voor het ene kind, en 1 keer voor het andere kind.

Dus bent u de ouder/verzorger van een meertalig kind tussen de 12 en 18 jaar? Vergeet dan niet uw kind ook de andere vragenlijst in te laten vullen (voor deze vragenlijst, klik [hier](#))

Alleen ouders en kinderen uit hetzelfde gezin kunnen meedoen.

Mocht u hulp nodig hebben bij het Nederlands, dan kunt u iemand (niet uw kind) vragen om te helpen met het invullen van de vragenlijst.

#### Vrijwilligheid

U en uw kind doen vrijwillig mee aan dit onderzoek.

Daarom kunt u op elk moment tijdens het onderzoek uw deelname stopzetten en uw toestemming

intrekken.

U hoeft niet aan te geven waarom u stopt.

Afzien van of stoppen met deelname heeft geen nadelige gevolgen voor u.

U kunt tot twee weken na deelname ook de onderzoeksgegevens en persoonsgegevens van uw kind laten verwijderen.

Dit kunt u doen door een mail te sturen naar: [justine.griffioen@ru.nl](mailto:justine.griffioen@ru.nl).

### **Wat gebeurt er met de gegevens?**

De onderzoeksgegevens die we in dit onderzoek verzamelen, zullen (mogelijk) door ons gebruikt worden voor datasets, artikelen en presentaties.

De onderzoeksgegevens zijn tenminste 10 jaar (anoniem) beschikbaar voor andere wetenschappers.

Persoonsgegevens die verzameld worden, blijven vertrouwelijk.

Als we gegevens met andere onderzoekers delen, kunnen deze dus niet tot uw kind herleid worden.

Voor de uitvoering van het onderzoek en registratie van deelname is het nodig dat wij persoonsgegevens verzamelen, gebruiken en bewaren.

De enige persoonsgegevens die wij verzamelen, is de geboortedatum van uw kind. Dit doen we om u antwoorden en die van uw kind aan elkaar te kunnen koppelen. We hoeven hierbij dan niet uw naam te weten.

We bewaren alle onderzoeks- en persoonsgegevens op beveiligde wijze volgens de richtlijnen van de Radboud Universiteit.

### **Heeft u vragen over het onderzoek?**

Als u vragen heeft of meer informatie over het onderzoek wilt hebben, kunt u een mail sturen naar: [justine.griffioen@ru.nl](mailto:justine.griffioen@ru.nl).

### **Ethische toetsing en klachten**

Dit onderzoek is goedgekeurd door de Ethische Toetsingscommissie Geesteswetenschappen van de Radboud Universiteit (ETC-GW nummer 2022-4596)

Heeft u klachten over het onderzoek, dan kunt u contact opnemen met de verantwoordelijke onderzoeker.

Ook kunt u een klacht indienen bij de secretaris van de Ethische Toetsingscommissie Geesteswetenschappen Radboud Universiteit ([etc-gw@ru.nl](mailto:etc-gw@ru.nl)).

Voor vragen over de verwerking van gegevens in dit onderzoek kunt u contact opnemen met: [dataofficer@let.ru.nl](mailto:dataofficer@let.ru.nl)

### **Toestemmingsverklaring**

Als u en uw kind aan dit onderzoek mee willen doen, vragen we u de toestemmingsverklaring te ondertekenen. Als uw kind ouder is dan 16 jaar, geeft het kind zelf toestemming in de afzonderlijke vragenlijst voor het kind.

Door uw schriftelijke toestemming geeft u aan dat u de informatie heeft begrepen en instemt met deelname aan het onderzoek. De toestemming kunt u geven op de volgende pagina, door straks op 'volgende' te klikken.

Alvast hartelijk bedankt voor uw deelname!

Met vriendelijke groet,

Justine Griffioen  
E-mail: Justine.griffioen@ru.nl

Q1 Is uw kind ouder dan 16 jaar?

- ja  
 nee

Introductie

Datum:  $\${date://CurrentDate/d\%2Fm\%2FY}$

**TOESTEMMINGSVERKLARING** voor deelname aan het wetenschappelijke onderzoek: de Meertalige Leesomgeving **Verklaring ouder/voogd** Ik heb uitleg gekregen over het doel van het onderzoek. Ik heb vragen mogen stellen over het onderzoek. Ik begrijp dat ik op elk moment tijdens het onderzoek de deelname van mij en mijn kind mag stopzetten. Ik begrijp hoe de gegevens van het onderzoek bewaard zullen worden en waarvoor ze gebruikt zullen worden. Ik stem in met de deelname van mij en mijn kind aan het onderzoek, zoals beschreven in het informatiedocument .

Q2 Daarnaast geef ik toestemming voor (s.v.p. aanvinken wat van toepassing is):

	Toestemming	
	Ja	Nee
Het verwerken van de volgende persoonsgegevens: geboortedatum kind	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q3 Ik geef toestemming voor deelname van mij en mijn kind in de studie zoals hierboven beschreven.

