

UHI Research Database pdf download summary

Establishing new norms of language use: the circulation of linguistic ideology in three new Irish-language communities

Armstrong, Timothy Currie

Published in:
Language Policy

Publication date:
2012

The re-use license for this item is:
CC BY-NC

The Document Version you have downloaded here is:
Early version, also known as pre-print

The final published version is available direct from the publisher website at:
[10.1007/s10993-011-9219-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-011-9219-2)

[Link to author version on UHI Research Database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Armstrong, T. C. (2012). Establishing new norms of language use: the circulation of linguistic ideology in three new Irish-language communities. *Language Policy*, 11(2), 145-168. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-011-9219-2>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the UHI Research Database are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights:

- 1) Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the UHI Research Database for the purpose of private study or research.
- 2) You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- 3) You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the UHI Research Database

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at RO@uhi.ac.uk providing details; we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Establishing New Norms of Language Use;
The circulation of linguistic ideology in three new Irish-language communities.

Timothy Currie Armstrong

Soillse, Sabhal Mòr Ostaig, An t-Eilean Sgitheanach, Alba, UK, IV44 8RQ
44 (0) 1471 888445 sm00ta@uhi.ac.uk

Ideology can be understood as a guide to action, and therefore, language ideology can be viewed as a link between language ability on the one hand, and language use on the other. In this respect, language ideology plays a central role in the success of language revitalization movements. In an effort to understand how new language ideologies are advanced in language revitalization movements at the micro level, research was conducted on the circulation of language ideology in three new Irish-language communities in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. I use these three communities as specific examples of a general policy problem in revitalizing lesser-used languages: how does one establish new norms for the use of a threatened language in a given site or domain and how does one defend these new norms against the counter-ideology of an encroaching or dominant language?

Keywords: language ideology, Irish language, Gaeltacht nua, language norms

Armstrong, Timothy Currie. 2012. "Establishing new norms of language use: the circulation of linguistic ideology in three new Irish-language communities." *Language Policy* 11: 145–168.

This is an archive copy. The final publication is available at:
<http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10993-011-9219-2>

Introduction

Language revitalization and revival movements¹ around the world often employ education as a principal tactic: typically focusing on teaching children the threatened language. Formal childhood education is a powerful socializing force and undoubtedly will be important to the long-term vitality of languages in the twenty-first century. Education has also played a central role in language revival in the past (Nahir 1998), but some have cautioned that an over-reliance on formal childhood education in language revitalization is a mistake (Fishman 2001a; Harris 1994; Hornberger and King 1996). The Irish Language Revival in the Republic of Ireland in particular has been cited as an example of the danger of an over-reliance on education to strengthen the use of a declining language (Coady and Ó Laoire 2002). Since the founding of the Irish Free State in 1922, children have been taught the Irish language in schools, both as a subject, and for some, as a medium of instruction, to the extent that more than a million adults in the Republic of Ireland [1,091,543; 20 years old or older] describe themselves as Irish speakers, a competency most would have acquired as children in school, but of these adults, only about 4% report using the language on a daily basis outside of the educational system [45,485; 20 years old or older] (Central Statistics Office of Ireland 2007). In the Republic of Ireland, education for widespread language ability did not lead to general language use.

This emphasis on education follows from the way in which activists and policy-makers often understand the nature of language. Language is understood as a coherent structure, as a collection of rules or a set of competencies, and in the field of linguistics, the structural understanding is foundational. When Ferdinand de Saussure described the boundaries of his inquiry, he bracketed out the social and practice aspects of language, choosing to study language strictly as a self-contained structure (Saussure 1986; discussed in Bourdieu 2005). Outside of the field of linguistics, language is also commonly understood as a kind of structure, as a collection of words organized by grammar (Pawley 1986), and certainly, this is how languages are frequently taught (Amery 2001). In this popular structuralist conception of the nature of language, a speaker is understood as someone who possesses specific competencies such as native-like pronunciation, proper grammar and appropriate vocabulary, and the absolute number or density of speakers is typically given as the first measure of the vitality of a threatened language (Urla 1993). It then follows that if we want to revitalize a language, we would work to increase the number of people who are *able* to speak it, but there are several leaps of faith in that strategy, not the least of which is the assumption that language ability will lead to language use.

