

10

New Speakers and Language in the Media: Audience Design in Breton and Irish Broadcast Media

Stefan Moal, Noel P. Ó Murchadha, and John Walsh

Introduction

As emphasised in the introduction to this volume, historical and contemporary language maintenance, revitalisation, and revival efforts in minoritised languages have typically been characterised by an overt valorisation of traditional 'native' speech varieties. The high prestige status afforded to traditional speech forms permeates standardisation and codification practices, language purism, and language engineering. Efforts to regain the sociolinguistic vitality of minoritised languages have subsequently tended to focus on maintaining, revitalising, or reviving the same traditional, 'native' varieties of the language that have been ideologised as authentic

S. Moal

Department of Breton and Celtic, Université Rennes 2, Rennes, France

N. P. Ó Murchadha (✉)

School of Education, Trinity College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland

J. Walsh

School of Languages, Literatures and Cultures, National University of
Ireland - Galway, Galway, Ireland

© fte Author(s) 2018

C. Smith-Christmas et al. (eds.), *New Speakers of Minority Languages*,
https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-57558-6_10

and legitimate target varieties (Ó Murchadha and Ó hIfearnáin 2018). Consequently, varieties which do not conform to this ideological scheme, such as the post-traditional varieties practised by many 'new speakers', have been denigrated, devalued, and identified as inauthentic, illegitimate forms. These ideologies of authenticity, legitimacy, and correctness are particularly pertinent when discussing minority language broadcast media. Broadcast media have traditionally been perceived by the public (and often by the media themselves) as paragons of linguistic performance and, by sociolinguists, as influential agents in establishing and reinforcing target language varieties for speakers (Coupland and Kristiansen 2011). There is thus often an expectation among many that minority language broadcast media (should) play an important role in establishing and maintaining language standards and that they ought to promote prestige traditional speech varieties through their output.

This paradigm is problematic in the late modern age, however, as these traditional ideologies on linguistic variation are beginning to change (Ó Murchadha and Ó hIfearnáin 2018). This change is closely related to the manner in which the vitality of minority languages is a balancing act between the maintenance of traditional language communities on the one hand, and the revival of the language among heritage speakers and new speakers of the language on the other. Using data from the Irish and Breton contexts, this chapter assesses the manner in which minority language broadcast media outlets negotiate this ideological landscape. A largely phonological discussion of the *RíRá ar RnaG* programme on the Irish-medium radio station *RTÉ Raidió na Gaeltachta (RnaG)* will be followed by a broader linguistic analysis of *Tud deus ar Vro* on *RKB (Radio Kreiz-Breizh)* and of *Breizh O Pluriel* on *FBBI (France-Bleu Breizh-Izel)*.

This chapter begins by giving a brief contextual background of radio broadcasting in the minority languages in question. This account is followed by an analysis of the linguistic variation on the programmes selected for investigation. In both cases, traditional and post-traditional linguistic variation is attested. This linguistic heterogeneity typically found in minoritised languages often results in what Cheshire et al. (2011), in a different context, refer to as a 'feature pool' of alternative linguistic forms—in other words, where a number of linguistic alternatives are available in a speaker's repertoire and where the speaker must choose between these alternatives. This linguistic variation that characterises the

Irish and Breton radio shows will be situated in the context of Bell's audience design framework (Bell 1984, 1999) and will explain how the way in which presenters select certain forms allows them to traverse sociolinguistic environments that include speakers, and potential speakers (*cf.* Carty, Chap. 13 this volume), with diverse linguistic competencies, allegiances, and ideologies. It will be posited that there is the potential for the presentation of linguistic variation on Irish- and Breton-medium radio to feed into the enregisterment (Agha 2003) and iconisation (Gal and Irvine 1995) processes, whereby linguistic features, forms, and practices become imbued with social values and significations.

Irish-Medium Radio: *RíRá ar RnaG*

RnaG was established on Easter Sunday 1972 under the auspices of the state broadcaster RTÉ. It followed a vigorous campaign by Gaeltacht people in favour of an Irish language radio service, including a pirate radio station, which broadcast, for a time in 1970, in the Connemara Gaeltacht. In the early years, *RnaG* broadcast for only a few hours each day but extended its schedule gradually. It was made available nationwide on FM from 1974, thereby allowing access to Irish speakers from throughout the country. Apart from the headquarters in Connemara, the station also has studios in other Gaeltacht areas and in Dublin. It broadcasts in Irish 24 hours a day, seven days a week and is available on various digital platforms and online as well as on FM. In line with an RTÉ rebranding exercise, it was renamed *RTÉ Raidió na Gaeltachta* in 2005. Historically, the station's focus was on serving traditional speakers in the Gaeltacht through a mixture of local news, sport, talk programmes, traditional music, and cultural activities associated with the Gaeltacht, such as traditional storytelling. Conservative local dialects were strongly favoured and the station did not allow the broadcasting of music with English lyrics for over 30 years after its establishment. *RTÉ RnaG* can be said to subscribe strongly to the traditional ideology on language variation in Irish and to the essentialist link between the Irish language and traditional culture. The station has therefore tended to be mostly conservative in choosing presenters and in the type of material featured on the station. The station has come to be widely considered as a bastion of traditional Gaeltacht speech and a gatekeeper of traditional linguistic and cultural heritage.

In 2005, however, a new service, *Anocht FM* (literally 'Tonight FM'), went on air from 9 pm until 1 am. Aimed at a youth audience, *Anocht FM* is presented in Irish but the slot features a mixture of contemporary music, including songs in English (Ó Glaisne 1982; Delap 2012). It is marked a significant departure from the previous focus of the station on content associated with 'traditional' cultural pursuits. *Anocht FM* is thus an outlier on the RTÉ RnaG schedule. It diverges from most other programming on the station by playing songs with lyrics in English. The next section of this paper analyses the speech of the two presenters of one programme on *Anocht FM*, *RíRá ar RnaG* (literally 'hubbub' or 'uproar' on RnaG). *RíRá ar RnaG* is broadcast from Tuesday to Friday from 9 pm to 10 pm. Both presenters are based in Dublin and work for an independent online Irish language radio station there, *Raidió RíRá*, which broadcasts contemporary music in English and is aimed exclusively at a young and predominantly new speaker audience. Taken as a whole, *RíRá ar RnaG* can be said to engage in what Ofelia García and Li Wei (2014) refer to as translanguaging. That is to say, the show transitions between content in Irish and English. Pop songs in English (and sometimes in Irish and in other languages) are sandwiched between links in Irish by the presenters. Given that these links often focus on aspects of late modern Western youth culture, the show transgresses the dominant linguistic, social, and cultural models whose preservation many consider the remit of RTÉ RnaG and which characterise most other programming on the station. What is most interesting from a sociolinguistic perspective, however, are the varieties of Irish practised by the presenters and the manner in which these speech varieties are paired with the modern global youth culture-based content that comprises the programme. The following section will give a deeper analysis of this observation.