- ja  
 nee

Datum:  $\${date://CurrentDate/d\%2Fm\%2FY}$

**TOESTEMMINGSVERKLARING** voor deelname aan het wetenschappelijke onderzoek: de Meertalige Leesomgeving **Verklaring ouder/voogd** Ik heb uitleg gekregen over het doel van het onderzoek. Ik heb vragen mogen stellen over het onderzoek. Ik begrijp dat ik op elk moment tijdens het onderzoek mijn deelname mag stopzetten. Ik begrijp hoe de gegevens van het onderzoek bewaard zullen worden en waarvoor ze gebruikt zullen worden. Ik stem in met mijn deelname aan het onderzoek, zoals beschreven in het informatiedocument.



Q4 Ik geef toestemming voor mijn deelname in de studie zoals hierboven beschreven.

- ja
- nee

Q5 We stellen eerst een aantal algemene vragen over uw kind.

Wat is de geboortedatum van uw kind?

- Geboortedatum (dd/mm/yyyy): \_\_\_\_\_

Q6 Hoeveel broers en/of zussen heeft uw kind?

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3 of meer

Q7 Hoeveel verzorgers heeft uw kind? Kies de belangrijkste verzorger of de twee belangrijkste verzorgers van uw kind. (Een verzorger is een ouder, een grootouder, of iemand anders die het grootste deel van de tijd voor je kind zorgt.)

- 1
- 2

Q8 Wat is de relatie van verzorger 1 tot het kind? (Dit bent uzelf.)

- vader
- moeder
- grootouder(s)
- oppas/au pair
- voogd

anders

Q9 Wat is de relatie van verzorger 2 tot het kind?

vader

moeder

grootouder(s)

oppas/au pair

voogd

anders

Q10 Vul hier a.u.b. alle talen in die uw kind spreekt of verstaat. Het maakt niet uit hoe goed uw kind de taal beheerst of hoe vaak hij/zij de taal gebruikt.

Taal 1: \_\_\_\_\_

Taal 2: \_\_\_\_\_

Taal 3: \_\_\_\_\_

Taal 4: \_\_\_\_\_

Taal 5: \_\_\_\_\_

Taal 6: \_\_\_\_\_

Taal 7: \_\_\_\_\_

Taal 8: \_\_\_\_\_

Taal 9: \_\_\_\_\_

Taal 10: \_\_\_\_\_

Q11 Spreekt uw kind thuis Nederlands?

ja

nee

Q12 Welke andere talen worden er thuis gesproken (buiten het Nederlands)?

- Thuis taal 1: \_\_\_\_\_
- Thuis taal 2: \_\_\_\_\_
- Thuis taal 3: \_\_\_\_\_
- Thuis taal 4: \_\_\_\_\_

Q13 Vanaf welke leeftijd woont uw kind in Nederland? (Kies 0 als hij/zij in Nederland is geboren.)

▼ 0 ... 18

Q14 Volgt uw kind tweetalig onderwijs (tto) of zit hij/zij op een international school?

- ja, mijn kind volgt tto (Engels)
- ja, mijn kind volgt tto (Duits)
- ja, mijn kind zit op een international school
- nee

Q15 De volgende vragen gaan over het **taalgebruik** bij u **thuis**. Als u het antwoord niet zeker weet, vul dan in wat u denkt dat het juiste antwoord is.

**Denk aan een gewone week in dit jaar.**

Hoe vaak gebruiken u en uw kind deze talen wanneer jullie thuis met elkaar praten?

	(bijna) nooit	heel soms	soms	vaak	(bijna) altijd	niet van toepassing
Nederlands	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 1:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 2:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 3:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 4:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q16 Hoe vaak gebruiken verzorger 2 en uw kind deze talen wanneer zij thuis met elkaar praten?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q17 Hoe vaak gebruiken broer/zus 1 en uw kind deze talen wanneer zij thuis met elkaar praten?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q18 Hoe vaak gebruiken broer/zus 2 en uw kind deze talen wanneer zij thuis met elkaar praten?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q19 Hoe vaak gebruiken broer/zus 3 en uw kind deze talen wanneer zij thuis met elkaar praten?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q20 Hoe vaak spreken volwassenen thuis in deze talen met elkaar, waar uw kind bij is?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q21 De volgende vragen gaan over het **taalgebruik** in **andere situaties** dan thuis. Als u het antwoord niet zeker weet, vul dan in wat u denkt dat het juiste antwoord is.

**Denk aan een gewone week in dit jaar.**

Hoe vaak gebruiken vrienden/vriendinnen en uw kind deze talen wanneer zij op school met elkaar praten?

	(bijna) nooit	heel soms	soms	vaak	(bijna) altijd	niet van toepassing
Nederlands	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 1:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 2:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 3:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 4:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q22 Hoe vaak gebruiken vrienden/vriendinnen en uw kind deze talen wanneer zij niet op school of bij jullie thuis met elkaar praten?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q23 Hoe vaak gebruiken volwassenen uit de buurt en uw kind deze talen wanneer zij niet op school of bij jullie thuis met elkaar praten?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q24 De volgende vragen gaan over het **taalgebruik** van uw kind in het **algemeen**. Als u het antwoord niet zeker weet, vul dan in wat u denkt dat het juiste antwoord is.

