# "FOR TINA-MEIDEN ONLY!"

## The use of English in Dutch teenager magazine *Tina*

MATHILDE TUCKER

Student number: 5998050

BA English Language & Culture

Date: 21 November 2019

Utrecht University

Supervisor: Dr. K. Sebregts

Second reader: Dr. D.L. Cole

Abstract

In the Netherlands, the influence of English can be found in many different places, such as in print media, online media, and in higher education. This has sparked a debate on how this affects the Dutch language and society. This study investigates the use and function of English in Dutch teenager magazine *Tina*, since teenage language is "a prime source of information about linguistic change" (Eckert, 1997, as cited in Drange, 2009, p. 62). The issues are from 2000, 2009 and 2019. It adds to the study by van den Berg (2017), that focused on magazines directed at people of the age of fifty and over. Like van den Berg (2017)'s study, it builds on the work of Matras (2009), specifically his codeswitching – borrowing continuum.

The results of this study show that the found items of English origin have decreased over the years. The vast majority of these items are borrowings on Matras's (2009) scale. It is suggested that English words are most of the time used because they have become the common expression in Dutch (borrowings). Codeswitches are suggested to be used mainly for ornamental reasons rather than functional reasons. Another suggestion is that the use of English can even be considered affected, since English has become normalised in Dutch discourse and is therefore not exclusive, as it used to be.

Contents

Theoretical background

In the Netherlands, there has been much discussion lately about the influence of English on daily life. Some examples of headlines in newspapers highlighting this debate are: "Oprukkend Engels maakt van Nederlands een B-taal" (The advance of English turns Dutch into a B-language) (Appel & Noordervliet, 2019), "Nederlandse taal bezwijkt helemaal niet onder Engels" (The Dutch language is not collapsing under English) (Van Velzen, 2017), and "Engels is de wetenschapstaal, Nederlands is de vertaling" (English is the language of science, Dutch is the translation) (Ieven & Korsten, 2019).

One of the areas in which the influence of English in the Netherlands can be found is that of advertising, in which English words, sentences and songs often go untranslated (Gerritsen, Korzilius, van Meurs, & Gijsbers (2000). This use of English is explained "as a matter of image. English would appear to be used only to give an international, 'cool,' modern flavor to the product" (p. 20). So, English appears to be a language with which people want to be associated in the Netherlands. Since English is then at the very least understood by most Dutch people, the question is raised whether these people can be classified as 'bilinguals' and what the term 'bilingualism' entails.

Throughout the years, views on bilingualism have changed. In 1935, Bloomfield defined bilingualism as "the native-like control of two languages" (as cited in Hamers & Blanc, 2000, p. 6). According to Bullock and Toribio (2009), this is still the layperson's definition today. However, the meaning of the term 'bilingualism' has expanded since.

Whereas researchers have for a long time tried to box language into different varieties, speakers often do not express such a clear-cut division in practice. According to Riionheimo, Kok, Paulasto, & Meriläinen (2014), "[language variety and modality] boundaries are not and have never been a key concern in the daily lives of people who are glossed as being bi- or

multilinguals" (p. 92). This is a postcolonial theory, which poses that researchers often express a "monolingual bias" (p. 92). Indeed, the study of World Englishes (WEs) focused on the way in which formerly colonialised countries have appropriated the English language (Edwards, 2016). From a postcolonialist view, Grosjean (1996), for example, argues that half of the world's inhabitants is bilingual, however not equally competent in both languages (p. 20). Matras (2009) contends that bilingualism can be seen as a continuum on which persons can be minimally bilingual (i.e. "have just rudimentary knowledge of another language", p. 111) to fully competent in two languages.

According to Matras (2009), bilinguals are the ones to introduce contact-induced language change (p. 110). They are the ones that, through codeswitches, bring in new items from another language, which then, often over time, can be adopted by others (p. 110). According to Bullock and Toribio (2009), codeswitching is a phenomenon specifically associated with bilingual speakers. They define codeswitching as the alternate use of two languages by bilinguals, often in the same utterance (p. 2). Muysken (2000) divides codeswitching into two groups: 'alternational' codeswitching and 'insertional' codeswitching. In the former type, speakers alternate languages *between* utterances or sentences, whereas in the latter a word or phrase in the other language is *inserted* (as cited in Matras, 2009, p. 101). When items from another language are fully incorporated, these are called borrowings. Borrowing is a more structural change in a language through contact with another language. It is a process of which the result is the 'loan' of a word or phrase from one language (the 'donor') into the other (the 'recipient') (Matras, 2009, p. 146).

