Putting local dialect in the mix: Indexicality and stylization in a TikTok challenge

Kristel Doreleijers [a,b,]*, Jos Swanenberg [a,b]

[a] *Tilburg University, School of Humanities and Digital Sciences, Department of Culture Studies, PO Box 90153, 5000 LE, Tilburg, the Netherlands*
[b] *Meertens Institute, Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, PO Box 10855, 1001 EW, Amsterdam, the Netherlands*

A R T I C L E   I N F O

A B S T R A C T

This paper investigates the role of local dialect forms and other semiotic signs in languagecultural practices on social media in the southern Dutch province North Brabant. Although dialect use is severely decreasing in this area, we find abundant dialect features in present-day media productions, but these are not simply some last remains. By conducting a qualitative discourse analysis of a carnivalesque music video (2020), we argue that non-linguistic resources and co-occurring dialect features are enregistered as recognizably 'Brabantish' for the purpose of indexing place-based identities. Moreover, we show that reproduction on TikTok (2021) takes place through recontextualization and indexical stance-taking.

1. Introduction

It is well known that new media have had impact on the spread of linguistic innovations: "People hear new words and phrases on TV, and sometimes start using them themselves" (Trudgill, 2014, p. 220). However, in recent years, increasing mediatization, including the widespread use of social media, has strengthened the interest in and the call for the normalization of mediated discourse in sociolinguistic research (Androutsopoulos, 2016, p. 298). This paper discusses the role of local dialect forms and other semiotic signs as a resource for 'remix' practices and products (Knobel and Lankshear, 2008) in Dutch internet culture. It takes a specific example of such a remix practice, in which cultural artifacts are combined and manipulated into new kinds of creative blends, to demonstrate how linguistic and semiotic material becomes recognized and regrouped, i.e., enregistered, by actors to index locality (Agha, 2005, 2007, p. 81; Johnstone, 2011a, 2011b, 2014, 2016). The sociolinguistic practice that is central to this paper is the *verrekte koekwaus* challenge ('damn *koekwaus* challenge') that flourished around November 2021 on the social media channel TikTok.

The challenge is based on the music video *Koekwaus* that was published on YouTube by the social media account *RoekOe Brabant* in January 2020.[1] The song is rooted in the southern Dutch province of North Brabant, which is reflected in the regional carnivalesque 'oompah' music, typically involving brass instruments, that is combined with linguistic elements from the local language, i.e., the Brabantish dialect (cf. Cornips et al., 2017, on the region of Limburg). The word *koekwaus* refers to a

---

* Corresponding author. Tilburg University, School of Humanities and Digital Sciences, Department of Culture Studies, PO Box 90153, 5000 LE, Tilburg, the Netherlands.

E-mail addresses: K.G.A.Doreleijers@tilburguniversity.edu (K. Doreleijers), A.P.C.Swanenberg@tilburguniversity.edu (J. Swanenberg).

[1] RoekOe Brabant – Koekwaus music video: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YkiWhtFRPzk.

person who is qualified (at least by the speaker) as foolish or crazy ('idiot'), and it often appears with the local intensifying adjective *verrekte* (Reelick et al., 1993; Swanenberg, 2007). The word has long been part of the dialects of North Brabant, alongside equivalents such as *waus/wous,* but became popular around 2010 because of the (fiction) television series *New Kids* (2007–2011) and the subsequent cinema movies *New Kids Turbo* (2010) and *New Kids Nitro* (2011). The series and movies were about a group of loitering youths in the small Brabantish neighborhood *Maaskantje.* The language use of the New Kids was considered to be a recognizable leveled variety of the Brabantish dialect, both for people inside and outside the province, although often exaggerated and quite vulgar (Swanenberg, 2019, p. 92; Wagemakers, 2017, p. 95–99). Through the iconic use of the mock name *koekwaus* (*verrekte mongol, verrekte koekwaus!*) by the characters in the series, the dialect word became a shibboleth, i.e., a linguistic identifier for the local vernacular of youths in the countryside, and was frequently reproduced on social media, for example in memes, and on merchandise products such as T-shirts, or mouth masks during the COVID pandemic (Doreleijers et al., 2021a).

The music video was first shared on a number of local Brabantish Facebook and Instagram pages but did not get much attention, perhaps also because carnival was cancelled in 2021 due to the COVID-19 measures. In November 2021, after almost two years, this suddenly changed when the *verrekte koekwaus-challenge* was launched, which went viral on TikTok (about 6700 videos in March 2022).[2] In the spinoffs, actors (especially young women) use part of the chorus of the song in short videos for lip synchronization ('lip sync'), followed by electronic music and the actors rolling their eyes very fast by means of a special TikTok filter.

In this paper, we reflect on the sudden success of the song and the social meaning of its reproduction on another social media channel, i.e., from YouTube to TikTok. In doing so, we aim to answer the following question: Why is a social media production in this specific form of language and culture so attractive? To answer this question, we investigate all semiotic resources, i.e., layout, use of images, sounds, and written and sung texts, to uncover the characteristics of the original media production (YouTube) and their function in its spinoffs (TikTok). Simultaneously, we discuss what these languagecultural practices (cf. Agar, 1994, p. 60) tell us about dialect use and pride, in particular the use of hyperdialectisms, shibboleths and non-standard spellings, in an era mainly characterized by (local) dialect loss. We show how practices of online dialect performance contribute to dialect revival on a sociolinguistic identity marking level, as specific local dialect features become associated with socially recognizable personae (Agha, 2003, p. 243). Actors make use of local language to show that they identify with the region or the people living there, i.e., local place-making, often in a parodic manner (cf. Cornips et al., 2018).

However, place-making does not necessarily have to be parodic. This is clearly illustrated by Auer (2013, p. 16) who defines place-making as an "emotional attachment" in which anonymous space is turned into "somebody's" place that can be described as "a location for which certain people have a "sense"." Furthermore, Auer (2013, p. 16–17) calls for a more thorough investigation of the use of dialect features for place-making within an era of New Regionalism, thereby pointing at the current trend of positive re-evaluation of traditional regions, including their local languages, within their nation states. Regional identity discourses seem to have gained force as a reaction to state centrism and globalization. As a consequence, Auer (2013, p. 17) expects modern speakers, for whom the dialect primarily functions as a 'gatekeeper' for the regional community, to deploy a small number of highly salient regional features, also in communication with outsiders. The present paper aims to provide new insights into this specific level of place-making.

The paper is structured as follows. First, Section 2 describes the (socio)linguistic state of affairs of the dialects in the Dutch province of North Brabant and provides a scaffolding of the key concepts that are used in the analysis of the music video. Section 3 then outlines the context of the media productions discussed here, with a focus on the sociolinguistic background of the creator of the original music video production and its audience. In Section 4, we present a discourse analysis of the song's lyrics and all other semiotic resources. This section provides a detailed description of the music video and an analysis of three categories of local dialect features: hyperdialectisms, shibboleths and non-standard spellings. The results are discussed in terms of meaning-making: enregisterment, i.e., the process of linking linguistic elements to social and place-based identities on social media. Subsequently, Section 5 concisely analyzes the spinoffs of the music video on TikTok. Finally, both media productions are discussed and synthesized in Section 6. Elaborating on the discourse analyses in Sections 4 and 5, we bring forward two additional theoretical concepts. We argue why intertextuality, the connections between texts over time and synchronically within repertoires, and (re)contextualization, placing texts in a context and thereby adding pragmatic meanings associated with a semiotic act, seem to be key for qualitative research into local language use in the online-offline nexus (Blommaert, 2005, 2022; Johnstone, 2018).