Hoe oud was uw kind (in jaren) toen mensen voor het eerst in deze talen tegen hem/haar begonnen te praten?

- Nederlands \_\_\_\_\_
- Thuis taal 1: \_\_\_\_\_
- Thuis taal 2: \_\_\_\_\_
- Thuis taal 3: \_\_\_\_\_
- Thuis taal 4: \_\_\_\_\_

Q25 Waar begonnen mensen voor het eerst in deze talen tegen uw kind te praten?

	thuis	op de kinderopvang (bijvoorbeeld een crèche of peuterspeelzaal)	op school	anders	niet van toepassing
Nederlands	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 1:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 2:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 3:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 4:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q26 De volgende vragen gaan over de **taalvaardigheid** van uw kind. Als u het antwoord niet zeker weet, vul dan in wat u denkt dat het juiste antwoord is.

Hoe goed spreekt uw kind deze talen voor zijn/haar leeftijd?

	niet goed	niet heel goed	best goed	heel goed
Nederlands	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 1:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 2:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 3:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 4:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q27 Hoe goed begrijpt uw kind deze talen voor zijn/haar leeftijd?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q28 Hoe goed kan uw kind in deze talen lezen voor zijn/haar leeftijd?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q29 Hoe goed kan uw kind in deze talen schrijven voor zijn/haar leeftijd?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q30 Hoe goed spreekt uw kind deze talen in vergelijking met twee- of meertalige jongeren van vergelijkbare leeftijd die ook in Nederland opgroeien?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q31 Hoe goed begrijpt uw kind deze talen in vergelijking met twee- of meertalige jongeren van vergelijkbare leeftijd die ook in Nederland opgroeien?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]



Q32 Hoe goed kan uw kind in deze talen lezen in vergelijking met twee- of meertalige jongeren van vergelijkbare leeftijd die ook in Nederland opgroeien?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q33 Hoe goed kan uw kind in deze talen schrijven in vergelijking met twee- of meertalige jongeren van vergelijkbare leeftijd die ook in Nederland opgroeien?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q34 De volgende vragen gaan over de **leesgewoontes** van uw kind. Als u het antwoord niet zeker weet, vul dan in wat u denkt dat het juiste antwoord is.

Maak een inschatting van het aantal boeken dat in uw huis aanwezig is (dit mogen ook e-books of geleende boeken zijn).

- geen
- 1 tot 25
- 25 tot 50
- 50 tot 100
- meer dan 100

Q35 Maak een inschatting van het aantal boeken dat per taal in uw huis aanwezig is (dit mogen ook e-books of geleende boeken zijn).

	geen	1 tot 25	25 tot 50	50 tot 100	meer dan 100
Nederlands	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 1:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 2:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 3:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 4:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q36 Maak een inschatting van het aantal boeken dat uw kind thuis per taal heeft die geschikt zijn voor zijn/haar leeftijd (dit mogen ook e-books of geleende boeken zijn).

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q37 De volgende vragen gaan over u. Als u het antwoord niet zeker weet, vul dan in wat u denkt dat het juiste antwoord is.

Hoe vaak leest u in deze talen?

	(bijna) nooit	één of twee keer per maand	één of twee keer per week	meerdere keren per week	elke dag
Nederlands	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 1:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 2:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 3:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 4:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q38 Hoe vaak schrijft u in deze talen?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q39 Hoe vaak schrijft of leest u in deze talen voor uw werk?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande + niet van toepassing]

Q40 Hoe vaak schrijft of leest u in deze talen voor privé zaken?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q41 Hoe vaak bent u bezig met multimedia-activiteiten in deze talen? Denk hierbij aan media zoals televisie, radio, muziek, films, websites, online spelletjes, tablets, laptops, computers, telefoons, apps, enzovoort.

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q42 De volgende vragen gaan over uw kind. Als u het antwoord niet zeker weet, vul dan in wat u denkt dat het juiste antwoord is.

Hoe vaak leest uw kind in deze talen of lezen mensen hem/haar voor in deze talen?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q43 Hoe vaak schrijft uw kind in deze talen?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q44 Hoe vaak maakt uw kind huiswerk in deze talen?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q45 Hoe vaak heeft uw kind in deze talen lessen op de reguliere school?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q46 Hoe vaak heeft uw kind in deze talen lessen buiten de reguliere school?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q47 Hoe vaak is uw kind bezig met multimedia-activiteiten in deze talen? Denk hierbij aan media zoals televisie, radio, muziek, films, websites, online spelletjes, tablets, laptops, computers, telefoons, apps, enzovoort.

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q48 Hoe vaak helpt u uw kind met zijn/haar huiswerk door middel van deze talen?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q49 Hoe vaak praat u met uw kind over school in deze talen?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q50 Hoe vaak praat u met uw kind over huiselijke zaken in deze talen? (Dus zaken die niet over school gaan.)