Post-traditional Speech in Irish

There is no overarching work on post-traditional Irish speech, but several authors have analysed this phenomenon both within traditional Gaeltacht speech communities and among new speakers of Irish more broadly. For instance, Ó Curnáin (2007) has studied the phonology, lexicon, and syntax of the changing traditional speech of the Iorras Aithneach Gaeltacht in Galway (see also Ó Curnáin 2009). Ó Curnáin has described the

Gaeltacht speech of speakers born before 1960 as 'traditional' and the speech of those born subsequently as 'post-traditional'. He argues that those who were born after 1990 are 'reduced' speakers of Irish (Ó Curnáin 2012, pp. 102–3). Other authors to discuss the emergence of post-traditional Gaeltacht speech—often from different theoretical perspectives—include Ó Dónaill (2000), Ó Sé (2000), Ó Béarra (2009), Ó hÍfearnáin and Ó Murchadha (2011) and Pétervary et al. (2014).

Studies of Irish outside the Gaeltacht include Maguire on the speech of west Belfast (1992), Ó Catháin on post-traditional speakers in Dublin and Belfast (2001), Walsh on the written Irish of pupils in secondary immersion schools Gaelcholáistí (2007), Ó Duibhir on the speech of children in primary immersion schools *Gaelscoileanna* (2009), and Mac Giolla Chríost on the Irish of former Republican prisoners in Northern Ireland (2012). Ó Broin (2014) has compared the phonetics and morphology of urban-based and Gaeltacht speakers of Irish.

***RíRá ar RnaG*: A Cultural and Linguistic Outlier on Raidió na Gaeltachta**

In this section, we analyse mostly phonological linguistic features of the speech of the two main presenters of *RíRá ar RnaG*. This is based on a sample programme broadcast in 2014, but the examples can be said to be representative of the speech of the presenters in particular and of many new speakers of Irish in general.

A large number of traditional linguistic features were evident in the presenters' speech. The distinction between most non-palatalised and palatalised consonants was evident in the case of the pairs [s], [ʃ]; [fʷ], [fʲ]; [vʷ], [vʲ]; [mʷ], [mʲ]; and [pʷ], [pʲ], although many of these phonemes are not substantially different from English. In the case of the pair [nʷ], [nʲ] which is more markedly different in traditional Irish, the distinction was evident in the speech of the more traditional of the two presenters. Long and short vowels were traditionally realised throughout the sample.

One presenter used a more idiomatic form of Irish, closer to a traditional Ulster Gaeltacht variety spoken relatively close to where he was brought up. Notable features of his speech included the raising of long

front /a:/ as in traditional Ulster dialect: *tá* (present tense of the verb 'to be') realised as [tʲæ:]. His lexicon also included some regional traditional variations and (generally) their traditional phonological realisation: *fá* 'dear' [fʲəɟʲarʲ] ('notice'), *bhal* [walʲ] ('well'), *fosta* [fʲastʲə] (also), *eadar* [adʲəɾʲ] (between), *pilleadh* [pʲilʲju:] (return), *ní thiocfadh* [nʲi: 'hʊkʊ:] le duine ar bith [bʲi:] ('no-one could).

The other presenter used more post-traditional pronunciation, although not markedly so. She also employed some traditional (mostly Munster) features in both vocabulary and pronunciation, perhaps as a result of periods spent in the Gaeltacht areas of that region or as a result of frequent contact with other speakers from those areas: *n' fheadar* [nʲadʲəɾʲ]¹ (perhaps) *ana-mhaith* [anʲə 'va] (very good), *nó* [nʲu:] (or), *'iontach* ['u:nʲtʲəx] (wonderful). Although she also used the non-traditional form ['u:nʲtʲək] with a final voiceless velar stop rather than a voiceless fricative (see discussion of post-traditional features below).

Rules of inflection (lenition/eclipsis) according to case and gender—a fundamental feature of the morphology of both Irish and Breton—were observed for the most part by both presenters. Syntax and lexicon were mostly traditional, with only very limited code-switching. Somewhat ironically (though perhaps not, given Lantto's observations, Chap. 9 this volume), the more traditional speaker used the English discourse markers *nah* (=no), *no* and *cos* (contraction of 'because'). Both speakers used the borrowing *'sexyáilte* ('sexy') rather than the more formal neologism *'gnéasach*, which might be expected among some new speakers of Irish. More extensive code-switching might be expected, given the informal nature of the programme and the target audience, but its very limited use may reflect adherence to the perceived prescriptive linguistic stance of the broadcaster as discussed above.

More post-traditional linguistic features were more limited in scope but more consistently present, particularly in the case of the phoneme /r/ and to a lesser extent /l/ and /x/. Both velarised alveolar tap /rʲ/ and palatalised alveolar tap /rʲ/ were realised as an alveolar approximant [ɹ] consistently by the less traditional presenter, reflecting the widespread allophone of /r/ in English as spoken in Ireland in the following examples: *'RíRá* ['ɹi:ɹɑ:] (hubbub), *'RnaG* [ɑ:ɹnʲ'dʒi:] (name of station using English realisations of letters of the alphabet as is the norm in Irish),

'ndáiríre?' [in^vɑ:ˈji:ɪə] (really?), 'clár' [kl^vɑ:ɪ] (programme), 'Meán Fómhair' [f^vo:vɪɪ] (September), 'is breá liom' [bɪɑ:] (I love), 'freisin' [f^vɪɛfɪn^j] (also), 'Máirt' [mɑ:ɪt^j] (Tuesday), 'amárach' [əˈmɑ:ɪəx] (tomorrow). Both the velarised alveolar tap /r^v/ and the palatalised alveolar tap /r^j/ were realised as an alveolar approximant [ɹ] occasionally by the more traditional presenter: 'RíRá', 'RnaG', 'glór' [glo:ɪ] (voice), 'go leor' [ljo:ɪ] (many), 'ní chreidim' [çɪɛdʒɪm^j] (I don't believe),² 'Éireann' [e:ɪə^v] (gen. form of 'Ireland'). fte may reflect his greater awareness of and identification with traditional norms.