2. The (socio)linguistic context of North Brabant

In the province of North Brabant, the third largest province of the Netherlands with approximately 2.5 million inhabitants, dialect use is declining rapidly (Swanenberg and Van Hout, 2013). A recent study by Statistics Netherlands shows that dialect is the home language in only a quarter of the households in North Brabant (Schmeets and Cornips, 2022). Researchers claim that from the second half of the twentieth century onward (mainly due to the establishment of school communities and increasing mobility) local dialects are given up in favor of varieties with a larger geographical reach, so-called *regiolects* (regional dialects) or *koines* (Britain, 2009; Hoppenbrouwers, 1990). Dialects undergo leveling: structural differences between

---

[2] See: https://www.tiktok.com/music/Koekwaus-6786248805319706625.

the standard and the dialects decrease, and a continuum with intermediate variants evolves (i.e., 'diaglossia', Auer, 2005, 2011). However, relatively dialect-colored speech is still used in the domains that traditionally were reserved for the dialects: informal situations that require the expression of local solidarity and render covert prestige.[3] More standard-like speech remains reserved for formal situations that require the acknowledgement of status and render overt prestige. Especially traditional dialect vocabulary is disappearing, and because many current and future speakers no longer have a (full) command of dialect grammar, structural shifts are occurring as well. This calls for a more dynamic view of language. Languages are no longer seen as distinct and homogeneous, but as part of (individual) plurilingual repertoires with features from all available languages from which speakers can draw, resulting in a new terminology to address the intensification of diversity (Pennycook, 2016, p. 201). This understanding of thinking and writing 'between' languages, as described by García and Wei (2014), is often also defined as a practice of (poly)languaging (Jørgensen et al., 2015).[4] Within this feature-based approach, individual language elements, i.e., features, are considered to be the basic unit of analysis, and may carry indexical meanings. These indexical meanings (i.e., associations with values, speakers and places) are fluid and negotiable, and different speakers can ascribe different meanings to the same feature.

From a polylanguaging perspective, speakers combining elements from different origin (i.e., more than one 'language') is not seen as deviating behavior, but it is seen as inherent to the human activity of using language (Jørgensen et al., 2015, p. 27). However, speakers differ in the ways they use linguistic and semiotic elements in a strategic and meaningful way. This implies that the question is not which languages are used by a speaker in a specific context, but rather which linguistic features they resort to, how these are used to achieve their goals, and which associations these choices evoke. In the sociolinguistics of digitally mediated communication, repertoires are considered a key concept. Linguistic repertoires (in a verbal sense) are supplemented by the affordances of digital communication, which implies that digital language practices draw on rich and multifaceted semiotic resources (Lillis, 2013, p. 28). Linguistic repertoires are not only enriched with pictorial signs such as emoji, but also with multimodality (i.e., images, graphics, colors) and graphic arrangement (layout). In an era of digital communication, it is important to acknowledge that repertoires are not restricted to spoken varieties. Therefore, repertoires "should include the specific resources people control for performing *all* the communicative functions within their scope" (Blommaert, 2013, p. 454).

Thinking of the Brabantish dialects as part of an individual and dynamic repertoire (i.e., feature-based approach) rather than a distinct code (i.e., language as a distinct 'entity') for communication, can improve our understanding of contemporary linguistic practices. Convergence to Dutch has increasingly led speakers to use specific features of their dialect on an occasional basis as a stylistic feature, 'a sauce' as it were, to make their language use more local. Speakers differ in the Brabantish features they have in their repertoire, leading to different individual linguistic choices and outcomes (Blommaert, 2013, p. 453; Mutsaers and Swanenberg, 2012). The choices they make can be sociolinguistically meaningful, especially when they are in some way 'unexpected', i.e., deviating from the traditional dialect. The current way of speaking dialect by Brabantish youth is often referred to as 'the new dialect' because the language use contains many hyperdialectisms, i.e., overgeneralizations of traditional dialect features (Swanenberg, 2014). Typical dialect features are exaggerated, i.e., used in contexts where they do not belong historically (Hinskens, 2014, p. 114), to emphasize a deviation from the standard (Lenz, 2004), in this case Standard Dutch. An example of these hyperdialectisms are overgeneralizations of the typical Brabantish diminutive suffix -*ske* (e.g., *clubske* instead of *clubke* 'small club'), as the -*ske* morpheme is only applied after a velar sound according to the traditional grammar rules (Swanenberg, 2020). Another example concerns the application of the adnominal marker for masculine lexical gender on determiners such as (in) definite articles – *unne(n)-de(n)* – preceding masculine singular nouns, where its form, i.e., with or without the binding-*n*, is governed by phonological constraints (e.g., *unnen hond* – *den hond* 'a-the dog' and *unne koning* – *de koning* 'a-the king') (De Schutter, 2013; Hoppenbrouwers, 1983). In contemporary Brabantish, the masculine suffix is increasingly used with feminine, neuter and plural nouns, thus stretching the boundaries of the dialect (Doreleijers et al., 2020, 2021b). Hyperdialectisms may be the result of linguistic insecurity and insufficient dialect knowledge: "speakers who hold dialect as an important part of their cultural identity but whose grammar is different from that of the older speakers, attempt to distinguish themselves from community outsiders through their "knowledge" of that traditional dialect" (Jamieson, 2020, p. 23).

For this reason, shibboleths, traditional dialect forms that make the language use of speakers recognizably local, are suitable to be the subject of hyperdialectisms (Agha, 2007, p. 81; Taeldeman, 2003). A shibboleth can form the basis for a hyperdialectism, because it is often symbolic for dialectal speech, i.e., shibboleths are "socially diagnostic in that they betray the regional and/or sociocultural origin of a speaker" (Polzenhagen and Xiaoyan, 2014, p. 26). Written shibboleths on social media can be understood as traces, i.e., forms that are unintentionally produced and give off sociolinguistic information about the author, but also as emblems, i.e., strategically deployed forms that in some way contrast with their standard variants (see Hillewaert, 2015, p. 206, for a more detailed explanation). The distinction between traces and emblems can be modelled against Labov's (1972) distinction between indicators, markers and stereotypes, as well as to Silverstein's (2003) upgrade through indexical orders. While first-order indexicality (cf. indicator) indicates linguistic forms that are linked to specific sociolinguistic contexts from the outside by linguistic observation, second-order indexicality (cf. marker) indicates linking that takes place from the inside, i.e., by the group members themselves. In addition, third-order indexicality (cf. stereotype)

---

[3] We suggest that this can also involve dynamic prestige (cf. Grondelaers and Van Gent, 2019), see also section 6 'global, young, modern'.

[4] Alongside polylanguaging (or 'polylingual languaging') concepts of translanguaging and metrolanguaging are frequently used (see Pennycook, 2016, for a brief overview).

points to the perception of linguistic forms as 'emblematic' for a given sociolinguistic context, which are therefore used in practices of stylization (cf. Coupland, 2001). Shibboleths are recognized not only outside the community (first-order indexicality) but also within the community (second order indexicality) as typical of the community's language use. By using a shibboleth, a speaker can show where they come from without much effort. As such, shibboleths point to (supposed) identities. In this (iterative) process, using a specific linguistic element can become emblematic for a specific value, speaker or place. Examples of shibboleths from the Brabantish dialects are the second person singular pronoun *gij* instead of Dutch *jij* ('you'), the verb form of the second person (singular and plural) in inversion structures, e.g., interrogative sentences, such as *hedde* instead of *heb je* ('have you'),[5] the use of the possessive pronoun *ons* 'our' preceding proper names and kinship terms, the diminutive suffix *-ke* instead of *-je*, e.g., *clubke* instead of *clubje* ('small club'), and also lexical items such as the farewell greeting *houdoe* ('bye') or the previous mentioned mock name *koekwaus* ('idiot').

Another example of frequently used Brabantish linguistic features concerns non-standard spelling and is typical of digital written language. In this case, visual difference to the standard orthography indexes vernacular speech, i.e., it is used to express a distinction from the standard. This practice often has a phonographic basis, pointing to spelling variants that index spoken language features (Eisenstein, 2015). "Writing with an accent", as it is called by Hillewaert (2015), is a selective process, as actors deliberately select variants from their repertoires to reflect regional variation. They do not make use of the full-fledged inventory of features, but have a preference for features that are most identifiable as belonging to the dialect (Hillewaert, 2015, p. 202). In the North Brabantish context, regional variation reflected in non-standard spelling can for example be seen in lexical items with *t*-deletion such as *wa, nie, meej* instead of *wat, niet, met* ('what', 'not', 'with') or in vowels such as *naor* instead of *naar* ('to').

Hyperdialectisms, shibboleths and non-standard spelling are three categories of local language features that play a prominent role in the repertoires of contemporary Brabantish speakers. At the same time, they are recognizable to non-Brabantish speakers as regionally colored spoken or written language. In some contexts, we expect these features to appear frequently, as language use can function there as an act of identity, i.e., a mechanism of inclusion and exclusion through language that plays an important role in the connection and identification with the region (cf. Bucholtz and Hall, 2005; Johnstone, 2016). Speakers who want to show that they come from Brabant are expected to align their language use with the content message they convey. Often, regional language use is augmented in a playful or parodical way, as a practice of stylization and social stance-taking (Coupland, 2001; Jaffe, 2009). We see this, for example, in series or films in which Brabantish characters play an important role, in the performances of artists such as stand-up comedians, during the annual carnival festival, or on social media accounts that aim at expressing the culture of the province, region or a specific city, village or neighborhood. The use of local language in performance practices can reveal how specific linguistic items can contribute to indexing locality, i.e., the ways in which a speaker can express regional belonging through language and other interrelated semiotic resources (Johnstone, 2011b, 2014). The basic assumption here is that by using language 'that makes no sense' from a traditional point of view (by deviating from the traditional dialect), speakers can still convey a local or regional message that is authentic at its core (Cornips et al., 2018). The question that then arises is exactly which linguistic features are magnified and why?