Since codeswitching and borrowing can therefore be seen as items on either side of a diachronic continuum, Matras (2009) constructed the 'codeswitching-borrowing continuum' (p. 111). This continuum can be seen in Figure 1.

| Bilinguality |
|---|
| bilingual speaker ↔ monolingual speaker |
| Composition |
| elaborate utterance/phrase ↔ single lexical item |
| Functionality |
| special conversational effect, stylistic choice ↔ default expression |
| Unique referent (specificity) |
| lexical ↔ para-lexical |
| Operationality |
| core vocabulary ↔ grammatical operations |
| Regularity |
| single occurrence ↔ regular occurrence |
| Structural integration |
| not integrated ↔ integrated |
| codeswitching ↔ borrowing |

*Figure 1. Dimensions of the codeswitching-borrowing continuum* (Matras, 2009, p. 111)

As shown in Figure 1, the continuum consists of seven dimensions. I will now briefly explain what these dimensions comprise. I will specifically focus on the use of English in Dutch here for the sake of clarity and specificity.

*Bilinguality*. In the bilinguality dimension, the bilingual speaker is placed on one end, and the monolingual speaker on the other end of the continuum. Since bilinguals are likely to switch between languages, and they have a wide vocabulary in two (or more) languages, they are placed at the codeswitching end of the continuum. Whilst monolingual speakers do not

have the vocabulary and tools to insert words or phrases from another language, the only way in which they use another language is through loanwords, at the borrowing end (Matras, 2009, p. 111).

*Composition*. The compositional dimension distinguishes between elaborate phrases or utterances on one end of the continuum and single lexical items on the other end. As in the bilinguality dimension, elaborate utterances demand advanced skills of the speaker and are thus more likely to be classified as codeswitching. Single words, on the other hand, demand less of the monolingual speaker and are more likely to become incorporated in the language. Formulaic expressions are also placed on the borrowing end of the continuum, since they form a single lexical item together (Matras, 2009, p. 112).

*Functionality*. The functionality dimension denotes on one end the use of English as a stylistic choice, and on the other end the use of English forms as default expressions in Dutch. Matras (2009) argues that codeswitching is 'conscious and discourse-strategic' (p. 112). Generally speaking, codeswitching forms an alternative to something that can also be expressed in Dutch, i.e. it has a Dutch equivalent. The use of default expressions, on the contrary, tends to lean towards the borrowing end of the continuum. These expressions oftentimes have no equivalent in Dutch (p. 112).

*Unique referent (specificity)*. This dimension has lexical referents on the codeswitching side of the continuum, and para-lexical referents on the borrowing side. These para-lexical items often refer to a unique referent. The referent can oftentimes be grouped into one of the following categories: institution or brand names (e.g. *Tupperware*), terms of kinship and terms of affection. To the speaker, the para-lexical items that are used better meet their mental image of the referent. They have no real equivalent in Dutch and are therefore on the borrowing end. Lexical items are exploited for 'special conversational effects', to enhance

the Dutch language; therefore they are placed on the codeswitching side of the continuum (Matras, 2009, p. 112-113). Examples of lexical items are the words 'kids' (instead of Dutch *kinderen*) and 'design' (instead of Dutch *vormgeving* or *ontwerp*).

*Operationality*. Here, the continuum separates non-conscious utterances on the borrowing side, utilised "to reduce the processing effort associated with the selection/inhibition mechanism" (Matras, 2009, p. 113), from conscious utterances on the codeswitching side of the continuum. Whereas bilinguals have the ability to use words from another language, monolinguals lack that choice (p. 113).

*Regularity*. In this dimension, regular occurrences are counted under borrowing and single occurrences under codeswitching. Here, a regular occurrence means that an utterance can be used in any language context. Codeswitches, however, are not always suitable in every context (Matras, 2009, p. 113).

*Structural integration*. The last dimension of Matras's (2009) codeswitching – borrowing continuum is that of structural integration. Words that have been appropriated to fit the demands of the Dutch language are integrated words and therefore considered borrowings. An example of this is the verb *racen*, which has the Dutch inflectional verbal ending *-en*. Words that are used in their original English form, on the other hand, are placed on the codeswitching end.