In the case of the less traditional presenter, there was a consistent absence of palatisation of the alveolar lateral approximant /l/ which was realised as [l^v] rather than [l^j]: 'le' [l^vɛ] (with), 'liom' [l^vɔm^v] (with me), 'linn' [l^vɪn] (with us), 'sexyáilte' [sɛksi:ˈɑl^vt^və] (sexy), 'craiceáilte' [kɪɑˈkɑ:l^vt^və] (crazy), 'go bhfuil' [gʊˈwɪl^v] (that is), 'scoileanna' ['skɔl^vɪnə] (schools). fte more traditional presenter generally produced the palatalised/non-palatalised distinction.

fte voiceless velar fricative /x/ and voiceless palatal fricative /ç/ were realised frequently as a voiceless velar stop [k] by both speakers in the following examples: 'ar chlár' [ɛɪˈkl^vɑ:ɪ] (on the programme), 'anocht' [aˈnɔkt^v] (tonight), 'cairteacha' ['kɑɪt^vəkə] (charts), 'ach' [ɑk] (but), 'ní bheadh' [n^ji:ˈv^je:k] (would not be), 'oiriúnach' [ɪˈu:n^vək] (suitable), 'leictreach' [l^jɛkt^vək] (electric), 'amach' [aˈmɑk] (out), 'a hocht' [aˈhɔkt^v] (eight), 'a chlog' [aˈkl^vɔg] (o' clock).

Another example of a non-traditional feature was an intrusive /w/ instead of a velar consonant [g/c] in the case of the less traditional speaker: [gw] / [kw] versus [g] / [k]: 'Gaeiltacht' [gwe:l^vt^vəxt^v] (Irish speaking area), 'Gaeilg' [gwe:l^vgə] (Irish language), 'is cuimhin liom' [ɪsˈkwi:n^j] (I remember). fte voiceless alveolar stops [t^v] and [d^v] were occasionally rendered as voiceless dental stops [t^j] and [d^j] by both speakers, as in the following examples: 'daoibh' [d^ji:v^v] (to you pl.), 'éisteacht' [e:ft^vəxt^j] (listen), 'a hocht' [aˈhɔxt^j] (eight), and vice-versa: 'b' fhéidir' [be:d^vəɪ] (maybe). On one occasion, the more traditional speaker realised the voiced velar fricative /ɣ/ as a voiced velar stop [g]: 'dhá' [gɑ:] (two), but as there were no other examples of this phoneme in the data, it is not possible to conclude that this is a regular feature of his speech. fte less

traditional speakers displayed the occasional diphthongisation of the long cardinal vowel /o:/ as [əʊ]: 'stiúideo' [stʲu:dʲəʊ] (studio), 'fós' [fʲəʊs] (still), 'óg' [əʊg] (young) which is a feature of certain younger speakers of English throughout Ireland.

Some of this variation is due to what Cheshire et al. (2011) have referred to as a 'feature pool of linguistic alternatives'; in other words, high linguistic diversity leads to a heterogeneous feature pool to select from. Such variation was also documented by Broderick (1984 – 86) in the case of late traditional Manx. Saliency is also an important factor in post-traditional variation in that some features appear more important to speakers than others. Some features are solely traditional, although many of them have equivalents in English. Others are solely post-traditional, appearing less salient to speakers, and therefore, it is implicitly acceptable to deviate from them, in particular the velarised alveolar tap /rʲ/ and palatalised alveolar tap /rʲ/. In cases such as palatisation of the alveolar lateral approximant /l/ as [lʲ] rather than [l], the realisation of voiceless velar /x/ and palatal fricatives /ç/ as voiceless velar plosives [k] and voiceless alveolar stops [tʲ] and [dʲ] occasionally rendered as voiceless dental stops [tʰ] and [dʰ], a feature pool of alternative traditional/post-traditional forms are available. Where the presenters use both forms often within the same few conversational turns, it is likely that they are aware of such choices but for a variety of reasons do not consistently use them. For instance, they may opt for the post-traditional varieties in casual speech but attempt to converge with more traditional norms when broadcasting on a national radio station which expects its presenters to adhere to such norms.

Therefore, the presenters may be constrained or constrain themselves in their stylistic choices while on air. On the one hand, they may wish to transcend traditional practice to achieve communicative functionality with a larger audience of less traditional new speakers, while, on the other, they may feel obliged to align themselves more closely linguistically with a smaller audience of more traditional speakers. Such tensions are at the core of the *RíRá ar RnaG* programme which departs from the predominantly essentialist and monolingual approach of its host broadcaster *RTÉ RnaG*. Its conservative approach contrasts with that of a community radio station serving of the Acadian community of the Baie Sainte-Marie in Nova Scotia, Canada, which broadcasts in a highly

hybridised version of the local variety of French, *acadjonne*. When using only standard French, the station almost went bankrupt, but after adopting the local variety, it became one of the country's most successful community radio stations. However, the decision was not without controversy and sparked lively ideological debates about the preservation of a specific local variety of language versus the promotion of a more broadly used standard (Boudreau and Dubois 2007). The more prescriptive approach to Irish adopted by *RTÉ RnaG* can also be contrasted to the Dublin-based Irish language community station, *Raidió na Life*, which was established in 1993 and avoided an overtly purist stance from the start (Cotter 1999). As we will discuss in the next section, a less essentialist approach also features in Breton-medium radio broadcasting.

Breton-Medium Radio: Tud deus ar Vro and Breizh O Pluriel

Regular Breton language programmes did not appear on Radio Rennes Bretagne until the German occupation (1940 – 1944) and, even then, only through a transmitter that was not powerful enough for the signal to reach Lower Brittany, the Breton-speaking western half of the peninsula. The post-war Breton radio output was very limited: a weekly half hour in 1946, and still only one hour in the late 1970s, until it reached a modest five and a half hours a week on *Radio Armorique* in 1978. In 1982, the *Radio-France* State Corporation, funded by the licence fee collected from the public, created bilingual *Radio Breizh-Izel*, broadcasting a dozen hours a week in Breton from Kemper to Lower-Brittany. This was rebranded as *FBBI* in 2000. In 1983, as a result of the long-awaited legalisation of 'free' radio stations, two independent bilingual stations were set up in central Brittany: *Radio Kreiz Breizh* and *Radio Bro Gwened*. Latest and most significantly, two all-Breton stations—the first ever—were launched in 1998, namely *Radio Kerne* and *Arvorig FM*. Today 90% of all programmes are produced by these four local community radios and financed by the Region, the *départements*, and the State. *Radio Breizh* is the internet portal of all private but not Radio France Breton programmes.