In the following section, we will elaborate on one example of performance in the North Brabant region. The example we use is *RoekOe Brabant*, an account that is active on various social media channels and is also the producer of the music video *Koekwaus*. We will first deal with the social and linguistic background of *RoekOe Brabant*, before moving on to the discourse analysis of the lyrics of the music video *Koekwaus* and the associated semiotic signs in Section 4 (cf. Johnstone, 2016; Cornips and De Rooij, 2020).

3. RoekOe Brabant[6]

In 2010, a group of friends dressed up as *duivenmelkers* 'pigeon fanciers' during the annual carnival festival in the town of *Kaaiendonk* in West Brabant. Wearing a jacket, corduroy trousers, loafers, flat cap and pigeon on the shoulder, they founded the playful association *Kaaiendonkse Duivenmelkers Vereniging* (KDV) *Roek-Oe*. It is a typical carnival phenomenon that place names are replaced during the festival, and in this case *Kaaiendonk* is the carnival name for the Brabantish town of Oosterhout. The friends decided to create a page on the Dutch social networking website Hyves (available from 2004 to 2013) on which they shared photos of their carnival adventures. When the festival was over, one of the friends decided to keep the page and post jokes on it. The jokes were about the city of Oosterhout and centered on the character of *De Oosterhouter*, a stereotyped inhabitant of the city. With the rise of Facebook and the discontinuation of Hyves in 2013, the Hyves page was exchanged for a Facebook page. Originally, all jokes were written in Dutch, but after a poll in which followers could vote on the language of the jokes, it was decided that the posts on the page would henceforth be in Brabantish dialect. At that time, the name of the page was *KDV Roek-Oe*. The problem with that name, however, was in the abbreviation that also means *kinderdagverblijf* 'child day care

---

[5] The grammatical form consists of a verb in the second person (singular or plural) and a pronoun. The pronoun *ge* (a 'weak' form of *gij*) is enclitic, i.e., attached to the verb. If the subject is stressed, the full form of the pronoun is used, *hedde gij*, which is then a case of pronoun doubling (Swanenberg, 2019, p. 98).

[6] The information in this section was obtained through an article of Boeijen (2018) and an interview with George, the initiator of *RoekOe Brabant*, on 23 June 2021. This interview was part of the data collection for this study. The interview was conducted by the first author of this paper, transcribed afterwards and stored for the long term in the digital archive of the Meertens Institute. Informed consent has been obtained. The data are accessible to other researchers under collection id 1144.

center' in Dutch. Therefore, the name was changed into *Roek-Oe Brabant*, coincidentally enlarging the areal reach, which resulted in a significant increase in the number of followers from 6000 in 2013 to 80,000 in 2022. The account is now also active on Instagram and has about 10,000 followers there. *Roek-Oe* is an onomatopoeia, as it refers to the sound a pigeon makes, which is also known as *koeren* 'cooing', and *Roek-Oe* also means *ik ruik je* (*ik roek oe* – 'I smell you') in Brabantish dialect. In the meantime, the original hyphen in the name has disappeared and the spelling has been changed to *RoekOe* for the practical reason that the hyphen made it difficult to use the name in hashtags on social media.

Of the group of friends who once started the account, only one is still active in 2022. This is a 49-year-old man, George, who was born and still lives in Oosterhout. He was raised in an upper middle class milieu and now works as a sales representative. His *RoekOe Brabant* activities are a hobby and not a steady source of income (apart from a limited income from the sale of merchandise). What is striking, is that George indicates that he was not brought up with dialect. He did not speak dialect with his parents, but learned it later in life by speaking it with friends. He associates dialect use with an in-group setting, conviviality and humor, three key aspects of carnival celebrations. He indicates how a joke may come across very differently in dialect than in standard language, for example *gij zal oewe dikke kop ok wel houwe* ('you will keep your fat head') when someone in the group orders unhealthy food. Saying this in Dutch, *jij zal je dikke kop ook wel houden,* sounds much harsher and less funny. Local language use fits very well with the carnivalesque origin of *RoekOe Brabant*, because "during carnival and carnivalesque events, local ways of speaking may index and authenticate a specific kind of localness and at the same time denaturalize other kinds of localness" (Cornips and De Rooij, 2020, p. 344). George does not regard himself a 'perfect' or 'native' dialect speaker. His dialect use is based on his linguistic intuition and the input from his social environment, as he claims to speak and write dialect based on the (perceived) authentic vernacular he hears from more 'traditional' speakers around him. Sometimes he searches the internet for the correct spelling of a certain word, but because there is no standardized orthography for Brabantish dialect, and differences between the eastern and western parts of the province are quite large, he is often still insecure of his dialect writing.

The aim of *RoekOe Brabant* is to promote the province's 'Burgundian' (exuberant) and convivial character. In doing so, George wants to resist another stereotypical image that is often conjured up when referring to the province of North Brabant: the rough and burly image, with foul language (for example in the earlier mentioned television series *New Kids*). He wants to showcase his pride in the region he comes from and contribute to the commodification of what is perceived as local and authentic. Besides the Brabantish language, non-linguistic cultural practices also play an important role, such as food, for example the typical *worstenbroodje* 'sausage roll', and the (design of the) Brabantish flag. The main genres of *RoekOe Brabant* are memes (Wagener, 2021), in which images are combined with short texts in Brabantish language, and digital 'tiles' with Brabantish jokes and aphorisms (for an analysis of this practice, see Doreleijers, forthcoming). The subjects of the posts vary, but themes that often recur are language, food, and carnival. More classic jokes are also posted, often with a (slightly) sexist undertone.

Another recurring aspect in *RoekOe Brabant* is the contrast between the *Brabander,* referring to a person coming from and/or living in the province of North Brabant, and the *Bovensloter,* referring to a person from above the rivers, that is, a place of residence above the rivers *Rijn/Waal* and *Maas.* Traditionally, these rivers have been a natural dividing line between the north and the south of the Netherlands, a division that has also been associated with the perceived personal characteristics of the people who live there. In general, people from above the rivers are characterized as sober and modest, and people from below the rivers as lively and cheerful (Bijsterveld, 2014). *RoekOe Brabant* plays with this contrast by regularly juxtaposing the *Brabander* and the *Bovensloter.* An opposition that is (partly) accompanied by this is that between the center of the Netherlands, i.e., the provinces of North Holland, South Holland and Utrecht (including the cities of Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague and Utrecht) – also called the *Randstad*, and the periphery, the *Landrand.* The province of North Brabant stands in contrast to the *Randstad* as more peripheral, although the rise of the flourishing high-tech industry, Philips, ASML and the university TU/e in the Eindhoven region is slowly changing this image. The magnification of this contrast, i.e., playing with the dichotomy between the urban and the peripheral, and the associated ideological (stereotypical) meanings (Swanenberg, 2019, p. 106), is particularly successful due to developments in new media that "made people in the periphery more aware than ever before of languagecultural differences between themselves and those occupying the center" (Cornips and De Rooij, 2020, p. 348).

Despite the strong orientation on the province of North Brabant, *RoekOe Brabant* also wants to appeal to social media users from other provinces or even people abroad. The only prerequisite is that they have sympathy for Brabant. For example, there are also emigrants among the followers who used to live in Brabant and follow the page out of 'homesickness' for the region. In order to be accessible also to non-dialect speakers and dialect speakers from other regions, the account indicates that all texts are written in (fictitious) *Algemeen Beschaafd Brabants* ('Common Civilized Brabantish'), referring to the ubiquitous designation of Standard Dutch as *ABN: Algemeen Beschaafd Nederlands* ('Common Civilized Dutch'). The aim is for the texts to be easily and fluently readable by everyone, even *Bovensloters.* This means that the audience does not have to be local to make sense of the self-presentation of *RoekOe Brabant.*

4. The semiotics and lyrics of the music video *Koekwaus*

On 23 January 2020, the music video *Koekwaus* was published on the video platform YouTube. The music video was uploaded by *Studio Apollo 98*, a music studio in Boxtel, a municipality in central North Brabant. The song was written and produced in collaboration with George (*RoekOe Brabant*) and others. The song was also published on the streaming service Spotify. In April 2023, the 2.46-minute YouTube video had more than 107,000 views. In this section, we first (Section 4.1) zoom in on the story told in the music video, conducting a step-by-step semiotic analysis that includes a detailed description

of the local dialect forms and non-linguistic local signs that are used. In the second part of this section (Section 4.2), we present a linguistic analysis of the song's lyrics, distinguishing between the previous outlined categories of hyperdialectisms, shibboleths and non-standard spellings. Finally, Section 4.3 brings both analyses together in the context of meaning-making.