This leads to the research described in this paper. There has been some research regarding English in the Netherlands (e.g. Edwards, 2016; Gerritsen, van Meurs, Planken, & Korzilius, 2016; van Oostendorp, 2012). Furthermore, studies have been conducted on the use of English in (job) advertisements in Dutch print media (Gerritsen et al., 2007; van Meurs, 2010). Van den Berg (2017), in her Master's thesis, researched the influence of English in Dutch magazines which are mainly read by people of fifty years or over. The current study

complements her study by looking at the influence of English on Dutch magazines directed at a different age range, namely teenagers. According to Eckert (1997, p. 52), "[a]dolescents are the linguistic movers and shakers [...] and as such a prime source of information about linguistic change" (as cited in Drange, 2009). A part of that linguistic change may be the uptake of English words and phrases as taken over by teenagers whose native language is not English. Since teenage language is usually seen as an indicator of language change, this paper will research how often English words and phrases are used in Dutch magazine *Tina*, which is directed at teenagers, and what the function of this English usage is. This magazine's language use appeals to teenagers and also reflects teenagers' own use of English. This leads to the following research questions.

- How common is the use of English words and phrases in Dutch magazine *Tina* in the years 2000, 2009 and 2019, and has its frequency changed over these years?

- How are the English words and phrases distributed over Matras's (2009) codeswitching – borrowing continuum?

- Looking at the distribution of English items on Matras's (2009) codeswitching – borrowing continuum, what can be said about the function of English in these magazines? Can Gerritsen et al.'s (2000) claim be confirmed that English is a marker of 'coolness'?

## Method

The methodology of this study is based on Van den Berg's (2017) Master's thesis. Matras's (2009) codeswitching – borrowing continuum functions as the basis for that study.

### *Materials*

I selected six *Tina* magazines from three different points in time: two from the year 2000, two from the year 2009 and two from the year 2019. The reason for analysis of two

magazines per year is to increase the reliability of the sample. *Tina* is a magazine directed at girls in the age range of eight to twelve years old. It is published by Sanoma. The following *Tina* magazines are included in the corpus:

- Niterink, A. (Ed.). (2000, September 29). *Tina*, *34*(39), 1-38.

- Niterink, A. (Ed.). (2000, December 1). *Tina*, *34*(48), 1-40.

- Lommen, J. (Ed.). (2009, April 10). *Tina*, *43*(16), 1-52.

- Lommen, J., & Roep, T. (Eds.). (2009, September 25). *Tina*, *43*(40), 1-52.

- Berkelaar, J. (Ed.). (2019, March 21). *Tina*, *53*(13), 1-52.

- Berkelaar, J. (Ed.). (2019, April 18). *Tina*, *53*(17), 1-52.

From these six issues, all the words and phrases of English origin (as recognisable as English to the researcher ) were collected. If I was unsure about the origin of a word, I looked it up on the website of *Etymologiebank* (2010).Subsequently, each item was coded either C (codeswitch) or B (borrowing) on four of seven categories of Matras's (2009) codeswitching-borrowing continuum. The dimensions of bilinguality and operationality were left out, as in van den Berg's (2017) study. These are already complicated to research in spoken language, and not measurable in written texts. In addition, I decided to omit the dimension of structural integration, since this dimension would be too complicated to treat in this study due to two reasons. Firstly, it is easier to determine whether verbs are structurally integrated than nouns. The general rule in Dutch is that verbs that are borrowed from a different language get the suffix -*en* and are declined by Dutch grammatical rules. Nouns that are borrowed from English receive the suffix '-s' to the word, which is the same as English and makes it difficult to say whether a noun of English origin is structurally integrated in Dutch or not. Secondly, Dutch syntax assigns a zero suffix to verbs in the singular case, which may or may not be counted as a suffix. An example of this is *ik babysit* (I am babysitting), which has a zero suffix, whereas in the plural it would be *wij babysitten* (we are babysitting).  Furthermore,

again emulating van den Berg (2017), elements that were left out of the analysis were advertisements and the colophon. In addition, names of people and companies (such as social media platforms like Instagram), text on clothing, text on posters, song lyrics and names of songs, albums, films, festivals and shows were not included, in order to limit the number of items in the sample to actual discourse  .