Most Breton programmes feature news, current affairs, or cultural magazine shows that feature Breton and Celtic music, traditional or not, balancing out their near absence on other stations. There have never been any restrictions on songs in French, which represent half of the traditional repertoire of bilingual Brittany and must by French law amount to at least 40% of the airtime. English, which is not a contentious issue in this context, is heard in genres ranging from ballads from Ireland to rock, pop, reggae, soul, funk, and rap, to name but a few. Unlike *RTÉ RnaG*, there is no predominantly essentialist link to traditional culture. Breton is, in contrast, juxtaposed with topics and values not traditionally associated with the language. It is vital, although particularly challenging, to attract younger audiences with shows they consider on par with French programmes.

Interestingly, the traditional versus post-traditional issues may not be as clear-cut in the context of Breton broadcast media as it appears to be in Irish and other minoritised language contexts. From its very early days, Breton radio has featured presenters practising traditional varieties as well as new speakers or users of so-called 'literary Breton. 'Native' presenters who were literate and educated in Breton, unlike most of their audience, worked out a halfway speech mode by essentially avoiding elisions typical of their variety. Since the 1970s, the majority of presenters have been new speakers, many with a passive knowledge of Breton from the family or the broader sociolinguistic environment. Today, only a handful of presenters could be fully characterised as traditional speakers. However, as traditional varieties—which are valued in terms of authenticity—are afforded high prestige, many presenters align themselves with a chosen local variety, while others go by unabatedly using the *de facto* school standard on air. All work together and share the airwaves, seemingly without making much of an issue of their diverging approach to the language, not openly at least. The division between traditional and post-traditional speakers therefore does not appear as sharp in Breton media, having been mitigated by this long-standing co-existence.

Post-traditional variation has not been confined to particular domains and genres as no semiotic link is made between post-traditional speech and post-traditional practices and genres. The two presenters whose speech styles are analysed further may come from widely different

backgrounds, but they both interview people from all ages, walks of life, and language varieties and address an undifferentiated audience (there are no audience surveys³), most likely composed of traditional speakers, new speakers, intermediate categories, as well as learners, passive speakers, and even non-speakers of Breton. There is no linguistic strategy to attract a particular listener cohort, while there do exist musical and thematic strategies to do so. Many new speakers listen to traditional Breton on the radio as a substitute for real-life linguistic immersion. Most of the estimated 160,000 speakers are 'native', elderly, and live in Lower Brittany, but there have not been for decades any sizeable compact speech community comparable to the Irish Gaeltacht where all generations use the language to some extent. Rather, new speakers willing to master a particular variety have to rely on fleeting, evanescent, local networks of elderly speakers. New speakers use Breton within their own networks— including social—on a regional scale or wider. Meeting places are needed for speakers of traditional and post-traditional varieties to get together. Radio, whose cumulative Breton language airtime is far greater than TV's, can be such a place.

Breton Radio: A Site of Interaction Between Traditional and Post-traditional Speech Practices

In order to confirm the hypothesis of an interaction between traditional and post-traditional speech practices, two programmes on two different stations, led by two presenters, male and female, with diverging age, social, and linguistic backgrounds were analysed. The corpus included, (1) two 60-minute weekday morning broadcasts of *Tud deus ar Vro* on *RKB* and *Radio Kerne* on June 11th and 18th, 2015; (2) three 45-minute Saturday afternoon broadcasts of *Breizh O Pluriel* on *France Bleu Breizh-Izel* on June 6th, 13th, and 20th, 2015. The methodology consisted of a careful stop-and-go listening to podcasts and a systematic scrutiny of linguistic features to include morphosyntax, vocabulary, phonology, stylistics, and pragmatics. Features typically associated with either traditional

or post-traditional language practices were highlighted, with a particular focus on what may be considered as 'cross-fertilisation' phenomena.

Because of the great polysemy of *bro* (practically from 'locality' to 'continent'), *Tud eus ar vro* may refer to both 'people from this country' and 'local people', as the presenter welcomes guests from Central Brittany as well as interviewees from further afield. He is a native speaker born in south-central Treger, who started reporting for *RKB* belatedly in his mid-forties at the turn of the century, after being a horse breeder for over 20 years. His phonology is typical of this area, with markedly traditional prosody, but his awareness of the listeners' diversity leads him to use an obviously slower tempo than that of colloquial speech. Given his geographic, generational, and acquisitional background, one would expect his lexical repertoire to be devoid of the neology and verbal idiosyncrasy, developed mainly within the language movement and the education system to varying degrees. In other words, as a native speaker, one would expect him to use French loanwords and phrases rather than neologisms and verbal idiosyncrasies in his Breton. However, this is not the case as he comfortably incorporates a great number of the latter into his spoken Breton, such as inviting his audience to *pellgomz da ofis an douristelezh* (phone the tourist office) rather than *telefoniñ d'an office du tourisme*. *Kevedigezh* (association) is preferred to the loanword *asosiasion*, and for Saturday and Sunday, *dibenn-sizhun* (end of week) is favoured, not the doubly-borrowed *weekend*. He uses verbs like *gweladenniñ* (to visit), whereas a native layman speaker would typically use *bizitañ* nowadays. He extends the semantic field of *dizoloiñ* (to uncover) to the notion of 'discover', which is a typically new speaker feature. He also integrates in his speech style the recent intransitive value of *eskemm* ('to swap', originally) with its post-traditional meaning 'to exchange opinions'. Both are new acceptances—although by no means unanimously accepted—derived from French usage. He speaks of *strollad*, *skipailh*, *pladenn*, and *sonadeg* rather than *group*, *ekip*, *disk*, and *koñser* (group, team, disc/record, and concert). On one occasion, he 'corrects' his interviewee's *fotoioù* (photos) by repeating *skeudennoù* ('pictures', in general) after him. The fact that the conversation between the presenter and his guest flows seamlessly with very few such epilinguistic interferences, notwithstanding the integration of a different register by the former, is an indication of

satisfactory communication. It also suggests that a reconciliation of possible ideological tensions over new/native 'speakerness' has taken place.