If we add social and practice elements to our conception of the nature of language, we are better able to understand why some languages are vital and others moribund. Here, I argue that language ideology is a particularly useful analytical frame for understanding language vitality. Language ideology tells us why our languages are important to us and how they should be used. Without an attendant ideology, a language would be an abstraction locked away unused in dictionaries and grammars. It is in the service of a particular language ideology that we acquire a

¹ In general, I will use the term 'revival' to refer to efforts to re-vernacularize a language, as in the case of Hebrew or Cornish. I will use the term 'revitalization' to refer to attempts to restrengthen a language that is falling out of vernacular use, as in the case of Irish or Welsh. Both the revival of Hebrew and the revitalization of Irish are historically called 'Revivals' when referred to as named movements, and I will follow this convention in the text.

language, that we speak a language and that we pass it on to the next generation. And behind the attrition of a language, we will often find a newer ideology that leads speakers not to pass on that language and not to use it. A more complete understanding of the nature of language would include language ideology as a constitutive element, defining a speaker of a language as someone who has both acquired the necessary competencies in the language and has also acquired an ideology that leads to the use of that language. Language ideology is a link between ability on the one hand and use on the other (Armstrong 2011a), and it therefore plays a central role in the success of language revitalization movements (Fishman 1991, 2001b). Though ideology is a key to language vitality, the promotion of ideology as an aspect of language revitalization remains relatively understudied. To effectively support the use of threatened languages, we need to better understand how new language ideologies are advanced in language revitalization movements, particularly in organizations and at the micro level.

To address this question, research was conducted on the circulation of language ideology in three new Irish-language communities, three *Gaeltachtaí nua* (singular: *Gaeltacht nua*), in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. These three communities serve as specific examples of a practical and central policy problem in promoting lesser-used languages: how does one establish new norms for the use of a threatened language in a given site or domain and how does one defend these new norms against the counter-ideology of an encroaching or dominant language? Analysis of language ideology in these three *Gaeltachtaí nua* shows how ideology circulates at the micro level, theoretically building on the work of Simons and Ingram (Ingram and Simons 2000, 2002; Simons and Ingram 1997, 2004) and others, demonstrating the role that the organization plays in mediating social change by advancing ideology, and specifically, the role organizations play in reversing language shift as a cellular, bottom-up social movement. Close examination of the circulation of ideology in these three communities illustrates a way of thinking about planning language ideology in small organizations or groups involved in language revitalization. I argue that language activists, educators and policy makers will be more successful in promoting the use of a threatened language if they self-consciously plan the language ideology of their organizations.

Research Sites and Methods

Three contrasting communities were selected for this study: Shaw's Road (*Bóthar Seoighe*) in Belfast, Northern Ireland; the Trinity College Residential Scheme (*Scéim Chónaithe Choláiste na Tríonóide*) in Dublin, Ireland; and Carnogher (*Carn Tóchair*), in County Derry, Northern Ireland. These communities differ along several axes, between permanent and temporary, new and established, rural and urban, up-and-running and in-development, and in their situation, with two in Northern Ireland and one in the Republic of Ireland. However, they all intended or intend to establish residential communities where Irish is used as the habitual language of daily communication. Members of all three communities used the label *Gaeltacht nua*, or in some cases, simply *Gaeltacht*, to describe where they lived. The traditional *Gaeltachtaí* in the Republic of Ireland are legally recognized and protected enclaves of Irish speakers. The idea of the *Gaeltacht* as the final refuge of traditional Irish language and culture is a powerful (and contested) notion in both the Republic of Ireland and in Northern Ireland, and by using the label, *Gaeltacht*, members were making similar and ambitious statements about the status of the Irish language in their communities.