<div align="center">*Procedure*</div>

The following section outlines whether a word or phrase is coded as codeswitch or borrowing, closely following van den Berg (2017). Since the continuum is a scale on which items can be placed regarding their proximity to codeswitching and/or borrowing, coded within various categories on the one scale, one single item can occupy different places for the various categories. So, for one category it can be coded as a codeswitch, yet for another as a borrowing.

*Composition*. Phrases or complete sentences are considered codeswitches, except if it forms a single lexical item. Single words are considered borrowings on this dimension.

*Functionality*. If a word or phrase is considered a stylistic choice, it is coded as a codeswitch on this dimension. If it is a default expression in Dutch, it is viewed as a borrowing. To judge whether the word or phrase is a stylistic choice or a default expression, various measures are used. The context the word is in will be taken into account, as well as whether the word has an entry in the Dutch dictionary and potential equivalents or alternatives in Dutch. In case of doubt, especially with the older issues, words are coded as borrowings.

*Unique referent (specificity)*. This dimension determines whether a word or phrase refers to something specific or not. If it does, it is categorised as borrowing, and if not, as codeswitching. As in the previous category, I will look at the context, the dictionary and potential Dutch equivalents.

*Regularity*. If an English word or phrase has an entry in the dictionary, it is deemed a borrowing. If not, it is considered codeswitching. This dimension only looks at whether a word can be found in a Dutch dictionary or not. This dimension and the dimension of functionality seem rather similar, but they differ in the fact that a word can have an entry in the dictionary and still be considered a stylistic choice (the functional criterium), e.g. *boy* instead of *jongen* or *party* instead of *feest*. So, in the 'functionality' category the word *boy* is judged as a codeswitch whereas in the 'regularity' category it is considered a borrowing.

The dictionaries used are: Geerts, G. and den Boon, C. A. (1999) for the 2000 issues, den Boon, C. A. and Geeraerts, D. (2005) for the 2009 issues, and den Boon, T., and Hendrickx, R. (2019) for the 2019 issues.

After the collection and coding of all the items, every word or phrase is marked with two numbers. The first number stands for the number of codeswitching dimensions this particular word or phrase comprises (0-5), and the second for the number of borrowing-dimensions (0-5). Since these the ends of the continuum are binary oppositions, the words can be categorised as either 4/0 (full codeswitch), 3/1, 2/2, 1/3, or 0/4 (full borrowing).

I decided not to include the words *record* (in the meaning of 'top achievement'). I also did not include the words *test(en), film(en), blunder and Mazzelmeidenclubpas*. These words ('club' in *Mazzelmeidenclubpas*) were considered so integrated in the Dutch language that they are almost unrecognisable as English. I also omitted 'swim swin-set' since it was unclear to me what that is.

Results

*Overall results*

Table 1 shows the total number of English words found in each magazine, the number of unique items and the number of pages of the magazine. Words that are combined with Dutch

words or derivations of the same word are considered as one unique item (e.g., *fan*, *voetbalfan*). The only exception to this is the distinction between *manager* and *management* in *Tina* 16 (2009); these are counted as separate items since they are two distinct English words.

| | 39 – 2000 | 48 – 2000 | 16 – 2009 | 40 – 2009 | 13 – 2019 | 17 – 2019 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Number of pages** | 38 | 40 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 52 |
| **Number of unique items (% of total number of tokens)** | 81 (49.69%) | 83 (61.03%) | 85 (63.43%) | 72 (66.06%) | 56 (56.00%) | 75 (63.03%) |
| **Total number of tokens** | 163 | 136 | 134 | 109 | 100 | 119 |

*Table 1. Number of items in six issues of* Tina *over the years of 2000, 2009 and 2019*

Table 1 shows that the number of words and phrases of English origin, as recognisable to the researcher, that were found in these magazines has decreased over the course of nineteen years, from 2000 to 2019, even though the number of pages increased from 38 and 40 in 2000 to 52 in 2009 and 2019. The mean of English items is respectively 149.5, 121.5 and 109.5 for the years 2000, 2009 and 2019.