4.1. Semiotic analysis of the music video

The song starts with a 'oompah' melody, typical for carnival music in North Brabant, however the rhythm is more up-tempo than is usually the case in traditional carnival songs.[7] The video consists of an animation that starts with a shot where we see a logo against the background of an orange, spinning sun (see Fig. 1). The logo is also known as the profile picture of *RoekOe Brabant*'s social media accounts at the time, and contains the red-white checkered pattern of the Brabantish flag and the name of *RoekOe Brabant,* with *RoekOe* in a black-white Comic-Sans-like font, contributing to a humorous effect. Over the years, the Comic Sans font has often been used as a gimmick that indicates a lack of taste and technological knowledge (Turner, 2017). The use of the font has been considered childish (and girlish) or even objectionable. This is for example commented upon in memes and merchandise products. It is argued that the use of the Comic Sans font may indicate a so-called typeface persona that refers to culturally created and socially situated identity (Turner, 2017, p. 90). Therefore, it is likely that the use of the Comic-Sans-like font in this video is not a random choice but a meaningful semiotic act.

The logo also features a typical Brabantish saying: *Witte wel, witte nie!* 'Do you know, don't you know'. This saying is recognizably Brabantish because of the second person pronoun (singular) that is integrated into the verb via cliticization in an inverted clause *witte* (*weet je,* 'you know') and the non-standard spellings of *wit* instead of *weet* ('know') and *nie* instead of *niet* (*t*-deletion; 'not'). For example, in carnival songs or in locally organized quizzes the saying *witte wel, witte nie* is frequently used. Below the logo, the text *RoekOe Brabant Priezents* appears on the screen, with *Koekwaus* underneath in a larger (again Comic-Sans-like) font. The letters are white and have a black outline so that they stand out from the background. What is striking here, is the non-standard (Dutchified) spelling of the English word *presents*. It is also noticeable that the holes of the *o*'s in both the text and the logo, and the *a* in *koekwaus*, are filled with red hearts, which is also the case in the social media profile picture of *RoekOe Brabant* (see Fig. 2)*.*

In the remainder of the video, a pigeon appears from the left side of the screen and makes a springy movement to the rhythm of the oompah music. Then the melody becomes slower and heavier and the pigeon says in a male voice: *Wa bende gij unne koekwaus.* The pigeon's eyes are slightly unnatural turned outwards. The tempo of the music then increases again and eight pigeons appear on the screen, making springy movements to the tempo of the music. Then the pigeon reappears and says *koekwaus* again. The music restarts and now many pigeons walk through the screen in all directions. The oompah starts to sound more electronic and turns into a dance beat. The number of pigeons continues changing throughout the video. Each time there is a speaking or singing voice the red-colored lyrics appear on the screen, i.e., spoken language bits are overlayered with written language, creating a context for singing along.

Figure 1. RoekOe Brabant's logo and social media profile picture.

Figure 2. First shot of RoekOe Brabant's music video Koekwaus.

The first verse of the song *Koekwaus* is about a woman who is in the bar with another female character (*Annie*) and is approached by a man who asks her to spend the night together. He uses the Dutch saying: *Met jou zou ik wel een beschuitje willen eten!* ('I would like to eat a rusk with you'), with a non-dialectal (Standard Dutch) accent. In the Netherlands, rusk is regularly consumed for breakfast, so in this saying it symbolizes 'the morning after'. At first, the woman thinks to herself that the man (referred to by the Dutch word *vent*, an informal term for an adult male) is ugly. Then, the woman replies with *Da denk ik toch nie, verrekte koekwaus!* ('I don't think so, damn *koekwaus*'), with a dialect accent. After this, the word *koekwaus* is repeated several times. The rapid pronunciation of *koek* in the sequence *koek koek koekwaus* is reminiscent of *koekoek*, a term sometimes used for 'crazy', and probably a translation of the English expression 'to be cuckoo'. This is followed by a choir singing the non-lexical sounds *la la la*. These so-called vocables are nonsense syllables, meaning that the syllables have no meaning on their own. In this case they increase the resonance of the song, as *la la la* evokes a context of singalong. However, it is also possible to argue that *la la la* is loaded with social meaning. Following the Urban Dictionary, *lalala* is "the definitive thing to say when you don't want to hear somebody speak anymore".[8] Moreover, *la-la* is sometimes seen as an imitation for the sound of someone who is 'crazy', which in this case would be the male character who is referred to as the *koekwaus*.[9]

In the second verse, the woman is again approached by a man. This time, the man is referred to with the dialect word *menneke*, a diminutive form for the word *man* but with a Brabantish, i.e., non-standard, spelling. The diminutive can also refer to a younger man, possibly immature. At first, the woman thinks that this male is even uglier than the previous one. Then something unexpected happens, as the man asks her with a Rotterdam accent to walk with him through the *Koopgoot: Hé lekker ding, hebbie zin om met mij effe lekker door de Koopgoot lopû te lopû?* ('Hey gorgeous, would you like to go walking through the *Koopgoot* with me?'). Rotterdam is a port city in the Dutch province of South Holland, and with approximately 588,000 inhabitants it is the second largest city in the Netherlands after the capital Amsterdam. Rotterdam is part of the *Randstad* area, the economic center of the Netherlands, and has a lively urban dialect. The *Koopgoot* (also known as *Beurstraverse*) is the most famous shopping street of Rotterdam. What is striking here, is the typical Rotterdam dialect verb inflection *hebbie* instead of *heb je* ('have you'), the non-standard spelling of *effe* instead of *even* ('just a moment'), the use of the word *lekker* (lit. 'good', 'delicious'), the verbal phrase *lopû te lopû* (lit. 'walk to walk')[10] and the non-standard spelling of *lopû* instead of *lopen* ('to walk'). In addition, the hard pronunciation of the *g*-sound is conspicuous. This is also a shibboleth, because the hard pronunciation is indexical for the northern part of the Netherlands and the soft *g* is indexical for the southern part of the Netherlands. It is not remarkable that a *Rotterdammer* is portrayed as a character here, since this strengthens the Brabantish ambience of the song. Through the opposition between the woman with a Brabantish accent and

---

[8] Urban Dictionary 'Lalala': https://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=lalala.

[9] Urban Dictionary 'Lalaland': https://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=lalaland.

[10] Here, the verb *lopen* ('to walk') is also called a 'group forming verb'. That is, it is combined with *te* ('to') and an infinitive (an independent verb), in this case also *lopen* ('to walk'). The group forming verb indicates the attitude or position of the subject who performs the action (walking), but this meaning is often weakened to 'being engaged in something', see e-ANS 18.5.4.2: https://e-ans.ivdnt.org/topics/pid/ans18050402lingtopic. This use of *lopen* is a shibboleth for the dialect of Rotterdam, as for instance shown in a parodic YouTube video (2019) in which the actors invent a new slogan for the city of Rotterdam: https://youtu.be/T6eRkkK7mxU.

the man with a Rotterdam accent, cf. the previous mentioned *Brabander-Bovensloter* contrast, both personae are exaggerated and magnified.

After the second verse, only the chorus is repeated. At the end of the song, the written lyrics *En nou jullie* 'and now you' appear (not spoken). This is a phrase that is frequently used by artists to encourage the audience to sing along. What also stands out is that there is a short pause several times between the phrase *wa bende gij* and the phrase *koekwaus*. When there is such a pause (see the lyrics in 4.2, lines 17–18, 20–21, 23–24, 37–38, 40–41, 43–44), the indefinite article does not include a suffix for masculine gender: *un* instead of *unne*. This could be explained by the nominal constituent that is temporarily broken up by the pause, making the grammatical congruence less necessary, as you do not immediately know which noun will follow. In the last two lines of the song, the written lyrics do not match the spoken text, because *unne* is written while *un* is pronounced. The written lyrics are therefore a more Brabantish reflection of the spoken text. This is also the case for line 28, as spoken text and written lyrics do not exactly match here, because *hebbie* is written and *heb jij* is pronounced. The written lyrics are therefore more Rotterdam-dialectal than the actual spoken lyrics. Since the written lyrics are not meant to help people understand the language in the video (which could have been the case with Standard Dutch subtitles), they seem to have been added during editing to further emphasize the local dialect (non-standard) features.