In a programme about school matters, the *RKB* presenter resorts to a much higher register than what would be expected from most of his traditional counterparts who have received no formal education in Breton, as is the case for the overwhelming majority of traditional speakers. Therefore, *divyezhegezh* (bilingualism), *skoliata* (to provide with school- ing), *treuzkas* (to transmit, to pass down), *soubidigezh* (immersion school- ing), *emren* (autonomous, self-reliant), *yalc'hadoù* (grants, subventions), *diskouezadeg* (exhibition), and *buhezour* (activity leader) have all been used instead of the expected translanguaging practices evident in grass-root Breton. Examples of this practice do feature mildly in his production, however, for example, *mobilizañ* (to mobilise) and *situasion* (situation). The highly neological *-el* suffix (implemented in new speakers' Breton, but virtually absent in traditional speech) is present, and we therefore note the use of *sevenadurel* (cultural) and *sportel* (athletic, sports as an adjective). Occasionally, the neology goes slightly off track; thus, an unheard-of *rektordiezh* (rectorate, regional education office) was coined live instead of *rektordi* (actual building) or *rektorelezh* (function). Further monitoring would be needed in order to determine whether this is a one-off or a stable idiosyncratic neologism. Likewise, we see *andro* instead of *endro* (traditional Breton would use here the loanword *añvironamant*, environment). Most striking is the *RKB* presenter's acceptance of new senses given to familiar words: for instance, *kerent*, meaning 'parents', as in mother and father, rather than the traditionally wider sense of 'relatives'. Another example is his use, in a lay context, of terms hitherto reserved to the religious register, like *lid/lidañ* (celebration/to celebrate) or *gouel*, a word that many would exclusively apply to religious feasts, choosing to use *fest* in all other circumstances. He uses both terms indiscriminately, sometimes in succession within the same utterance (*un devezh fest, un devezh gouel* 'a festival day'), and by doing so, he probably says something to both sections of his listenership: 'Yes, I'm aware of the traditional distinction, but I also accept that younger, de-Christianised generations might now want to use *gouel* for other purposes.' Finally, he greets his listeners with *devezh mat* (good day) and thanks them with *truqarez*, both from a rather high register, no-complex attitude that

contrasts with that of some younger presenters who prefer the loanwords *salud* and *mersi bras*, presumably to escape purism.

ftis is notably the case with the Breton radio presenter of *Breizh O Pluriel* on State-run *France Bleu Breizh-Izel*. In her late thirties, born near Paris, raised in Tregunc, south-Cornouaille, she became a speaker as a young adult while also studying the language in Brest University. She patently strives to give her speech style a distinctive south Cornouaille colour. For instance, she palatalises her [z] into [ʒ] and her [s] into [ʃ]: *komzou* (talk, words) > [ˈkõmʒu]; *pezh* (piece) > [peʒ-ʃ]. She occasionally overplays this palatalisation, in contrast to traditional Breton phonology, as in *perzh* (part) > [ˈpeʃ] instead of traditional [ˈpeʁz-s], or in *leun-chouk* (full to the brim) and *o selaou* (listening) respectively pronounced [lø:nˈʒuk] (traditional [lø:nˈʃuk]) and [oʒiˈlõw] (traditional [oʃiˈlõw]), as *o* stands for an ancient *oc'h*.

Another way to sound like a speaker from south Cornouaille is the high use of elision and syncopation, which are characteristic of this very rhythmical variety of Breton. Here is a list of such short pronunciations heard in *Breizh O Pluriel*: *an dra-se* [ənˈdʁøʃ] (that); *du-se* [ˈdys] (down there); *just a-walc'h* [ʒysˈwah] (precisely, as it happens); *marteze* [maˈtreh] (perhaps); *sizhun* [ˈzø:n] (week); *nevez* [ˈne:] ([ˈne:ve], new); *neuze* [nøh] ([ˈnø:ze], [ˈnø:he], so); *amañ* [ãm] ([ˈãmə], [ˈãmã], here); *bremañ* [ˈbrøem] ([ˈbrømə], [ˈbrømã], now); *bin* [ˈbi:n] ([ˈbijən], small); *hiziv* [ˈhiw] (today); *klevet* [klø:t] ([ˈklø:vət], heard); *goude se* [guˈzø] ([ˈgu:dəˈzø], afterwards).

Conversely, however, many a word is pronounced the way ‘handbook Breton’ would have pronounced it, in a much slower tempo and without elision: *Menez-Are* (the Arre mountain) is pronounced [ˈme:nezˈa:ʁe], complete with [z], and not [ˈme:neˈaʁe] or [minˈa:ʁ] like in Cornouaille Breton. Likewise, *ouezit* (you know) is [ˈwe:zit] and *talvoudegezh* (value) retains its full form [ˌtalvuˈde:gøʃ]; *gortoz* (wait) is [ˈgøʁtøʃ] and not [ˈgøʁtəs], and *diouzhtu* (straightaway) is [djuˈty:] and not [døʃˈty] or [disˈty] as it is in traditional south-Cornouaille Breton.

For *ivez* (also, too) there is some fluctuation in her speech between two south Cornouaille local forms which are quite different from each other: sometimes [ˈije], other times the Bigoudenn [ve:]. *Ba'rradio*, a very wide-spread shortened form for ‘on (actually: in) the radio’ with the definite

article *ar* leads her hesitatingly to the aberrant *b'ur radio* 'on a radio' with the indefinite article *ur*, although the full *ba* would be required here for comprehension: *ba' ur radio*. *Gant* (with) is systematically rendered as [gɑ], but the conjugation of this preposition appears more erratic since *gant* (with them) follows the same stress pattern [gə'tɛ] as *ganin* [gə'ni:n], while the traditional form would be ['gate].