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q51 De volgende vragen gaan over **uw voorkeuren** op het gebied van **taal**. Als u het antwoord niet zeker weet, vul dan in wat u denkt dat het juiste antwoord is.

Het is voor mij belangrijk om deze taal te kunnen spreken.

	niet belangrijk	niet heel belangrijk	best belangrijk	heel erg belangrijk	geen mening	niet van toepassing
Nederlands	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 1:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 2:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 3:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 4:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q52 Het is voor mij belangrijk om in deze taal te kunnen schrijven.

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q53 Het is voor mij belangrijk om in deze taal te kunnen lezen.

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q54 Het is voor mij belangrijk dat mijn kind deze taal kan spreken.

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q55 Het is voor mij belangrijk dat mijn kind in deze taal kan schrijven.

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q56 Het is voor mij belangrijk dat mijn kind in deze taal kan lezen.

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q57

De volgende vragen gaan over **voorkeuren** op het gebied van **taal** in het **algemeen**. Als u het antwoord niet zeker weet, vul dan in wat u denkt dat het juiste antwoord is..

Hoe vaak willen de mensen in uw huis, inclusief uzelf, in het algemeen deze talen spreken?

	(bijna) nooit	heel soms	soms	vaak	(bijna) altijd	niet van toepassing
Nederlands	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 1:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 2:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 3:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 4:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q58 Hoe vaak willen anderen in uw buurt (dus niet op school) in het algemeen deze talen spreken?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q59 Hoe vaak wil uw kind in het algemeen deze talen spreken?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q60

Bij de volgende vragen kijken we naar het **opleidingsniveau** van **verzorger 1 en 2**.

Selecteer uw hoogstbehaalde opleidingsniveau, behaald in deze talen.

	geen	basisschool	middelbare school	MBO (of vergelijkbaar)	HBO (hogeschool) of WO (universiteit)
Nederlands	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 1:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 2:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 3:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 4:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q61 Selecteer het hoogstbehaalde opleidingsniveau van verzorger 2, behaald in deze talen.

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q62 Dit is het einde van de vragenlijst. Heel hartelijk dank voor uw deelname! Heeft u nog opmerkingen? Die kunt u hieronder intypen. Als u kans wil maken op de cadeaubon van Bol.com van 10 euro, laat dan ook uw e-mailadres hieronder achter. Ik kan u dan ook benaderen voor een eventueel interview (maar dit is niet verplicht). Klik als u klaar bent op 'antwoorden insturen'.

---

# de Meertalige Leesomgeving (voor jongeren)

## INFORMATIE OVER HET ONDERZOEK

De Meertalige Leesomgeving

### Inleiding

Wij vragen jou en je ouder/verzorger om mee te doen aan een wetenschappelijk onderzoek.

Meedoen is vrijwillig.

Voordat je beslist of je wilt meedoen, krijg je uitleg over het onderzoek.

Lees deze informatie rustig door.

Mocht je vragen hebben, dan kun je die stellen via email: [justine.griffioen@ru.nl](mailto:justine.griffioen@ru.nl).

Je kunt dan de vragenlijst invullen nadat je antwoord hebt gekregen op je vraag.

### Beschrijving en doel van het onderzoek

In dit onderzoek kijken we naar je taalgebruik en leesgedrag.

Dus: welke talen spreek je? En hoeveel lees je in elke taal?

Het meeste onderzoek over dit onderwerp is gedaan met eentalige gezinnen.

Daarom willen wij dit onderzoeken bij meertalige jongeren.

Hiermee bedoelen we jongeren die thuis een andere taal of andere talen spreken dan het Nederlands.

Het gaat hierbij om meertalige jongeren tussen de 12 en 18 jaar oud.

Welke talen je spreekt, maakt hierbij niet uit, maar de talen moeten wel een geschreven vorm hebben.

### Wat wordt er van jou en je ouder/verzorger verwacht?

In dit onderzoek gaan jij en 1 van je ouder(s)/verzorger(s) afzonderlijk een online vragenlijst invullen.

Dit duurt ongeveer 10-15 minuten.

Jij vult een vragenlijst in over jezelf. Hiernaast is er een andere vragenlijst die 1 van je ouder(s)/verzorger(s) in moet vullen.

We zijn namelijk benieuwd naar het perspectief van zowel jou als je ouder/verzorger.

Dus ben jij een meertalige jongere in deze doelgroep?

Vergeet dan niet 1 van je ouder(s)/verzorger(s) ook de andere vragenlijst in te laten vullen (voor deze vragenlijst, klik [hier](#)).

Alleen ouders en kinderen uit hetzelfde gezin kunnen meedoen.

Mocht je broers of zussen hebben die ook mee willen doen, dan kan dat.

Zij moeten dan zelf de vragenlijst invullen.

Mocht je hulp nodig hebben bij het Nederlands, dan kun je iemand (niet je ouder/verzorger) vragen om te helpen met het invullen van de vragenlijst.

### Vrijwilligheid

Je doet vrijwillig mee aan dit onderzoek.

Daarom kun je op elk moment tijdens het onderzoek je deelname stopzetten en je toestemming intrekken.