4.2. Linguistic analysis of the song's lyrics

In the lyrics, several linguistic cues are used as a vehicle to invoke stereotypes. These linguistic cues together make the text unmistakably local and consist of the use of shibboleths and hyperdialectisms in the spoken and written lyrics, and the use of non-standard spelling variants in the written lyrics. In the lines displayed below (taken from the music video on YouTube) there are many linguistic forms associated with the dialect of North Brabant on the level of lexicon, phonology, and morphosyntax. The **words in bold-faced print** reveal hyperdialectisms, *italized words* reveal shibboleths, underlined words show non-standard spellings, and unmarked words are identical to Standard Dutch. The line written in CAPITALS indicates the Rotterdam dialect. All categories can also be combined, e.g., a word that is both a shibboleth and written in non-standard spelling.

1 *Wa bende gij unne koekwaus* (male voice 1)
   'You are such a damn idiot'
2 *Koekwaus*
   'Idiot'
3 *Koekwaus*
   'Idiot'
4 Sta ik meej *onsannie* in **d'n** kroeg (female voice 1)
   'So, I'm standing in a bar with Anny'
5 Komt er *zo'ne* vent naor mij toe
   'And this guy walks over to me'
6 Lelluk dat ie was…
   'He was so ugly'
7 En *witte wa* tie tegen mij zee?
   'And do you know what he said to me?'
8 Met jou zou ik wel een beschuitje willen eten! (male voice 2)
   'I would like to eat a rusk with you'
9 *Da* denk ik toch nie, (female voice 1)
   'I don't think so'
10 *Verrekte koekwaus*!
   'Damn idiot'
11 *Wa bende gij unne* koek *waus* (male voice 1)
   'You are such a damn idiot'
12 Koek koek *koekwaus*
   'Idiot'
13 Koek *waus*
   'Idiot'
14 Koek koek *waus* (echoing)
   'Idiot'
15 *Wa bende gij unne koekwaus*
   'You are such a damn idiot'
16 La la la (choir)
17 *Wa bende gij* un (male voice 1)
   'You are such a'
18 *Koekwaus*
   'Idiot'
19 La la la
20 *Wa bende gij* un
   'You are such a'

21   *Koekwaus*
     'Idiot'
22   La la la
23   <u>*Wa*</u> *bende gij* <u>un</u>
     'You are such a'
24   *Koekwaus*
     'Idiot'
25   <u>*Un*</u> <u>*bietje*</u> later komt er <u>*wir*</u> zo'n <u>*menneke*</u> <u>*naor*</u> mij toe (female voice 1)
     'A little later, again a little man comes up to me'
26   Nog <u>lellukker</u> dan ***dieje*** <u>vurige</u>…
     'Even uglier that the first one'
27   En <u>*witte*</u> <u>*wa*</u> <u>*tie*</u> tegen mij <u>*zee*</u>?
     'And do you know what he said to me?'
28   HÉ LEKKER DING, *HEBBIE* ZIN OM MET MIJ <u>EFFE</u> LEKKER DOOR DE *KOOPGOOT* <u>*LOPÛ TE LOPÛ*</u>? (male voice 3)
     'Hey gorgeous, would you like to go walking with me through the Koopgoot?'
29   <u>*Da*</u> denk ik toch <u>*nie*</u>, (female voice 1)
     'I don't think so'
30   *Verrekte koekwaus*!
     'Damn idiot'
31   <u>*Wa*</u> *bende gij unne koek waus* (male voice 1)
     'You are such an idiot'
32   Koek koek *waus*
     'Idiot'
33   Koek *waus*
     'Idiot'
34   Koek koek *waus* (echoing)
     'Idiot'
35   <u>*Wa*</u> *bende gij unne koekwaus*
     'You are such an idiot'
36   La La La (choir)
37   <u>*Wa*</u> *bende gij* <u>un</u> (choir)
     'You are such a'
38   *Koekwaus* (male voice 1)
     'Idiot'
39   La la la (choir)
40   <u>*Wa*</u> *bende gij* <u>un</u> (choir)
     'You are such a'
41   *Koekwaus* (male voice 1)
     'Idiot'
42   La la la (choir)
43   <u>*Wa*</u> *bende gij* <u>un</u> (choir)
     'You are such a'
44   *Koekwaus* (male voice 1)
     'Idiot'
45   La la la (choir)
46   <u>*Wa*</u> *bende gij* <u>un</u> (choir)
     'You are such a'
47   En nou jullie (written only)
     'And now you' [sing along]
48   La la la (choir)
49   <u>*Wa*</u> *bende gij* <u>*unne*</u> (choir)
     'You are such a'
50   *Koekwaus* (male voice 1)
     'Idiot'

4.2.1. Hyperdialectisms

In total, the lyrics contain two hyperdialectisms, i.e., overgeneralizations of a dialect feature: *d'n kroeg* ('the bar') and *dieje vurige* ('that previous one')*.* In *d'n kroeg* the masculine gender suffix *-n* is applied to the definite article *de*, however this is unexpected due to the initial sound of the masculine noun *kroeg* that does not trigger a binding-*n* (i.e., phonological constraint, see Doreleijers et al., 2020). In the demonstrative pronoun *dieje* the masculine suffix *-e* is applied, but the antecedent is the neuter noun *menneke* (a diminutive of the Dutch word *man* 'man'). Probably the gender suffix selection here is based on the semantic status of the antecedent, i.e., animate and masculine biological gender.

4.2.2. Shibboleths

In the text, we see several words that, with their non-standard form, function as a recognition sign for local language, i.e., the dialect of North Brabant. For example, we find shortened forms, which are emblematic of the way Brabantish is sometimes presented as 'the shortest language in the Netherlands' (Swanenberg and Brok, 2008, p. 4), here through the *t*-deletion in *wa* instead of *wat* ('what'), *da* instead of *dat* ('that') and *nie* instead of *niet* ('not'). A second example are the expected suffixes for

masculine lexical gender on the indefinite article: *unne* (or the abbreviated form *ne* in *zo'ne vent* 'such a guy') and the hyperdialectal form *d'n*. Since adnominal gender marking is a linguistic feature found only in the Southern Dutch dialects, it is an important means of differentiation from Northern Dutch speakers, i.e., *Bovensloters*. A third feature that is indexical of North Brabantish dialect is the cliticization of the second person (singular) in the verb *bende* (*ben je* 'are you') and *witte* (*weet je* 'know you'). A fourth example of a shibboleth is the use of the personal pronoun singular *gij* 'you'. That this feature is used deliberately is also shown by an earlier lobby by *RoekOe Brabant* to have a provincial *Gij-dag* ('*gij* day') in North Brabant, a day when everyone addresses each other as *gij* to promote the regional culture and the regional language that is a key part of it (see Fig. 3). Another feature that immediately reminds the listener or reader of Brabant is the use of the possessive pronoun *ons* in *onsannie* (*ons Annie* 'our Annie'), i.e., in combination with a proper name. In North Brabant friends or family members (i.e., proper names and kinship terms) are often referred to by the possessive pronoun *ons/onze* to express proximity or familiarity. Also *un bietje* instead of *een beetje* ('a bit') is recognizable as a typical Brabantish phrase due to the non-standard spelling (see below), in this case used as an equivalent of an adverbial constituent, as a degree indicator, i.e., *een bietje later* 'a little later'. The other shibboleths used in the song are the aforementioned intensifier (adjective) *verrekte* 'damn', the central word *koekwaus* 'idiot' and its variant *waus*, and the diminutive *menneke* 'little man'.

Figure 3. Instagram RoekOe Brabant, 10 March 2017.

4.2.3. Non-standard spellings

The use of shibboleths is accompanied by non-standard spellings in the written language. These are all examples of phonography, i.e., writing the word as one would pronounce it, however not necessarily deviant because there is no standardized orthography for Brabantish. Next to the examples of *t*-deletion (*wa, da, nie*) they include vowel alternations: *naor* instead of *naar* ('to'), *lelluk(ker)* instead of *lelijk(er)* ('ugly/uglier'), *zee* instead of *zei* ('said'), *un* instead of *een* ('a'), *bietje* instead of *beetje* ('a bit'), *wir* instead of *weer* ('again'), *vurige* instead of *vorige* ('previous'), and *meej* instead of *met* ('with'). These spellings are all clearly local rather than standard. There are also a number of non-standard spellings that do not index locality so much as informality. This is revealed through the consecutive form *onsannie* instead of *ons Annie* ('our Anny'), but also in the reduced form of addressing the masculine third person singular *ie* instead of *hij* ('he'); in line 7 and line 27, this reduced form is written as *tie*, since a vowel collision necessitates the realization of the word final *t* in *wa(t)*.