Government language policy in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland are fundamentally different and the two communities in Northern Ireland, Carntogher and Shaw's Road, and the community in the Republic of Ireland, the Trinity College Residential Scheme, would be located in distinct political and historical contexts. In the early twentieth century, the Irish Language Revival developed into a broad grassroots movement focused around local chapters of the Irish-language organization, *Conradh na Gaeilge* (the Gaelic League). With the establishment of the Irish Free State, the revitalization of Irish became state policy and *Conradh na Gaeilge* entered a period of decline (Ó Croidheáin 2006). Symbolically, support for the Irish language by the Irish Free State, and later, the Republic of Ireland, has never wavered and Irish remains the first official language of the Republic of Ireland as declared in Article 8 of the Constitution of Ireland (*Bunreacht na hÉireann*), with English as a second official language. However, symbolism aside, Muiris Ó Laoire charts a gradual shift in policy goals in the Republic of Ireland through the second half of the twentieth century, from pursuing Irish-language monolingualism as the ultimate aim of state policy, to a gradual acquiescence to the role of English in Irish society, and pursuing stable social bilingualism as the ultimate aim (2005; see also Ó Buachalla 1984). Yet in spite of this basic shift in policy goals, the government of the Republic of Ireland continues to plan and implement a range of interventions designed to strengthen the Irish language and recently adopted a *20 Year Strategy for the Irish Language* that includes the ambitious target of increasing the number of daily users of Irish to 250,000 by 2030 (Government of Ireland 2010).

After the establishment of the Irish Free State, Northern Ireland remained in the U.K. and government policy towards the Irish language north of the border followed a very different trajectory. As a symbol of Irish Nationalism, the use of the Irish language in official venues in Northern Ireland was for all practical purposes proscribed (Crowley 2005). The Irish language in Northern Ireland is often cast as a pawn in a struggle between Catholic Irish Nationalists and Protestant British Unionists, although this is an oversimplification of a complex dynamic (Pritchard 2004). Throughout the twentieth century, support for Irish was certainly politicized by some in Northern Ireland, particularly during the disruption and inter-ethnic violence, the Troubles, that peaked in the 1970s and 1980s, but after all and in spite of decades of polarizing rhetoric around the language, Diarmait Mac Giolla Chríost (2000, 2002) presents data demonstrating that there is continuing quiet support for Irish amongst some Protestants as well as significant ambivalence towards the language amongst many Catholics. Since 1998, with the signing of the 'Good Friday Agreement,' the Irish language has been slowly gaining official recognition and support from the Northern Ireland Assembly, albeit nothing like the official status and support the language enjoys in the Republic of Ireland. Meanwhile, the Irish Language Revival as a grassroots movement continues to gain strength in Northern Ireland, particularly as evidenced by the growth of Irish-medium education, driven by parental demand and often in the face of official intransigence and obstructionism (Ó Baoill 2007).

Members of all three of the communities studied here describe where they live with reference to the concept of the *Gaeltacht*. The traditional *Gaeltacht* regions were first defined in 1925 in a special survey commissioned by the new government in the Irish Free State and the regions were grouped according to the number of Irish speakers enumerated in this survey, with areas at or over 80% classed as *Fíor-Ghaeltacht* (True *Gaeltacht*) and areas between 25% and 79% classed as *Breac-Ghaeltacht* (Partial *Gaeltacht*) (Ní Bhrádaigh et al. 2007). Catriona Ó Torna plots the

development of the idea of the *Gaeltacht* and notes that the term was little-used in Ireland before the period of the early Irish Language Revival, 1893-1922, and that this idea of the *Gaeltacht* was a creative construction of those early revivalists who projected their aspirations for Ireland and the Irish language on the people of the *Gaeltacht*, constructing a utopia that would serve as an ideal Ireland: pious, culturally rich but physically poor, and innocent (2005). Central to this construction is the notion that the traditional *Gaeltacht* regions are uniformly Irish-speaking territories (Ó hÍfearnáin 2006) and members of the *Gaeltachtaí nua* drew on this sense of term when they used it to refer to their own communities, as a short-hand for particular norms of Irish use.