Je hoeft niet aan te geven waarom je stopt.

Afzien van of stoppen met deelname heeft geen nadelige gevolgen voor je.

Je kunt tot twee weken na deelname ook je onderzoeksgegevens en persoonsgegevens laten verwijderen. Dit kun je doen door een mail te sturen naar: [justine.griffioen@ru.nl](mailto:justine.griffioen@ru.nl).

### **Wat gebeurt er met de gegevens?**

De onderzoeksgegevens die we in dit onderzoek verzamelen, zullen (mogelijk) door ons gebruikt worden voor datasets, artikelen en presentaties.

De onderzoeksgegevens zijn tenminste 10 jaar (anoniem) beschikbaar voor andere wetenschappers. Persoonsgegevens die verzameld worden, blijven vertrouwelijk.

Als we gegevens met andere onderzoekers delen, kunnen deze dus niet tot jou herleid worden.

Voor de uitvoering van het onderzoek en registratie van deelname is het nodig dat wij persoonsgegevens verzamelen, gebruiken en bewaren.

De enige persoonsgegevens die wij verzamelen, is jouw geboortedatum. Dit doen we om jouw antwoorden en die van je ouder/verzorger aan elkaar te kunnen koppelen. We hoeven hierbij dan je naam niet te weten.

We bewaren alle onderzoeks- en persoonsgegevens op beveiligde wijze volgens de richtlijnen van de Radboud Universiteit.

### **Heb je vragen over het onderzoek?**

Als je vragen hebt of meer informatie over het onderzoek wilt hebben, kun je een mail sturen naar: [justine.griffioen@ru.nl](mailto:justine.griffioen@ru.nl).

### **Ethische toetsing en klachten**

Dit onderzoek is goedgekeurd door de Ethische Toetsingscommissie Geesteswetenschappen van de Radboud Universiteit (ETC-GW nummer 2022-4596)

Heb je klachten over het onderzoek, dan kunt je contact opnemen met de verantwoordelijke onderzoeker.

Ook kunt je een klacht indienen bij de secretaris van de Ethische Toetsingscommissie Geesteswetenschappen Radboud Universiteit ([etc-gw@ru.nl](mailto:etc-gw@ru.nl)).

Voor vragen over de verwerking van gegevens in dit onderzoek kun je contact opnemen met: [dataofficer@let.ru.nl](mailto:dataofficer@let.ru.nl)

### **Toestemmingsverklaring**

Als je aan dit onderzoek mee wil doen, vragen we je de toestemmingsverklaring te ondertekenen. Als je jonger dan 17 bent, geeft je ouder/verzorger toestemming in hun vragenlijst. Als je ouder dan 16 bent, geef je deze toestemming zelf.

Door je schriftelijke toestemming geef je aan dat je de informatie hebt begrepen en instemt met deelname aan het onderzoek. De toestemming kun je geven op de volgende pagina, door straks op 'volgende' te klikken.

Alvast hartelijk bedankt voor je deelname!

Met vriendelijke groet,  
Justine Griffioen



E-mail: Justine.griffioen@ru.nl

Q1 Ben je ouder dan 16 jaar?

- ja
- nee

Introductie

Datum:  $\${date://CurrentDate/d\%2Fm\%2FY}$

**TOESTEMMINGSVERKLARING** voor deelname aan het wetenschappelijke onderzoek: de Meertalige Leesomgeving **Verklaring jongere >16 jaar oud** Ik heb uitleg gekregen over het doel van het onderzoek. Ik heb vragen mogen stellen over het onderzoek. Ik begrijp dat ik op elk moment tijdens het onderzoek mijn deelname mag stopzetten. Ik begrijp hoe de gegevens van het onderzoek bewaard zullen worden en waarvoor ze gebruikt zullen worden. Ik stem in met mijn deelname aan het onderzoek, zoals beschreven in het informatiedocument.

Q2 Daarnaast geef ik toestemming voor (s.v.p. aanvinken wat van toepassing is):

	Toestemming	
	Ja	Nee
Het verwerken van de volgende persoonsgegevens: geboortedatum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q3 Ik geef toestemming voor mijn deelname in de studie zoals hierboven beschreven.

- ja
- nee

Q4 We stellen je eerst een aantal algemene vragen.

Wat is je geboortedatum?

- Geboortedatum (dd/mm/yyyy): \_\_\_\_\_

Q5 Hoeveel broers en/of zussen heb je?

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3 of meer

Q6 Hoeveel ouders/verzorgers heb je? Kies je belangrijkste verzorger of je twee belangrijkste verzorgers. (Een verzorger is een ouder, een grootouder, of iemand anders die het grootste deel van de tijd voor je zorgt.)

- 1
- 2

Q7 Wat is de relatie van verzorger 1 ten opzichte van jou?

- vader
- moeder
- grootouder(s)
- oppas/au pair
- voogd
- anders

Q8 Wat is de relatie van verzorger 2 ten opzichte van jou?