4.3. Meaning-making through language and other semiotic resources

Overall, the discourse analysis reveals that the music video *Koekwaus* contains many dialect forms (lexical, morphosyntactic, and phonological) that index locality, i.e., 'Brabantishness'. However, local place-making also takes place through non-linguistic signs, such as local music, (the design of) the Brabantish flag, and the pigeons that refer to *RoekOe Brabant*. We argue here that sociolinguistic enregisterment (i.e., specific forms performing specific social functions) takes shape through the co-occurrence and mutual interaction of all these forms, i.e., through the linguistic and semiotic links between those forms (Cornips and De Rooij, 2020, p. 354; cf. 'the total linguistic fact', Silverstein, 1985).

In the first place, this process of meaning-making is governed by patterns of recognizability, as precisely the forms that are recognizable as typically local (for people within and people outside the community) are selected. This is also reflected in the audience response. For example, the 37 comments on the YouTube video show that some viewers repeat part of the song in

which they 'drop' dialect features themselves (cf. 'feature-dropping' in Johnstone and Baumgardt, 2004, p. 115). Comments like *wanne koekwaus!* ('what an idiot!') or *Wa Bende Gai ('gij') Unne Koekwaus*! ('you are such an idiot!') include the typical masculine gender suffix (*wanne, unne*), t-deletion (*wa*), the verb form *bende* ('are you') and the personal pronoun *gij*. This further legitimizes the Brabantishness of the online endeavors.

In addition, meaning-making is about making inferences (Blommaert, 2013, p. 448), that is, being part of a largely ritualized language use. The title of the music video, *koekwaus*, was not chosen randomly, as the word was already loaded with social meaning by previous occurrences. The word *waus/wous* already appeared in twentieth century dictionaries, and *koekwaus* gained a shibboleth status through the television series *New Kids*, where it was associated with streetwise youth, and used with both a cheeky and humorous undertone. This intertextuality is also noticed by viewers of the video, as for example demonstrated in one of the comments about a specific part of the video (after 35 s) where the word *koekwaus* is used for the first time: *0:35 dat is van new kids* ("0:35 that is from new kids"). It is therefore not surprising that this word, including the tone of voice, is reproduced in the music video and in its spinoffs on TikTok.

5. TikTok spinoffs

In the TikTok-challenge, three lines of the original lyrics are repeated.[11] These lyrics are spoken, there is usually no written text displayed in the TikTok videos.

En witte wat ie tegen mij zee?
'And do you know what he said to me?'

Met jou zou ik wel een beschuitje willen eten!
'I would like to eat a rusk with you!'

Da denk ik toch nie, verrekte koekwaus!
'I don't think so, damn idiot!'

During the first two lines, the actors (mostly young women) simply look into their cameras, but during the third line the lip sync takes place. Immediately afterwards, the electronic music starts and the actors start rolling their eyes very fast, i.e., squinting, through a TikTok filter, and this action lasts until the end of the video. This languagecultural practice is a clear example of stylization, as specific linguistic (dialectal) and semiotic resources are used for "styling the other" (Rampton, 1999) in order to position oneself (Leppänen et al., 2015). This is for example shown by the double voicing in the TikTok videos (Bakhtin, 1994[1963]; Rampton, 1995; Baxter, 2014). The adopted, i.e., imitated (lip sync), voice is vari-directional: the speakers appropriate a social voice and keep it at bay, as they use it for parody. Practices of stylization also evoke stereotypical behavior and worldviews (Coupland, 2001). This is shown by the social persona of the *koekwaus* who evokes a short, to the point, blunt and dismissive reaction by the female character that is communicated in local language, but is also reflexive in itself, meaning that it presupposes cultural knowledge, i.e., recognizing and (re)valuing Brabantish dialect as sometimes coarse (cf. the *New Kids*) and as the so-called shortest and most efficient language in the Netherlands.

Another important characteristic of stylization is that it is often a hyperbolic realization (Coupland, 2001, p. 350). Language structure, i.e., positioning the *Brabander* through the use of a limited number of local language features that are indexical for its stereotypical social persona, as well as non-linguistic practices such as squinting to literally portray a stereotypical *koekwaus* 'idiot', illustrate how the actors are evoking an exaggerated image of their referents. To a large extent, these stylistic practices revolve around creativity. The actors make creative use of the available semiotic resources from the original music video to express their social and/or local place-based identities (cf. Antonsich, 2010). They strategically deploy selected forms, cf. 'feature-dropping', to emphasize contrast with their standard variants and to show that they are legitimate contributors (Johnstone and Baumgardt, 2004, p. 115; Hillewaert, 2015, p. 206). In doing so, specific forms become emblematic for the *Brabander* and the region *North Brabant*, i.e., third-order indexicality (stereotype). Moreover, stylization is about self-presentation. What stance do the actors want to adopt and what is required for this? The challenge allows actors to convey belonging to their peers on the TikTok channel, i.e., engaging in a popular social media activity, but it also includes a competitive element to make the funniest possible version of the video.

6. Discussion

The intertwining of the music video (Section 4) and the TikTok spinoffs (Section 5) obviously still needs to be further discussed, as the spinoffs only exist through the first music video production. At the same time, the music video acquires meaning through the possibility of making inferences between specific features and previous contexts in which these features have been used. Therefore, we argue that the *verrekte koekwaus* challenge can only be fully understood by taking into account the movement of and intertextual connection between the linguistic and semiotic elements across different social loci

---

[11] See for example https://www.telegraaf.nl/video/87019380/nederlandse-tik-tok-hype-gaat-viral-verrekte-koekwaus.

(Krzyżanowski, 2016, p. 314). This process of recontextualization (as part of entextualization, cf. Blommaert, 2005) evolves around the (recurring) signaling of intended contexts and readings of an utterance (Gumperz, 1992). Bernstein (1990) distinguishes between three stages and types of related contexts of recontextualization. A particular utterance, we take the intensified mock name *verrekte koekwaus* again as an example, originates in a primary context (the source), i.e., the television series *New Kids*. Ten years later it is deliberately selected in the YouTube music video *Koekwaus* (the recontextualization context), and two years after the publication of the video it is reproduced on a different social media channel, i.e., TikTok, in a completely different context, from local and carnivalesque to global, young and modern (the target context). This process shows that the recontextualized piece of discourse "becomes a signifier for something other than itself" (Bernstein, 1990, p. 193). In this case, the word *koekwaus* which is used to indicate a stereotypical social character in the original song, is re-indexed as a social marker for the actor themselves, i.e., as a stylistic practice of social stance-taking to convey localness, 'Brabantishness' and a good sense of humor, while at the same time indicating globalness and trendiness by participating in a viral internet challenge.

A non-linguistic example of recontextualization takes place, for example, through the pigeons, which do not play a role in the TikTok challenge but do in the original video. The audience viewing the music video from a primary-context perspective will probably pay little attention to the meaning of those pigeons. However, the audience that is also familiar with the social media account of *RoekOe Brabant* and the sociohistorical background of this account, will be able to interpret that the pigeons actually do have a specific meaning, as they refer to the carnivalesque origin of *RoekOe Brabant,* in the playful association *Kaaiendonkse Duivenmelkers Vereniging* (pigeon fanciers), that is reproduced in the local music and lyrics. The fact that the local carnivalesque oompah music and the local language are combined with an electronic dance beat, and that this dance beat in turn is combined with imitated local language by young women on a global social media channel, indicates that this languagecultural practice has become a case of glocalization, i.e. combining the 'local' with the 'global' (Robertson, 1995). The use of local dialect in combination with other local semiotic signs shows that even in an era of globalization and perceived dialect loss, dialect is still meaningful to express where one comes from or with whom one identifies (cf. Auer's (2013) New Regionalism, see Section 1).