The *Gaeltacht nua* on Shaw's Road is the oldest and most well-known of the three communities (Mac Póilin 2007; Maguire 1991; Nig Uidhir 2006). Established in 1969 by five families of Irish speakers who built homes and moved in together in a new, permanent community near Andersontown, in West Belfast, the Shaw's Road *Gaeltacht* grew steadily over the years, and at the time of research (2007-2008), there were 22 houses in the *Gaeltacht*, with members proud to report that a third generation was being raised in the community as native Irish speakers. In 1971, the members of the Shaw's Road *Gaeltacht* established an independent Irish-medium school to serve the children in the *Gaeltacht*. For the first 13 years, the school was not funded by the state, but after a lengthy and sometimes acrimonious struggle, the school was given full recognition and grant aid by the Department of Education in 1984 (Maguire 1991, Ó Baoill 2007), and eventually passed out of direct community administration and control. When the first five houses were built, the *Gaeltacht* was on the urban edge of Belfast and surrounded on two sides by undeveloped fields, but over the years, as the members built more houses and the Shaw's Road *Gaeltacht* expanded, Belfast also grew, sprawling around and enclosing the *Gaeltacht*. There is now no remaining undeveloped land adjacent to the *Gaeltacht*, and the *Gaeltacht* can no longer expand, at least not by building more houses. It should also be noted that the Shaw's Road *Gaeltacht* was founded on the eve of the Troubles in Northern Ireland, and although it is situated some distance from the centre of Belfast, its members did not escape the violence and disruption of that era. It is remarkable, therefore, that in such an environment, the *Gaeltacht* on Shaw's Road not only survived, but grew and thrived.

The project to establish a *Gaeltacht nua* in the rural area known as Carntogher in County Derry in Northern Ireland is relatively less well known and documented (Armstrong 2011a; 2011b). Carntogher refers to the country north-west of the town of Maghera (Irish: *Machaire Rátha*) with the little village of Tirkane (Irish: *Tír Chiana*) as its focus. Tirkane is unusually developed given its size², and boasts a pre-school, a primary school, a community centre with a post office, shop and business units and a small social-housing development, all within a few yards of the cross-roads that mark the centre of the village. All of these developments, apart from the primary school, were initiated by a group of community development activists, the Carntogher Community Association, and on the 29th of January, 2008, the same community association launched a strategy to redevelop their area as a *Gaeltacht* within fifty years or two generations. The planned *Gaeltacht* in Carntogher would differ from the *Gaeltacht* on Shaw's Road in that, rather than bringing Irish speakers together into a new community, the Carntogher Community Association is working to shift their entire established community from speaking English as its

² In the last census in 2001, Maghera had a population of 3711. Tirkane was not enumerated as a separate village by the census, but as part of the rural Swatragh ward with a total population of 2668 (Northern Ireland Census 2001).

common community language to speaking Irish. To date, much of the work in the *Gaeltacht* initiative has focused on schooling. The Community Association established two pre-schools, one in Tirkane and one in Maghera, that both feed into an Irish-medium unit in Saint Brigid's Primary School in Tirkane (Armstrong 2011b). The unit is growing and at the time of research (2007-2008), there were more children in the Irish unit than in the English main-stream classes at the school.³

In contrast to these two permanent communities, the Trinity College Residential Scheme is a *Gaeltacht nua* that comes together anew each year as Irish-language residences for students on the campuses of Trinity College in Dublin. The scheme was established in 2003 with ten students together in one residence on campus, but like the *Gaeltacht* on Shaw's Road, it has also expanded, and in the academic year of 2006-2007 when this research was carried out, there were three separate residences in the scheme, one on the main campus for second, third and fourth-year students, one on a satellite campus for first-year students, and a third on the main campus for honour students (scholars), with a total of 36 students living between the three sites. For the purposes of this research, I concentrated on the largest of these three small residences at Trinity College, the residence on the main campus for second, third and fourth-year students, with 18 Irish speakers living together.