- vader
- moeder
- grootouder(s)
- oppas/au pair
- voogd
- anders

Q9 Schrijf hier alle talen op die je spreekt of begrijpt. Het maakt niet uit hoe goed je de taal spreekt/begrijpt of hoe vaak je de taal gebruikt.

- Taal 1: \_\_\_\_\_
- Taal 2: \_\_\_\_\_
- Taal 3: \_\_\_\_\_
- Taal 4: \_\_\_\_\_
- Taal 5: \_\_\_\_\_
- Taal 6: \_\_\_\_\_
- Taal 7: \_\_\_\_\_
- Taal 8: \_\_\_\_\_
- Taal 9: \_\_\_\_\_
- Taal 10: \_\_\_\_\_

Q10 Spreek jij thuis Nederlands?

- ja
- nee

Q11 Welke andere talen worden er thuis gesproken (buiten het Nederlands)?

- Thuistaal 1: \_\_\_\_\_
- Thuistaal 2: \_\_\_\_\_
- Thuistaal 3: \_\_\_\_\_
- Thuistaal 4: \_\_\_\_\_

Q12 Vanaf welke leeftijd woon je in Nederland? (Kies 0 als je in Nederland bent geboren.)

▼ 0 ... 18

Q13 Volg je tweetalig onderwijs of zit je op een international school?

- ja, ik volg tto (Engels)
- ja, ik volg tto (Duits)
- ja, ik zit op een international school
- nee

Q14 De volgende vragen gaan over het **taalgebruik** bij jou **thuis**. Als je het antwoord niet zeker weet, vul dan in wat je denkt dat het juiste antwoord is.

**Denk aan een gewone week in dit jaar.**

Hoe vaak gebruiken jij en verzorger 1 deze talen wanneer jullie thuis met elkaar praten?

	(bijna) nooit	heel soms	soms	vaak	(bijna) altijd	niet van toepassing
Nederlands	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 1:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 2:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 3:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 4:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q15

Hoe vaak gebruiken jij en verzorger 2 deze talen wanneer jullie thuis met elkaar praten?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q16

Hoe vaak gebruiken jij en broer/zus 1 deze talen wanneer jullie thuis met elkaar praten?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q17

Hoe vaak gebruiken jij en broer/zus 2 deze talen wanneer jullie thuis met elkaar praten?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q18

Hoe vaak gebruiken jij en broer/zus 3 deze talen wanneer jullie thuis met elkaar praten?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q19 Hoe vaak spreken volwassenen thuis in deze talen met elkaar, waar jij bij bent?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q20 De volgende vragen gaan over het **taalgebruik** in **andere situaties** dan thuis. Als je het antwoord niet zeker weet, vul dan in wat je denkt dat het juiste antwoord is.

**Denk aan een gewone week in dit jaar.**

Hoe vaak gebruiken jij en je vrienden/vriendinnen deze talen wanneer jullie op school met elkaar praten?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q21 Hoe vaak gebruiken jij en je vrienden/vriendinnen deze talen wanneer jullie niet op school of bij jou thuis met elkaar praten?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q22 Hoe vaak gebruiken jij en volwassenen uit de buurt deze talen wanneer jullie niet op school of bij jou thuis met elkaar praten?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q23 De volgende vragen gaan over je **taalvaardigheid**. Als je het antwoord niet zeker weet, vul dan in wat je denkt dat het juiste antwoord is.

Hoe goed spreek je deze talen voor jouw leeftijd?

	niet goed	niet heel goed	best goed	heel goed
Nederlands	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 1:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 2:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 3:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 4:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q24 Hoe goed begrijp je deze talen voor jouw leeftijd?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q25 Hoe goed kun je in deze talen lezen voor jouw leeftijd?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q26 Hoe goed kun je in deze talen schrijven voor jouw leeftijd?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q27 Hoe goed spreek je deze talen in vergelijking met twee- of meertalige jongeren van vergelijkbare leeftijd die ook in Nederland opgroeien?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q28 Hoe goed begrijp je deze talen in vergelijking met twee- of meertalige jongeren van vergelijkbare leeftijd die ook in Nederland opgroeien?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q29 Hoe goed kun je in deze talen lezen in vergelijking met twee- of meertalige jongeren van vergelijkbare leeftijd die ook in Nederland opgroeien?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q30 Hoe goed kun je in deze talen schrijven in vergelijking met twee- of meertalige jongeren van vergelijkbare leeftijd die ook in Nederland opgroeien?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q31 De volgende vragen gaan over je **leesgewoontes**. Als je het antwoord niet zeker weet, vul dan in wat je denkt dat het juiste antwoord is.

Maak een inschatting van het aantal boeken dat in je huis aanwezig is (dit mogen ook e-books of geleende boeken zijn).

- geen
- 1 tot 25
- 25 tot 50
- 50 tot 100
- meer dan 100

Q32 Maak een inschatting van het aantal boeken dat per taal in je huis aanwezig is (dit mogen ook e-books of geleende boeken zijn).

	geen	1 tot 25	25 tot 50	50 tot 100	meer dan 100
Nederlands	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 1:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 2:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 3:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 4:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q33 Maak een inschatting van het aantal boeken dat jij thuis per taal hebt die geschikt zijn voor jouw leeftijd (dit mogen ook e-books of geleende boeken zijn).