Although Breton does possess a small number of words—mostly adverbs—carrying oxytonic lexical stress (on the final syllable) as in standard French, the overall word stress pattern in northwestern Breton is paroxytonic (on the penultimate syllable). Word stress, very strongly marked in Cornouaille Breton, is obtained by elevating the fundamental frequency and not by stretching the vowel as it does in French. The opposition between long and short vowels is semantically pertinent in Breton, unlike in French, which excludes using vocalic length for highlighting purposes. Word stress does not disappear when included into a segment in Breton, contrary to the phrase accent that is so characteristic of northern French prosody. Overall, traditional word stress is interspersed in the *Breizh O Pluriel* presenter's speech production with non-traditional stress, mostly oxytonic, like in French. Therefore, *ur bourme'nadenn* (walk, stroll) is stressed as *ur bourmena'denn*, *maget* (fed) as are [ma'gɛ:t] (traditional ['mɑ:gɛt]), *danvez* (material/matter) [dã'n'ves] (traditional ['dãnve]). Other examples include many plurals: *bloave'zhioù* (years, traditional *bloa'vezhioù*), *euroe'zhioù* (hours, traditional *eur'vezhioù*), *goule'nnoù* (questions, traditional *gou'lennoù*) *isto'rioù* (stories, traditional *is'torioù*). In the case of *pajennoù* (pages), in addition to the shift of stress, a front [a] is replaced by a back [ɑ:] [pa'ʒɛn:u] > [pɑ:ʒɛ'nu:], as occurs also in *plasoù* (places) rendered as ['plɑ:su] instead of traditional ['plasu]. Likewise, she pronounces *holl* (all), as numerous new speakers do, with a long closed vowel [o:l], possibly by assimilation with RP English, where traditional Breton has an open [ɔ]. In the rendition 'next Saturday' tempo allegro [di'sa:n] is contradicted by the typical new speaker *o tont* (coming), thus *disadorn o tont* ('Saturday coming'), where traditional Breton would have either *disadorn a zeu* ('Saturday that comes') or *a-benn disadorn* (*a-benn* being in this case a future-oriented temporal proposition).

One particularly well-known trait often observed in learners' or new speakers' Breton is 'orthographism', that is, the influence of spelling on

pronunciation, also known as the Buben effect. It is present in *Breizh O Pluriel*, although rather moderately, in the following extracts: *'vidout eo un tamm...* (for you it's a bit...) [vi'duteœn'tãm] (traditional [vi'du:de'œntãm]); *adalek unneg eur* (from eleven o' clock) [a'da:lɛk'œnɛgœ:ɾ] (traditional [a'da:lɛgœ'nɛ:gœ]); *prantadoù plijus a zo* (there are nice moments) ['pli:ʒysa'zo:] (traditional ['pli:ʒyɔ'zo:]). In each of these cases, it is the very spelling of t, k, and s that has caused these consonants to remain unvoiced between two vowels, a phenomenon that does not occur with (usually near illiterate) traditional speakers, who would spontaneously voice them respectively into [d], [g], and [z]. There is, to date, a woolly but broad consensus in the education, media, publishing, and language planning sectors to retain the prevailing spelling system in spite of some shortcomings. Routine is obviously involved, but the other two dissenting systems carry their own drawbacks too and represent, nowadays, two restricted circles of mostly mature users. Pending possible orthographic accommodations, it will therefore remain the task of educators to convey the final-obstruent devoicing mechanism in Breton, as they do with French *liaisons*.

ftuuvular [ɾ] has become the most common way to pronounce 'r' in Breton among speakers of all ages, not just young or new speakers. Its frequency nowadays exceeds historical [r] or [ʀ], which nevertheless are still holding strong in many places. The relative proximity of [ɾ] with [x] or [ħ] can cause a certain confusion, as shown in a couple of instances in the course of *Breizh O Pluriel*. Thus, *bec'h déi* (go for it, let's go) is realised as [beɾ'dɛj], as opposed to traditional [be:ħ'tɛj] (with [d] > [t] sandhi), while *'lâren deoc'h* (I was telling you) was uttered ['laħɛn'dax] instead of traditional ['la:ɾɛn'dɔħ], notwithstanding the fact that the [laħ] stem means 'to kill'.

In terms of syntax and stylistics, one encounters some new speaker language features in the *FBBI* presenter's speech style too, like the post-traditional construct *fenoz 'vo gwelet 'nezhe* (tonight—will be seen—part of them) as opposed to the intended sense captured in the traditional *fenoz e vint gwelet* (tonight they will be seen). Another well-documented new speaker feature, also observed here, is the near disappearance of the verb *gallout* (can, be able to), most often replaced by *tu 'oa-zo-'vo da* (there was-is-will be a way to) regardless of whether the context is one of

practical feasibility, permission, moral inclination, or so forth. *ftus*, *e c'hellimp sikour* or *sikour a c'hellimp* or *gall(out) a raimp sikour* are substituted by *tu 'vo deomp sikour* (literally 'we'll be able help', as *da* is missing for a proper 'we'll be able to help'). Translanguaging appears to be less conscious and less controlled in *Breizh o pluriel* than in *Tud deus ar Vro* as it primarily consists of French filler words like *ouais*, *ben*, *bon*, and especially *voilà*. ftere is one instance of probable unconscious code-mixing: *war ar prim comme ça*: in a rush (Breton) like that (French).

Discussion

fte contexts and data presented above illustrate the manner in which radio stations and presenters in two minoritised Celtic languages, Irish and Breton, negotiate the environments in which they are operating through their sociolinguistic choices. As in minoritised languages, more generally, the pool of users and potential users of Irish and Breton comprise a broad spectrum of ability levels. ftey further comprise 'native' and 'new' speaker cohorts, variously orienting to traditional and post-traditional linguistic models. fte composition of the potential audience for all programming on Irish- and Breton-medium radio means that there is a range of linguistic styles and practices available to presenters and station management which can facilitate them in engaging various segments of the public. Bell's (1984, 1999) seminal work on audience design describes how individual radio presenters' conceptualisations of their audiences regulate their linguistic choices. Bell illustrates how presenters manage their linguistic production so as to align themselves with the various audiences that they imagine themselves to be addressing. fte audience design model can be adapted here to explain the kinds of linguistic variations that have already been described for Irish- and Breton-medium radio broadcasts. While this variation is partly attributable to stylistic choices by individual presenters, it is also germane to focus on the macro-level audience design choices made by station management as they endeavour to cater for their projected audiences.

RíRá ar RnaG is an outlier on *RnaG*. fte programme transgresses the traditional linguistic and cultural model espoused by the station in the

rest of its schedule. It does so, firstly, by playing songs with lyrics in English—a practice restricted to the stations nightly *Anocht FM* slot. As a show that segues between dialogue in Irish and pop music mainly in English, *RíRá ar RnaG* represents a departure from monolingual, protectionist approaches to minority languages that are often characterised by the institutional separation of the minority language from the more dominant language(s). The programme further deviates from the station's mainly traditional cultural stance by embracing and focusing on modern pop music and on aspects of modern global youth culture. The station thus juxtaposes Irish with a range of social and cultural values not commonly associated with the language. In doing so, *RíRá ar RnaG*, and *RTÉ RnaG* as a station, expand the range of broadcast media genres in which Irish is seen to be functional. *RíRá ar RnaG* transgresses the boundaries of traditional conceptualisations of the language and the essentialist indexical links associated with it in the public psyche—links that are actually reinforced in most of the station's other programming.