*Results codeswitching – borrowing continuum*

Table 2 displays the results of the coding of the English words and phrases found in the magazines on four dimensions of Matras's (2009) codeswitching – borrowing continuum, and their respective percentages compared to the total number of items in the same issue.

| C/B | 39 – 2000 | 48 – 2000 | 16 – 2009 | 40 – 2009 | 13 – 2019 | 17 – 2019 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4/0 | 8 (4.91%) | 4 (2.94%) | 2 (1.49%) | 0 (0.00%) | 0 (0.00%) | 0 (0.00%) |
| 3/1 | 11 (6.74%) | 6 (4.41%) | 6 (4.48%) | 3 (2.75%) | 15 (15.00%) | 13 (10.92%) |
| 2/2 | 23 (14.11%) | 18(13.24%) | 13 (9.70%) | 12 (11.01%) | 6 (6.00%) | 7 (5.88%) |
| 1/3 | 33 (20.25%) | 20 (14.71%) | 24 (17.91%) | 12 (11.01%) | 12 (12.00%) | 20 (16.81%) |
| 0/4 | 88 (53.99%) | 88 (64.71%) | 89(66.42%) | 82 (75.23%) | 67 (67.00%) | 80 (67.23%) |

*Table 2. Number of English items coded on four dimensions of Matras's (2009) codeswitching (4/0) – borrowing (0/4) continuum*

One clear result is that in every issue, more than half of the total number of items are on the far end of the borrowing side of the continuum: they have no codeswitching elements whatsoever and are considered full borrowings (category 0/4). This category contains words such as *caravans* (39 – 2000), *CD* (48 – 2000), *ponyrijden* (16 – 2009), *piercing* (40 – 2009), *yes* (13 – 2019), and *tip* (17 – 2019). The numbers in this category stay relatively stable over the years. Taking all issues together, the vast majority of items (more than 75% in every issue) of the found words and phrases are on the borrowing end of the continuum (0/4 and 1/3). The 1/3-category involves words like *gedumpt* (39 – 2000), *trendy* (48 – 2000), *weekendje* (16 – 2009), *cool* (40 – 2009), *DIY* (13 – 2019), and *YouTuber* (17 – 2019). The items in category 2/2 are items that have equally as many codeswitching elements as

borrowing elements to them. Therefore, they cannot be defined as either borrowings or codeswitches, but fall somewhere in the middle of the scale. Instances of items in this category include *boys* (39 – 2000), *showen* (48 – 2000), *baggy* (16 – 2009), *relaxed* (40 – 2009), *shoppen* (13 – 2019), and *challenge* (17 – 2019). In this particular category, all items fall on the borrowing side of the scale on the dimension of structural integration, since they are all single words. The majority of items in this category are also on the borrowing end on the dimension of regularity, which means that they have an entry in the dictionary. Most items in this category fall on the codeswitching end of the scale on the dimensions of functionality and specificity. So, the majority of items are on the borrowing side on the dimensions of structural integration and regularity, and on the codeswitching side on the dimensions of functionality and specificity. There is also a smaller group of items that fall on the borrowing side on composition and specificity, and on the codeswitching side on functionality and regularity. One single item is on the borrowing side on composition and functionality and on the codeswitching side on specificity and regularity. The categories of 3/1 and 4/0 are on the codeswitching side of the continuum. Examples of words that occur in the magazines that have three codeswitching elements and one borrowing element to them are *space ship* (39 – 2000), *kerst-girl* (48 – 2000), *in love* (16 – 2009), *send* (40 – 2009), *rollerskate disco* (13 – 2019), and *bestie* (17 – 2019). All of the items in this category are either single words or, occasionally, multiple words that form a lexical unit. Thus, they all have a borrowing element on the dimension of composition, whereas on the other dimension they are considered codeswitches. The percentage of items which have three codeswitching elements and only one borrowing element to them (3/1) becomes greater in 2019 compared to 2000. Yet, the percentage of 3/1-items drops slightly in the 2009issues. The number of full codeswitches is considerably small in 2000 and disappears completely in 2019. Items that belong to this

category are, for example, *the lucky-ones* (39 – 2000), *very big* ("Wie verdient volgens jou een very big kado?", 48 – 2000), and *I love you* (16 – 2009).