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]



Q34 Hoe vaak lees je in deze talen of lezen mensen jou in deze talen voor?

	(bijna) nooit	één of twee keer per maand	één of twee keer per week	meerdere keren per week	elke dag
Nederlands	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 1:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 2:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 3:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 4:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q35 Hoe vaak schrijf je in deze talen?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q36 Hoe vaak maak je huiswerk in deze talen?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q37 Hoe vaak heb je in deze talen lessen op de reguliere school?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q38 Hoe vaak heb je in deze talen lessen buiten de reguliere school?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q39 Hoe vaak ben je bezig met multimedia-activiteiten in deze talen? Denk hierbij aan media zoals televisie, radio, muziek, films, websites, online spelletjes, tablets, laptops, computers, telefoons, apps, enzovoort.

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q40 Hoe vaak helpt je ouder/verzorger jou met jouw huiswerk door middel van deze talen?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q41 Hoe vaak praat je ouder/verzorger met jou over school in deze talen?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q42 Hoe vaak praat je ouder/verzorger met jou over huiselijke zaken in deze talen? (Dus zaken die niet over school gaan.)

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q43 De volgende vragen gaan over **jouw voorkeuren** op het gebied van **taal**. Als je het antwoord niet zeker weet, vul dan in wat je denkt dat het juiste antwoord is.

Het is voor mij belangrijk om deze taal te kunnen spreken.

	niet belangrijk	niet heel belangrijk	best belangrijk	heel erg belangrijk	geen mening	niet van toepassing
Nederlands	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 1:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 2:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 3:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 4:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q44 Het is voor mij belangrijk om in deze taal te kunnen schrijven.

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q45 Het is voor mij belangrijk om in deze taal te kunnen lezen.

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q46 De volgende vragen gaan over de **voorkeuren** van je **ouder(s)/verzorger(s)** op het gebied van **taal**. Als je het antwoord niet zeker weet, vul dan in wat je denkt dat het juiste antwoord is.

Het is voor mijn ouder(s)/verzorger(s) belangrijk dat ik deze taal kan spreken.

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q47 Het is voor mijn ouder(s)/verzorger(s) belangrijk dat ik in deze taal kan schrijven.

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q48 Het is voor mijn ouder(s)/verzorger(s) belangrijk dat ik in deze taal kan lezen.

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q49 De volgende vragen gaan over **voorkeuren** op het gebied van **taal** in het **algemeen**. Als je het antwoord niet zeker weet, vul dan in wat je denkt dat het juiste antwoord is.

Hoe vaak willen de mensen in je huis in het algemeen deze talen spreken?

	(bijna) nooit	heel soms	soms	vaak	(bijna) altijd	niet van toepassing
Nederlands	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 1:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 2:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 3:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thuis taal 4:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q50 Hoe vaak willen anderen in je buurt (dus niet op school) in het algemeen deze talen spreken?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q51 Hoe vaak wil jijzelf in het algemeen deze talen spreken?

[zelfde antwoordopties als voorgaande]

Q52 Dit is het einde van de vragenlijst. Heel hartelijk dank voor je deelname! Heb je nog opmerkingen? Die kun je hieronder intypen. Als je kans wil maken op de cadeaubon van Bol.com van

10 euro, laat dan hieronder ook je e-mailadres achter. Ik kan je dan ook benaderen voor een eventueel interview (maar dit is niet verplicht). Klik als je klaar bent op 'antwoorden insturen'.

---

---

---

---

---

## **Appendix D: Interview questions**

1. In what level of education is your child enrolled at school?
2. What is your opinion about the use of Dutch of your child?
3. What is your opinion about the use of the home language(s) of your child?
4. Are there any specific reading- and writing activities you do with your child in their home language(s)?
5. And when your child was younger?
6. What does your child read in the home language(s)?
7. What obstacles do you face when using the home language with your child?
8. Where would you like to spend more time on with regard to the home language of your child?
9. Why are you not able to do this? (time/child/school/policies)
10. What do you think is the role of friends in using the home language?
11. Do you see a difference with regard to this with when your child was younger?
12. And what do you think about the role of the school? (is multilingualism being stimulated within school or not?)
13. Does your child use the home language a lot on social media? Which ones?
14. When (within what context) do you speak every language with your child? Do you use a specific strategy for this? (e.g. OPOL)

## Appendix E: Transcriptions of the interviews

### Recording Parent of P9

The transcription is a rough translation of the original recording. Parts between [brackets] are extra questions by the researcher.

Question 1: They are both in school. He doesn't understand because the levels for him are very different (in his country), so I don't know how to explain.

Question 2: No. 5 years of escaping. 5 years without studying: they couldn't go to school, they were hiding. Big psychological dramas. When the 7-year-old started school, he would isolate himself, he wouldn't talk to anyone, he couldn't understand anything. The drama was huge. Thank God these months my kids started socializing and understanding the language, and they have been treated nicely. I feel very happy about this. My 13-year old the same, he doesn't talk much because he is shy and is scared of talking. But anything we do, e.g., if we go to the supermarket, he helps us and says what we want. They start to grasp the language.