The processes of recontextualization and reproduction are also reflected in the specific way the described stylistic practice in the TikTok challenge takes shape. "By combining cultural artifacts and manipulating them into new kinds of creative blends" (Knobel and Lankshear, 2008, p. 22), actors are engaging in a practice of remix. Knobel and Lankshear (2008, p. 22) describe how remix is inherently a practice of reproduction: "Whenever we comment on, say, a film or book and discuss it with others, we take the original author's creativity and remix it into our own lives, using it to extend our own ideas or to produce an evaluation." It is no coincidence that adolescents in particular are doing this on social media as "young people are embracing remix *en masse*, and it is increasingly integral to how they make meaning and express ideas" (Knobel and Lankshear, 2008, p. 23). The concept of remix is in a way reminiscent of the concept of bricolage (Eckert, 2019, p. 753), but both concepts have different origins. Whereas remix has a more educational basis and points to multimodality, which can also serve only for entertainment without a satirical undertone, bricolage has a more critical edge, i.e., is more pronounced. Originally, bricolage was an art concept used in research into subcultures, (cf. 'The Meaning of Style', Hebdige, 1979), that points to the repurposing of forms that in themselves carry social meaning but are recombined. In this sense, the term bricolage could thus be applied to the deliberate indexical stance-taking processes of actors through their videos, whereas the term remix can be used in general as a descriptive analytic concept of a genre that aims at entertainment. Nevertheless, the present paper has shown that through processes of intertextuality and recontextualization, remix practices can easily shift towards practices of meaning-making. In our study, remix practices are not merely a 'genre of entertainment', but they evolve as stylistic practices through which speakers can emphasize their belonging to a 'place', i.e., the local community, and likewise 'flag' their identity. This is done by drawing on a specific set of enregistered salient local dialect forms (hyperdialectisms, shibboleths, and non-standard spellings). The 'dialect', i.e., the set of co-occurring dialectal forms, does no serve so much as habitual local speech, but it rather bears a strategically symbolic function to showcase a (recognizable) local identity (cf. Androutsopoulos, 2010, p. 747).

Returning to the starting question, it is exactly this ability for (dynamically) enregistering local dialect forms and other semiotic signs that makes the described social media production so attractive for reproduction. Actors doing the reproduction deploy videos that are not only fun to watch, but also offer the opportunity to express local identities on a large digital scale without leaning on a nostalgic or 'corny' image, but rather magnifying what is considered typically local in a parodical, humorous way. This illuminates that the role of local dialects in a global reality of increased digitally mediated communication has not yet been played out.

Funding

CRediT author statement

Kristel Doreleijers: Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Data curation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing.

Jos Swanenberg: Conceptualization, Methodology, Supervision, Writing – review & editing.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgment

References

Agar, M., 1994. Language Shock: Understanding the Culture of Conversation. William Morrow and Company, New York NY.

Agha, A., 2003. The social life of cultural value. Lang. Commun. 23 (3–4), 231–273.

Agha, A., 2005. Voice, footing, enregisterment. J. Ling. Anthropol. 15 (1), 38–59.

Agha, A., 2007. Language and Social Relations. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Androutsopoulos, J., 2010. The study of language and space in media discourse. In: Auer, P., Schmidt, J.E. (Eds.), Language and Space: an International Handbook of Linguistic Variation. Vol I: Theory and Methods, pp. 740–758.

Androutsopoulos, J., 2016. Theorizing media, mediation and mediatization. In: Coupland, N. (Ed.), Sociolinguistics: Theoretical Debates. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 282–302.

Antonsich, M., 2010. Searching for belonging – an analytical framework. Geography Compass 4 (6), 644–659.

Auer, P., 2005. Europe's sociolinguistic unity, or: a typology of European dialect/standard constellations. In: Delbecque, N., van der Auwera, J., Geeraerts, D. (Eds.), Perspectives on Variation. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 7–42.

Auer, P., 2011. Dialect vs. standard: a typology of scenarios in Europe. In: Kortmann, B., van der Auwera, J. (Eds.), The Languages and Linguistics of Europe: A Comprehensive Guide. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 485–500.

Auer, P., 2013. The Geography of Language: Steps toward a New Approach. FRAGL2013.

Bakhtin, M., 1994. Double-voiced discourse in dostoevsky. In: Morris, P. (Ed.), The Bakhtin Reader: Selected Writings. Edward Arnold, London, pp. 102–111. First published 1963.

Baxter, J., 2014. Double-voicing at Work: Power, Gender and Linguistic Expertise. Palgrave Macmillan Ltd, London.

Bernstein, B., 1990. In: Class, Codes and Control, Vol. IV: The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse. Routledge, London.

Bijsterveld, A.-J., 2014. Naar indicatoren voor regionale samenhang: De bijdrage van landschaps- en cultuurgeschiedenis ['Towards indicators of regional cohesion: The contribution of landscape and cultural history']. Province of North Brabant, 's-Hertogenbosch.

Blommaert, J., 2005. Discourse: A Critical Introduction. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Blommaert, J., 2013. Writing as a sociolinguistic object. J. SocioLinguistics 17 (4), 440–459.

Blommaert, J., 2022. Sociolinguistic restratification in the online-offline nexus: Trump's viral errors. In: Spotti, M., Swanenberg, J., Blommaert, J. (Eds.), Language Practices and the Politics of Language Practices. Essays in Honour of Sjaak Kroon. Springer, Cham, pp. 7–24.

Boeijen, R., 2018. "Roek-Oe Brabant: Leutige dingeskes op z'n Brabants, witte wel, witte nie!". ['Roek-Oe Brabant: Funny things in Brabantish, *witte wel, witte nie!*'] Brabants. Tijdschrift over Brabanders en hun taal 4 (4), 20–21.

Britain, D., 2009. One foot in the grave? Dialect death, dialect contact, and dialect birth in England. Int. J. Sociol. Lang. 196/197, 121–155.

Bucholtz, M., Hall, K., 2005. Identity and interaction: a sociocultural linguistic approach. Discourse Stud. 7 (4–5), 585–614.

Cornips, L., de Rooij, V., 2020. Sociolinguistic enregisterment through languagecultural practices. In: Smith, N., Veenstra, T., Aboh, E.O. (Eds.), Advances in Contact Linguistics: in Honour of Pieter Muysken. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 342–364.

Cornips, L., de Rooij, V., Stengs, I., 2017. Carnivalesque language use and the construction of local identities: a plea for languageculture as a field of research. Jahrbüch fur Europäische Ethnologie/Yearbook of European Ethnology 12, 61–89.

Cornips, L., Marzo, S., Swanenberg, J., 2018. Processen van place-making door talige praktijken in Tilburg, Heerlen en Genk. Parodie van de Braboneger en Getske Boys, en het cités ['Processes of place-making through linguistic practices in Tilburg, Heerlen and Genk: Parody of the Braboneger and Getske Boys, and Cité']. Taal en Tongval 70 (2), 149–177.

Coupland, N., 2001. Dialect stylization in radio talk. Lang. Soc. 30 (3), 345–375.

De Schutter, G., 2013. The dialects of Brabant: grammatical properties. In: Hinskens, F., Taeldeman, J. (Eds.), Language and Space, Vol. 3: DutchMouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 297–318.

Doreleijers, K. Forthcoming. Enregistering grammatical gender. indexing brabantishness through languagecultural practices in digital tiles. Signs and Society.

Doreleijers, K., van Koppen, M., Swanenberg, J., 2020. De dynamiek van geslachtsmarkering in de Noord-Brabantse dialecten ['The dynamics of gender marking in the North Brabantish dialects']. Taal en Tongval 72 (1), 69–116.

Doreleijers, K., van Koppen, M., Swanenberg, J., 2021a. Tebbie nou op je muil, joh? Lokale taal in een mondiale pandemie ['*Tebbie nou op je muil, joh?* Local language in a global pandemic']. In: van Oostendorp, M., Wolff, S. (Eds.), Viraal Nederland. Sterck & De Vreese, Gorredijk, pp. 40–51.

Doreleijers, K., Piepers, J., Backus, A., Swanenberg, J., 2021b. Language variation in dialect-standard contact situations. In: Kristiansen, G., Franco, K., De Pascale, S., Rosseel, L., Zhang, W. (Eds.), Cognitive Sociolinguistics Revisited, pp. 175–185.

Eckert, P., 2019. The limits of meaning: social indexicality, variation, and the cline of interiority. Language 95 (4), 751–776.

Eisenstein, J., 2015. Systematic patterning in phonologically motivated orthographic variation. J. SocioLinguistics 19 (2), 161–188.

García, O., Wei, L., 2014. Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism, and Education. Palgrave MacMillan, New York.

Grondelaers, S., van Gent, P., 2019. How "deep" is Dynamism? Revisiting the evaluation of Moroccan-flavored Netherlandic Dutch. Ling Vanguard 5 (s1).