In Table 3 the top-5 of most-occurring English words (for any category) are displayed per issue.

| 39 – 2000 | 48 – 2000 | 16 – 2009 | 40 – 2009 | 13 – 2019 | 17 – 2019 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *(mode)show* (0/4) / *showen* (2/2)(8x) | *cd's* (0/4) / *cd'tje* (0/4) / *cd-hoesje* (0/4) / *Top 40-cd* (0/4) (12x) | *fan(s)* (0/4) (7x) | *tip(s)* (0/4) (9x) | *bestie(s)* (3/1) (11x) | *bestie(s)* (3/1) / *bestietest* (3/1) (9x) |
| ***spacy*** (2/2) (8x) | *boy(s)* (2/2) / *droomboy* (2/2)(7x) | *cool* (1/3) (6x) | *piercing(s/ en)* (0/4) (5x) | *fan(s)* (0/4) / *megafan* (0/4) (6x) | *rappen* (0/4) / *rapper* (0/4) (4x) |
| ***shop(pen)*** (2/2) / *shoptip* (2/2)/ *shopverslaafde n* 2/2) (7x) | *fan(s)* (0/4) / *Vier op een Rij-fans* (1/3) (5x) | *mail(maatje)* (0/4)(4x) | *cool* (1/3) (3x) | *glitter(s)* (0/4) (6x) | *yes* (0/4)(4x) |

| *beauty(rubriek) (0/4) / beauty- of haarbehandeling (2/2) / bjoetiebehandeling (1/3) / bjoetiehoek (0/4) (5x)* | *show (0/4) / showen (2/2) (5x)* | *(sterrenstemmen) quiz (0/4) / tv-quiz (0/4) (4x)* | *dvd(-speler) (0/4) (3x)* | *cornflakes (0/4) (5x)* | *YouTuber (s) (1/3) (4x)* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **computer***(en)* **(0/4) /** **computerspelletje** *(0/4) (5x)* | *dance(muziek) (0/4) (4x)* | *set (0/4) (4x)* | *hamburger (s) (0/4) (3x)* | *(super)cool (1/3) (3x)* | *dad (2/2) (3x)* |

*Table 3. Top-5 of most-used English-origin words in six issues of Tina\**

*If tokens occur the same number of times, they are selected (or not) through alphabetical order.

In Table 4, the words on the codeswitching side of the continuum (4/0 and 3/1) are listed for every issue. These will be discussed in more detail in the next section.

|  | 4/0 | 3/1 |
|---|---|---|
| **39 – 2000** | for Tina-meiden only<br><br>Happy Hair-Hoek (2x)<br><br>hot news<br><br>show it<br><br>spacy interview<br><br>spacy interview<br><br>the lucky-ones | dog food<br><br>[e]xcuse me?<br><br>girlfriend<br><br>in love (2x)<br><br>no way<br><br>party-time<br><br>spaceship (3x)<br><br>Spice Girl-**lovers** |
| **48 – 2000** | [de grootste] BSB-fan on earth<br><br>cool…not<br><br>lots of love<br><br>very big | City Girl<br><br>happy<br><br>interesting<br><br>kerst-**girl**<br><br>not<br><br>slowen |
| **16 – 2009** | I♥<br>I love you | girls<br><br>girlz<br><br>hey<br><br>in love<br><br>love<br><br>polish |
| **40 – 2009** | - | send<br><br>SPANGirls |

| | | SPANGuys |
|---|---|---|
| **13 – 2019** | - | bestie (8x) |
| | | besties (3x) |
| | | doodle |
| | | like |
| | | rollerskate disco |
| | | sisters |
| **17 – 2019** | - | bestie (4x) |
| | | besties (4x) |
| | | bestietest |
| | | go |
| | | please |
| | | unicorn |

*Table 4. English words and phrases on the codeswitching end (4/0 and 3/1) of the codeswitching-borrowing continuum.*

## Discussion

According to the results presented above, the use of English decreased in *Tina* magazines that were collected from the time periods of 2000, 2009 and 2019. This is contrary to what was expected at the beginning of this study. Since the influence of English on Dutch society is a contentious issue causing much debate, it is remarkable that the results of this study suggest a decline of English.

Edwards (2016) states that "English loanwords and phrases [in Dutch newspapers and magazines] are used for new technologies and buzzwords, to seem 'hip' or 'cool', and for snob appeal" (p. 57). An explanation for the decrease of English in the present study could be

that English is currently seen as less prestigious by young Dutch teenagers. This conclusion fits with the 'prestige' hypothesis (Matras, 2009). This hypothesis entails that if a language (in this case English) is deemed prestigious or socially dominant by speakers of another speech community, elements of this language are imitated (p. 150). Thus, if English has indeed become less prestigious in Dutch society, a logical result would be the decrease of English in Dutch discourse. However, it is the question if this is really the case, or if something else is happening.