Question 4: My 7-year-old paints a lot, he likes it very much. I buy colours and vignettes for him to draw because he likes it. They write in the school, with all the kids they do activities, they also do gym activities. And the 13-year-old he goes to school by bike, it is quite some exercise for him and also a small football field. So he goes to play in the afternoons with his small brother. [So, what do they read in Spanish, books or magazines?] They are mostly on the phone. They give his notebooks to my 13-year-old for reading ... . And my little boy, the teacher is teaching him even reading. [So what types of books do they read? Or do they only read for school?] I don't know what kind of books they read, because they do that in class. And the 13-year-old, he brings like a [unknown].

Question 8: We mostly talk Spanish in the asylum, here there are many people that come from the war. There are many Syrians, Afghans, Iraqis, so their language is different from ours. There is only one other family that talks Spanish. So we mainly talk Spanish with them, but apart from that not much. I work every morning, I just finished, and my bosses are Dutch, so they talk to me in Dutch, which I don't know much, I'm not going to lie. My kids yes, we go to the doctor's, my kids understand [Dutch], good, good. They translate it for me, 'Dad, he is saying this, he is saying that'. We practice Spanish only here in the apartment.

Question 10: No. No one here speaks Spanish, so my kids try to talk the language (Dutch). The friends don't talk Spanish.

Question 12: No. The school focuses on the language here, Dutch. It is good. It is excellent, I think “multilingualism is good”.

Question 13: Yes. Our phone is in Spanish, but same, I put things for them in Dutch for them to adapt more. [Do they use it more in Spanish or also in Spanish?] We cover more in Spanish.

Question 14: No strategy, because, as I said, we have been here for barely 7 months. This is all new for us, I’m not going to lie. We never thought / imagined that we would come to such a beautiful country, we didn’t know anything. Slowly, we want to keep doing things.

--

### **Recording Parent of P17**

The transcription is a rough transcription of the original recording. Parts between [brackets] are extra questions by the researcher.

Question 1: She studies now in school. I don’t know the level.

Question 2: She studies, I think like, for three months already. She has progressed. She can speak and read a bit of Dutch. [Is it important for you that she learns Dutch?] Yes for sure, if we are in the Netherlands, sure, it is important to learn Dutch.

Question 3: Ukrainian is our native language we have spoken the most of our life, so it is still our main language to communicate in the family. About other languages, for me it’s like, I communicate in English, because I only know basic Dutch, I learn it a bit with some apps or when I communicate with others, but often I just switch to English because if I don’t understand most of the words it’s hard to understand people. [So you prefer English?] Yes, at least I can communicate a bit.

Question 4: Yes, mostly like this, but she has some after school homework. She and my younger son also learn a bit of Dutch after school and do their homework. And sometimes they even ask me to help with something, but with Dutch I cannot help them so much. In school they communicate in Dutch, although they can speak English very well, school prefers pupils to speak in Dutch, because when they switch to English, learning Dutch will go slower. [Does your child still read in Ukrainian at home?] Yes, but usually more from tablet, because we didn’t take books with us (when we had to flee). So electronic books mostly, but not in Dutch, because Dutch E-books are mostly too difficult to read.

Question 7: It's no problem for us to use Ukrainian between us, we need sometimes some other people from Ukraine.

Question 8: Mostly like technical subjects, because my daughter is interested in that and sometimes I help her a bit.

Question 10: She has contact with other Ukrainian children and she speaks Ukrainian with them, also in school, but mostly they use Dutch in school.

Question 12: I think they stimulate to speak more Dutch and I think this is good for them, because I feel in school she and my younger boy are fine. I think that teachers try to do the best and to me it's logical if they try to ask them to communicate in Dutch in school, because then they can learn it faster. They can still speak Ukrainian after school and play together (in Ukrainian).

Question 13: I think that they can use both, because I think they sometimes put something from Youtube on in Ukrainian and sometimes in Dutch, but I'm not sure about this. [So, it's not more in Ukrainian?] I'm not sure, but often they use English subtitles for Dutch cartoons or movies and sometimes they watch things in Ukrainian. They use English subtitles, because there are not a lot of Ukrainian subtitles.

[Do you speak a bit of Dutch?] Just a bit, I make some small sentences like 'Ik drink melk' and sometimes I understand something when I'm in the shop like if they ask me if I need a receipt in Dutch. [And do you also try to speak it with your child sometimes?] Yeah we do sometimes, because my daughter knows it a bit already. Sometimes when we go to the market my daughter tries to use Dutch, because for me I can sometimes understand when they say something, but it is hard to say something for me, I just know like some words, like 'Ik wil het'. [So she can help you a bit?] Yeah, but if they tell something more I need to change to English, because my Dutch is very limited, but at least I try to speak some Dutch. And if I can't understand it, I use Google translate and try to at least remember some important words.