As the linguistic analysis above has shown, the presenters of *RíRá ar RnaG* display many post-traditional linguistic features. They are themselves linguistic outliers on a station that tends towards presenters who use traditional Gaeltacht speech. *RíRá ar RnaG* provides a forum for post-traditional speech practices and illustrates the utility of these models. It is significant, however, that post-traditional speech, global pop, and youth culture are paired together in this manner. This pairing, as well as the ideological factors influencing the widespread expansion of post-traditional speech varieties to other genres on the station, is likely to contribute to the development of indexical links between post-traditional speech practices and late modern global youth culture. The audience design choices made by the radio station in relation to the content and the linguistic composition of *RíRá ar RnaG* allow the show to engage with young, post-traditional users of Irish on their own cultural and linguistic terms. This audience design of the show is further likely to appeal to more passive users of Irish who, perhaps, recognise in the presenters some small elements of their own linguistic practices, developed through compulsory study of Irish in education with varying levels of success, a phenomenon Ó hÍfearnáin (2008) has pointed to in relation to Irish-medium television. The potential enregisterment (Agha 2003), or

iconisation (Gal and Irvine 1995), of post-traditional speech practices may well lead to its pigeonholing within this genre. Ultimately, such an association could reproduce dominant overt language ideologies around linguistic variation within Irish, where traditional speech is valorised and post-traditional speech stigmatised.

Despite the persistence of well-documented ideological contention around the role of traditional Breton and so-called literary Breton or *néo-breton* (e.g., Hornsby 2005), the data, on Breton-medium radio broadcasting, presented above suggest that radio has not emerged as a battleground for ideological contestation to the same extent as the Irish context. The sociolinguistic history of Breton-medium radio broadcasting reveals how Breton has not been isolated from other languages in this domain. Studio discourse has typically been punctuated by music, from all genres, in French, English, and other languages, as well as in Breton itself. Furthermore, traditional and post-traditional speech varieties have shared the airwaves without confining either traditional or post-traditional speech practices to a particular genre, domain, or register. The linguistic analysis already presented evidence of a fundamentally different type of audience design for Breton radio—one that appears to be based on compromise and accommodation.

The high linguistic diversity to which the *FBBI* and *RKB* presenters are exposed leads to a heterogeneous feature pool from which they may select. Their respective idiolects reflect not only their linguistic backgrounds but also their experiences and engagements with language as social actors in their daily lives. While post-traditional influence is basically limited to vocabulary in the *RKB* presenter's idiolect, the effect of new speaker speech on some of his constructs or on new meanings given to familiar words is also clear. There can be little doubt that this is a result of linguistic osmosis through contact with revivalist milieu. As for the Breton idiolect developed by the *FBBI* presenter, although some aspects make it seem rather heterogeneous and patchy, despite a vigorously determined south-Cornouaille inclination, this idiolect is certainly more integrative than some new speaker school varieties, where the prosody appears so strongly influenced by French that it may constitute—*aesthetic considerations aside*—a real hindrance to traditional speakers' comprehension, should these young speakers eventually become radio presenters

without previously making sure to adapt their speech style to accommodate a wider 'native' audience.

fte data analysed here speak to a conscious or subconscious audience design strategy, either by presenters themselves or by station management, in which the heterogeneous makeup of the potential listener cohort is recognised. fte programmers/presenters might therefore be said to arrive at a linguistic middle ground by utilising a linguistic style that contains both traditional and post-traditional elements. Although not addressing potential listeners in the precise linguistic variety that they practise themselves, the presenters arguably arrive at a variety designed not to alienate would-be listeners—be they of the traditional or of the new speaker variety. ftherefore, despite ideological tensions around traditional and new speaker varieties and popular belief that Breton as spoken by radio journalists and presenters is incomprehensible to the vast majority of traditional speakers, a 2007 survey proved this not the case. In response to the question 'Do you encounter difficulties understanding the Breton spoken by radio journalists or presenters?' Breton speakers responded as follows: rarely or never 32%, sometimes 41%, often 26% (Broudic 2009). fte mere fact that hundreds of interviews are conducted every year in between radio staff and Breton speakers of all walks of life, traditional or post-traditional alike, is in itself proof that intergenerational comprehension is not only attainable but widespread. fthat a quarter of listeners often find radio voices difficult to understand—a phenomenon attested, to a lesser extent, in majority languages too—may have to do with the frequent written-spoken texture of radio speech, a possible overuse of journalese, or indeed an inadequate language proficiency on the part of 'quasi-speakers', 'semi-speakers', or 'rememberers' of the language.

Conclusion

fte audience design approaches that are implicit in the linguistic data analysed for this chapter are notable for their divergence from one another. fte analysis of the Irish data reveal heavily demarcated boundaries of distinction between traditional language usage, typical of older

Gaeltacht speakers, and the post-traditional linguistic practices characteristic of the speech of younger Gaeltacht speakers and new speakers of Irish. These boundaries seem to restrict traditional and post-traditional varieties of Irish to predetermined broadcast genres on *RTÉ RnaG*. Post-traditional speech varieties, characteristic of the speech of younger Gaeltacht speakers and of so-called new speakers, have a presence in the modern, youth-oriented pop culture genre. However, post-traditional speech does not feature so prominently in traditionally high-prestige and more 'serious' genres such as news and current affairs programming or in magazine programmes aimed at the traditional Gaeltacht communities. In confining the presence of post-traditional speech to youth genres, it is likely that *RTÉ RnaG* feeds into the broader indexical processes through which language varieties become valorised or stigmatised. In that way, the inclusion on *RTÉ RnaG* of presenters who practise post-traditional speech varieties, and their confinement to youth programming on *Raidió RíRá*, may actually reinforce the traditional hierarchy of speech varieties of Irish. In comparison, such boundaries are rather opaque in the Breton context as presenters instead seem to attempt to address traditional and new speaker populations alike. Given the role of the broadcast media in establishing and maintaining language standards and targets for language excellence, one might expect *RTÉ RnaG* to contribute to the perpetuation of traditional ideologies on language variation in spoken Irish. The audience design strategies on Breton-medium radio, however, neither fully support speech models based on traditional Breton or spoken varieties of 'literary' Breton. Nonetheless, the choices made in terms of the linguistic output of Breton-medium radio may in future have implications for the ideologisation of spoken language variation in Breton and for the manner in which the public conceive of both traditional and new speakers varieties.