It is worthwhile to especially take a closer look at the words and phrases on the codeswitching end of Matras's (2009) continuum, as displayed in Table 4. Since borrowings often have no equivalent in Dutch, there is a clear, functional reason to use those. This is different for codeswitches, which can have more complicated motivations to be used and can on first sight even seem to be used randomly, without a solid function. Indeed, the codeswitches collected in this study seem to be rather ornamental than functional in their use, as was already stated by Gerritsen et al. (2000). This is in line with Matras's (2009) theory that codeswitching is a more conscious and strategic decision made by the bilingual speaker to fully use his or her linguistic repertoire. Codeswitches often have Dutch equivalents, yet meanings are always slightly different in either language. All of the codeswitches have Dutch equivalents that approximate the intended meaning, but for most words the English adds an extra layer of 'coolness' and youthfulness. "[F]or Tina-meiden only" (17 – 2000) sounds more playful than Dutch 'alleen voor Tina-meiden', "kerst-girl" (48 – 2000) sounds more fancy than 'kerstmeisje', "I love you" (16 – 2009) is less serious than 'ik hou van jou', and "rollerskate disco" (13 – 2019) can be interpreted as more attractive than 'rolschaatsdisco'.

Furthermore, it is striking that this study has a remarkably different outcome than van den Berg's (2017) Master's thesis, on which this study design is based. Since van den Berg (2017) focused on magazines directed at middle-aged people and above, an interesting

comparison can be made. One interpretation of these differences can be that the times have changed, and maybe are still changing, regarding views on English in Dutch society. Whereas the older generations in the Netherlands may still view English as a prestige language that enhances the Dutch language, the outcome of this study suggests that this has become less so for the younger generations. There might be a shift going on from English being prestigious to more appreciation for the Dutch language by young people. However, since the codeswitches mentioned above suggest that English is used for the effect of playfulness, this is not very likely. Indeed, the use of English codeswitches can even be seen as affected, exactly because English has become normalised in the Dutch language, thus lacking in exclusivity, which is a marker of 'coolness'.

Taking all this into account, it is important to remember that borrowing and especially codeswitching are complex phenomena and often have complicated and intricate motivations. As Bullock and Toribio (2009) state, "the individual and social factors that are implicated in CS [i.e. codeswitching] are complex and difficult to isolate". Of course this is even more so in speech than in writing, yet it is still good to acknowledge that this is also an issue whilst studying written texts. And Gardner-Chloros argues that "CS embodies, or corresponds with, a wide range of sociolinguistic factors that interact or operate simultaneously. We should therefore be wary of ascribing particular 'reasons' to particular instances of CS, as these are likely to present only a partial picture" (p. 113).

A limitation of this study is that the coding of the English words and phrases can be viewed as somewhat subjective, especially the dimensions of functionality and specificity. Whereas one person may consider the word 'shoppen', for example, as a stylistic choice, another might feel that the word has taken on such a different meaning from Dutch 'winkelen' that it has become a regular expression. The selection of words from the magazines also ties in with the point of subjectivity. Words that I did not recognise as English could have been

missed. Another potential confound is the fact that *Tina* is, of course, produced by editors who are older than the target group. This means that it is probable that they have made different language choices than a teenager would have done, even though they try to adapt to the target group. Language choices could also be due to editorial decisions. To rule out the possibility that a particular (chief) editor diverges from the societal language norm due to individual preferences, issues from before and after an editorial switch should be researched. Furthermore, an important possible explanation for the decrease of codeswitches found in this study could be that in the more recent editions of the dictionary, more English words have been taken up. This means that there are indeed theoretically fewer codeswitches, but it actually indicates an increased influence of English in the Dutch language. It is also important to mention that sometimes words can be borrowed within a specific subculture, but not be taken up in the wider speech community. The word *bestie*, for example, is used in the 2019 *Tina* issues, but seems to be a word that is rather age-specific. Therefore, it is important that media directed at different age groups are investigated.

More research is needed to investigate if the trend of the decrease of English in Dutch discourse is similar in other print media and in broader discourse in society. If that can be proven, it could change the public debate on the influence of English in Dutch society.

Since this study is focused on magazines directed at girls, it would be interesting to conduct further research by investigating Dutch magazines directed at boys. Gardner-Chloros states that "[v]arious studies show that CS cannot be correlated in any direct way with gender, but intersects with a large number of intervening variables which are themselves connected with gender issues" (p. 107). Thus, investigating magazines directed at males can give a more inclusive and coherent overview of English borrowings and codeswitches in Dutch discourse.