Gumperz, J., 1992. Contextualization revisited. In: Auer, P., Di Luzio, A. (Eds.), The Contextualization of Language. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 39–53.

Hebdige, D., 1979. Subculture: the Meaning of Style. Routledge, London.

Hillewaert, S., 2015. Writing with an accent: orthographic practice, emblems, and traces on Facebook. J. Ling. Anthropol. 25 (2), 195–214.

Hinskens, F., 2014. Despite or because of intensive contact? Internal, external and extralinguistic aspects of divergence in modern dialects and ethnolects of Dutch. In: Braunmüller, K., Höder, S., Kühl, K. (Eds.), Stability and Divergence in Language Contact: Factors and Mechanisms. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 109–140.

Hoppenbrouwers, C., 1983. Het genus in een Brabants regiolect ['Gender in a Brabantish regional dialect']. Tabu 13, 1–25.

Hoppenbrouwers, C., 1990. Het regiolect: van Dialect tot Algemeen Nederlands ['Regional dialect: from dialect to standard Dutch']. Coutinho, Muiderberg.

Jaffe, A., 2009. Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Jamieson, E., 2020. Viewing dialect change through acceptability judgments: a case study in Shetland dialect. Glossa: a journal of general linguistics 5 (1), 1–28.

Johnstone, B., 2011a. Language and place. In: Mesthrie, R. (Ed.), The Cambridge Handbook of Sociolinguistics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 203–217.

Johnstone, B., 2011b. Dialect enregisterment in performance. J. SocioLinguistics 15 (5), 657–679.

Johnstone, B., 2014. "100% Authentic Pittsburgh": sociolinguistic authenticity and the linguistics of particularity. In: Lacoste, V., Leimgruber, J., Breyer, T. (Eds.), Indexing Authenticity: Sociolinguistic Perspectives. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 97–112.

Johnstone, B., 2016. Enregisterment: how linguistic items become linked with ways of speaking. Language and Linguistics Compass 10 (11), 632–643.

Johnstone, B., 2018. Discourse Analysis, third ed. Wiley Blackwell, Hoboken.

Johnstone, B., Baumgardt, D., 2004. "Pittsburghese" online: vernacular norming in Conversation. Am. Speech 79 (2), 115–145.

Jørgensen, J.N., Karrebæk, M.S., Madsen, L.M., Møller, J.S., 2015. Polylanguaging in superdiversity. In: Arnout, K., Blommaert, J., Rampton, B., Spotti, M. (Eds.), Language and Superdiversity. Routledge, London, pp. 147–164.

Knobel, M., Lankshear, C., 2008. Remix: the art and craft of endless hybridization. J. Adolesc. Adult Literacy 52 (1), 22–33.

Krzyżanowski, M., 2016. Recontextualisation of neoliberalism and the increasingly conceptual nature of discourse: Challenges for critical discourse studies. Discourse Soc. 27 (3), 308–321.

Labov, W., 1972. The isolation of contextual styles. In: Labov, W. (Ed.), Sociolinguistic Patterns. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, pp. 70–109.

Lenz, A., 2004. Hyperforms and variety barriers. In: Gunnarsson, B.-L. (Ed.), Language Variation in Europe. Uppsala University, Uppsala, pp. 281–293.

Leppänen, S., Møller, J.S., Nørreby, T.R., Stæhr, A., Kytölä, S., 2015. Authenticity, normativity and social media. Discourse, Context and Media 8, 1–78.

Lillis, T., 2013. Sociolinguistics of Writing. Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.

Mutsaers, P., Swanenberg, J., 2012. Super-diversity at the margins? Youth language in North Brabant, The Netherlands. Socioling. Stud. 6 (1), 65–89.

Pennycook, A., 2016. Mobile times, mobile terms: the trans-super-poly-metro movement. In: Coupland, N. (Ed.), Sociolinguistics: Theoretical Debates. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 201–216.

Polzenhagen, F., Xiaoyan, X., 2014. Language, culture and Prototypicality. In: Sharifian, S. (Ed.), Routledge Handbook of Language and Culture. Routledge, New York, pp. 253–269.

Rampton, B., 1995. Crossing. Longman, London.

Rampton, B., 1999. Styling the other: introduction. J. SocioLinguistics 3 (4), 421–427.

Reelick, L., Swanenberg, C., Verzandvoort, E., Wouters, M., 1993. Het Bosch Woordenboek ['The *Bosch* dictionary']. Adr. Heinen, 's-Hertogenbosch.

Robertson, R., 1995. Glocalization: time-space and homogeneity- heterogeneity. In: Featherstone, M., Lash, S., Robertson, R. (Eds.), Global Modernities. Sage Publications Ltd, London, pp. 25–44.

Schmeets, H., Cornips, L., 2022. Taaldiversiteit in Nederland ['Language diversity in The Netherlands']. Taal en Tongval 74 (1), 75–106.

Silverstein, M., 1985. Language and the culture of gender. At the intersection of structure, usage, and ideology. In: Mertz, E., Parmentier, R. (Eds.), Semiotic Mediation. Academic, Orlando, pp. 219–239.

Silverstein, M., 2003. Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. Lang. Commun. 23 (3–4), 193–229.

Swanenberg, J., 2007. Moers taal: koekwaus.['Mother Tongue: *Koekwaus*']. Bossche Bladen 2, 54–55.

Swanenberg, J., 2014. Het nieuwste Brabants. Taalgebruik van jonge en nieuwe Brabanders. ['The newest Brabantish. Language use of young and new *Brabanders*']. In: van de Donk, W., Janssen, J. (Eds.), Het Nieuwste Brabant. Uitgeverij Lecturis, Eindhoven, pp. 425–444.

Swanenberg, J., 2019. The language and culture of new kids: appreciation of and familiarity with online Brabantish identities. In: Kroon, S., Swanenberg, J. (Eds.), Language and Culture on the Margins. Global/social Interactions. Routledge, New York, pp. 91–108.

Swanenberg, J., 2020. Does dialect loss give more or less variation? On dialect leveling and language creativity. In: Asahi, Y. (Ed.), Proceedings of Methods XVI. Papers from the Sixteenth International Conference on Methods in Dialectology. Bern, Peter Lang, pp. 65–74.

Swanenberg, J., Brok, H., 2008. Het Brabants beschreven. Dialect in Noord-Brabant, met een bibliografie van 1776 tot 2007. ['Brabantish described. Dialect in North Brabant, with a bibliography from 1776 to 2007']. Uitgeverij Veerhuis, Alpen aan de Maas.

Swanenberg, J., van Hout, R., 2013. Recent developments in the mid southern dialects. In: Hinskens, F., Taeldeman, J. (Eds.), Language and Space, Vol. 3: DutchMouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 319–335.

Taeldeman, J., 2003. Aan uw taal heb Ik u herkend. Over sjibboletvorming in de Nederlandse dialecten. ['By your language I recognized you. On shibboleth formation in Dutch dialects']. In: De Tier, V., Vandekerckhove, R. (Eds.), Aan Taal Herkend. Het Bewustzijn Van Dialectverschil. Groesbeek: Stichting Nederlandse Dialecten, pp. 17–44.

Trudgill, P., 2014. Diffusion, drift, and the irrelevance of media influence. J. SocioLinguistics 18 (2), 213–222.

Turner, H., 2017. The development of typeface personas and the consequences of perceived identities. In: Wyatt, C., DeVoss, D. (Eds.), Type Matters: the Rhetoricity of Letterforms. Parlor Press LLC, Anderson, pp. 89–107.

Wagemakers, S., 2017. Brabant is here: making sense of regional identification. PhD Dissertation. Tilburg University.

Wagener, A., 2021. The postdigital emergence of memes and GIFs: meaning, discourse, and hypernarrative creativity. Postdigital Science and Education 3 (3), 831–850.

Kristel Doreleijers is a PhD candidate in Dutch linguistics at Tilburg University and the KNAW Meertens Institute in Amsterdam. She is researching language variation and change in Dutch and the dialects of North Brabant within the NWO (Dutch Research Council) funded project 'Changing gender: language variation and change in gender marking in Dutch dialects' (2019–2023), PGW.19.018.

Jos Swanenberg is full professor in Diversity in Language and Culture at Tilburg University and research fellow at the KNAW Meertens Institute in Amsterdam. He is the editor (with Sjaak Kroon) of *Language and Culture on the Margins: Local/Global Interactions* (2019, Routledge) and *Chronotopic Identity Work. Sociolinguistic Analyses of Cultural and Linguistic Phenomena in Time and Space* (2020, Multilingual Matters).