Notes

1. 'N' fheadar' is a traditional form associated with Munster, but the speaker here realises the final 'r' in a post-traditional way, i.e. as an alveolar approximant [ɹ] rather than an alveolar tap [r].

2. fte is an interesting example as it contains the traditional voiceless palatal fricative [ç], often challenging for new speakers as it has no close equivalent in English, and yet is followed by the wholly post-traditional rhotic alveolar approximant [ɹ].
3. Audience surveys are not carried out on behalf of community Breton language radios, mainly for cost reasons and because it would be difficult to constitute a representative sample for such a scattered audience.

References

- Agha, A. (2003). fte Social Life of Cultural Value. *Language and Communication*, 23(3/4), 231 – 273.
- Bell, A. (1984). Language Style as Audience Design. *Language in Society*, 13(2), 145 – 204.
- Bell, A. (1999). Back in Style: Reworking Audience Design. In P. Eckert & J. Rickford (Eds.), *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation* (pp. 139 – 169). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boudreau, A., & Dubois, L. (2007). *Français, acadien, acadjonne*: Competing Discourses on Language Preservation Along the Shores of the Baie Sainte-Marie. In A. Duchêne & M. Heller (Eds.), *Discourses of Endangerment: Ideology and Interest in the Defence of Languages* (pp. 99 – 120). London: Continuum.
- Broderick, G. (1984 – 96). *A Handbook of Late Spoken Manx* (vols. 1 – 3). Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Broudic, F. (2009). *Parler breton au XXIe siècle*. Brest: Emgleo Breiz.
- Cheshire, J., Kerswill, P., Fox, S., & Torgersen, E. (2011). Contact, the Feature Pool and the Speech Community: fte Emergence of Multicultural London English. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 15(2), 151 – 192.
- Cotter, C. (1999). *Raidió na Life*: Innovations in the Use of Media for Language Revitalization. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 140, 135 – 147.
- Coupland, N., & Kristiansen, T. (2011). Critical Perspectives on Language (De) standardisation. In T. Kristiansen & N. Coupland (Eds.), *Language Standards and Standard Languages in a Changing Europe* (pp. 11 – 38). Oslo: Novus.
- Gal, S., & Irvine, J. (1995). fte Boundaries of Language and Disciplines: How Ideologies Construct Differences. *Social Research*, 3(4), 443 – 460.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Hornsby, M. (2005). Néo-Breton and Questions of Authenticity. *Estudios de Sociolingüística*, 6(2), 191 – 218.
- Mac Giolla Chríost, D. (2012). *Jailtacht: The Irish Language, Symbolic Power and Political Violence in Northern Ireland, 1972–2008*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Maguire, G. (1992). Resilience and Versatility in an Urban Gaeltacht. In D. P. Ó. Baoill (Ed.), *Insealbhú na Gaeilge mar chéad teanga/Acquisition of Irish as a first language* (pp. 43 – 53). Dublin: Irish Association of Applied Linguistics.
- Ó Béarra, F. (2009). An Ghaeilge Nua agus Triall na Gaeilge. In M. Mac Craith & P. Ó. Héalaí (Eds.), *Diasa Díograise: Aistí i gCuimhnear Mháirtín Ó Briain* (pp. 257 – 276). Indreabhán: Cló Iar-Chonnachta.
- Ó Broin, B. (2014). New Urban Irish: Pidgin, Creole, or Bona Fide Dialect? fte Phonetics and Morphology of City and Gaeltacht Speakers Systematically Compared. *Journal of Celtic Linguistics*, 15, 69 – 91.
- Ó Curnáin, B. (2007). *The Irish of Iorras Aithneach, Co. Galway* (4 vols.). Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Ó Curnáin, B. (2009). Mionteangú na Gaeilge. In B. Ó Catháin (Ed.), *Sochtheangeolaíocht na Gaeilge: Léachtaí Cholm Cille XXXIX* (pp. 90 – 153). Maynooth: An Sagart.
- Ó Curnáin, B. (2012). An Chanúineolaíocht. In T. Ó. hÍfearnáin & M. Ní Neachtain (Eds.), *An tSochtheangeolaíocht: Feidhm agus Tuairisc* (pp. 83 – 110). Dublin: Cois Life.
- Ó Dónaill, É. (2000). "Tá sé suas duit féin": Impleachtaí Mheath na Gaeilge do Mhúineadh na Teanga. In M. Mac Mathúna, L. Mac Murchaidh, & M. Nic Eoin (Eds.), *Teanga, Pobal agus Réigiún: Aistí ar Chultúr na Gaeltachta Inniu* (pp. 48 – 63). Dublin: Coisceim.
- Ó Duibhir, P. (2009). *The Spoken Irish of Sixth-Class Pupils in Irish Immersion Schools* (Unpublished PhD thesis in Applied Linguistics). Dublin: Trinity College.
- Ó hÍfearnáin, T. (2008). An tírdhreach teanga agus taibhiú teanga ar TG4. In E. O'Connell, J. Walsh, & G. Denvir (Eds.), *TG4@10* (pp. 91 – 102). Indreabhán: Cló Iar-Chonnacht.
- Ó hÍfearnáin, T., & Ó Murchadha, N. (2011). fte Perception of Standard Irish as a Prestige Target Variety. In T. Kristiansen & N. Coupland (Eds.), *Standard Languages in a Changing Europe* (pp. 97 – 104). Oslo: Novus Press.
- Ó Murchadha, N., & Ó hÍfearnáin, T. (2018, In press). Converging and Diverging Stances on Target Varieties in Collateral Languages. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*.

- Péterváry, T., Ó Curnáin, B., Ó Giollagáin, C., & Sheahan, J. (2014). *Analysis of Bilingual Competence: Language Acquisition Among Young People in the Gaeltacht*. Dublin: COGG.
- Walsh, C. (2007). *Cruinneas na Gaeilge scríofa sna hiar-bhunscoileanna lán-Ghaeilge i mBaile Átha Cliath*. Dublin: COGG. Available at: <http://www.cogg.ie/includes/documents/Walshereport.pdf>