Conclusion

This study investigated the use of English in *Tina* magazines from 2000, 2009 and 2019. The results of this investigation were striking: the use of English words and phrases that were found, decreased over the course of nineteen years. Most words are located on the borrowing side of Matras's (2009) codeswitching – borrowing continuum, which means that they are almost or fully incorporated into the Dutch language. The words and phrases on the codeswitching end of the continuum were few, and full codeswitches even disappeared completely in 2009. These results give rise to many questions regarding the influence of English in the Netherlands. Therefore, further research is highly recommended. As cited before, "[a]dolescents are the linguistic movers and shakers [...] and as such a prime source of information about linguistic change" (Eckert, 1997, p. 52 as cited in Drange, 2009). It seems that a shift in the use of English may be taking place in Dutch teenagers, thus indicating a greater shift in Dutch society.

References

Appel, R., & Noordervliet, N. (2019, March 19). Oprukkend Engels maakt van Nederlands een B-taal. *De Volkskrant*. Retrieved from http://volkskrant.nl

Bullock, B. E., & Toribio, A. J. (2009). Themes in the study of code-switching. In Bullock, B. E., & Toribio, A. J. (Eds.), *Linguistic code-switching* (pp. 1-17). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Den Boon, T., & Geeraerts, D. (2005). *Groot woordenboek der Nederlandse taal* (14$^{th}$ ed.). Utrecht, the Netherlands: Van Dale Lexicografie.

Den Boon, T., & Hendrickx, R. (2019). *Dikke Van Dale online.* Retrieved from http://vandale.nl

Drange, E. M. (2009). Anglicisms in the informal speech of Norwegian and Chilean

    adolescents. In Jørgensen, A. M., & Stenström, A. B. (Eds.), *Youngspeak in a*

    *Multilingual Perspective*, (pp. 161-176). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins

    Publishing Company.

Edwards, A. (2016). *English in the Netherlands: Functions, forms and attitudes.* Amsterdam,

    the Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Gardner-Chloros, P. (2009). Sociolinguistic factors in code-switching. In Bullock, B. E., &

    Toribio, A. J. (Eds.), *Linguistic code-switching* (pp. 97-113). New York, NY:

    Cambridge University Press.

Geerts, G., & Den Boon, T. (Eds.) (1999). *Groot woordenboek der Nederlandse taal* (13th

    ed.). Utrecht, the Netherlands: Van Dale Lexicografie.

Gerritsen, M., Korzilius, H., van Meurs, F., & Gijsbers, I. (2000). English in Dutch

    commercials: Not understood and not appreciated. *Journal of Advertising Research*,

    *40*(4), 17-31. doi:10.2501/JAR-40-4-17-31

Grosjean, F. (1996). Living with two languages and two cultures. In I. Parasnis (Ed.), *Cultural*

    *and language diversity and the deaf experience* (pp. 20-37). Cambridge, England:

    Cambridge University Press.

Ieven, B., & Korsten, F. W. (2019, April 9). Engels is de wetenschapstaal, Nederlands is de

    vertaling. *NRC Handelsblad*. Retrieved from http://nrc.nl

Matras, Y. (2009). *Language contact*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Riionheimo, H., Kok, M., Paulasto, H., & Meriläinen, L. (2014). *Language contacts at the crossroads of disciplines*. Newcastle upon Tyne, England: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Van Meurs, F. (2010). *English in job advertisements in the Netherlands: Reasons, use and effects* (Doctoral dissertation).Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics.. Retrieved from https://www.lotpublications.nl/Documents/263_fulltext.pdf. (LOT number 263)

Van Oostendorp, M. (2012). Bilingualism versus multilingualism in the Netherlands. *Language Problems and Language Planning, 36*(3), 252-272. doi:10.1075/lplp.36.3.04van

Van Velzen, J. (2017, May 8). Nederlandse taal bezwijkt helemaal niet onder Engels. *Trouw*. Retrieved from http://trouw.nl

Van den Berg, S. (2017). '*Stay calm and blijf opletten': Een onderzoek naar Engels taalgebruik in Nederlandse tijdschriften* (Master's thesis). Utrecht: Universiteit Utrecht. Retrieved from https://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/352401

Van der Sijs, N. (2010). *Etymologiebank*. Retrieved from http://etymologiebank.nl

Appendix

The Excel file containing the data collected for this study is sent to the supervisor by e-mail.