These three communities are successes in the sense that all three function as (or are becoming) Irish-speaking communities as envisioned by their founders. In both the Shaw's Road *Gaeltacht* and the Trinity College Residential Scheme, members were universal in their assessment that Irish was the language used between most residents most of the time. It is early days yet for the planned *Gaeltacht* in Carntogher, and English is still the dominant language in the area for almost all adult residents, but activists pointed to the ever-increasing numbers of children attending Irish-medium education, as well as the small but growing number of young families raising their children in Irish, as evidence that their initiative is succeeding and on track towards the long-term goal of creating an Irish-speaking community⁴.

The following analysis will be based on data gathered in semi-structured, in-depth interviews with members, activists and organizers in each community, along with examples of language ideology found in texts produced in the communities such as webpages, press-releases, and strategy documents. Between the three communities, a total of 45 recorded and transcribed interviews were conducted with 46 individuals. Most of the interviews were conducted with the understanding that statements would be carefully anonymized if reported. However, some of the informants were speaking in an official capacity and were interviewed with the understanding that they would be named next to any extracts from their interviews that were used in published reports. In the case of these official, named interviews, the informants had the opportunity to read, edit and approve the transcripts of their interviews before they were analyzed. All interviews were conducted in English.

³ The total enrolment in 2007-2008 was 133 students (Northern Ireland Department of Education 2007), with 75 students in the Irish-medium unit (Niall Ó Catháin, personal communication, February 25, 2011).

⁴ Ethically researching social behavior at the micro-level in named communities is challenging with potential repercussions both for the communities under study and for the researchers themselves. Throughout the research and write-up process I was keenly aware of the danger that my research might pose to the *Gaeltachtaí nua* and as part of my effort not to damage the communities I studied, an early draft of this paper was read by a key informant in each community to help ensure that nothing reported would cause harm.

In the Shaw's Road *Gaeltacht* and in the Trinity College Residential Scheme, clear membership boundaries made it relatively simple to determine who should be interviewed, but in the case of the planned *Gaeltacht* in Carntogher, involvement in the *Gaeltacht* initiative was less well delineated. Grassroots Irish-language activism in Carntogher is diffuse and not everyone involved in promoting Irish in the community is directly connected to the Carntogher Community Association. I defined the pool of potential interviewees as anyone involved in Irish-language activities in the Carntogher community. This would include workers and volunteers at the community centre, parents with children in the Irish-medium unit at the primary school, adult Irish-language learners taking classes at the community centre, activists organizing Irish-language initiatives and events not connected to the Community Association, and of course, members of the Community Association itself. Starting with the central activists on the Community Association, I proceeded by snow-balling (Warren 2001) from interview to interview towards the fringes of the Irish-language movement in the area. In all three communities, I was aiming at what Klaus Bruhn Jensen (2002: 239) has called "maximum variation sampling" and I interviewed as wide a range of different people in each community as possible, varying on as many axes as possible: age, gender, class, length of involvement in the *Gaeltacht nua*, level of involvement or commitment to the *Gaeltacht nua*, level of fluency in Irish, and so on.

Language Ideology

Ideology is a common concept in the social sciences but it is a concept with a host of different definitions depending on the analytical tradition in which it is used (for a review, see Gerring 1997). As is implied by the notion of a circulation of ideology, in this analysis, I investigate a process whereby multiple ideologies are advanced, contested and defended (Gal 1998). A certain ideology may be dominant in society as a whole, in an organization, or in a community, and as part of that dominance, the ideology will be naturalized, de-politicized and de-historicized (Eagleton 1991, Schmidt 2007), but there is nothing actually inevitable about the ascendancy of one ideology over another. The ascendancy would be the result of a social process, and as researchers, we can ask, what is that process? If, for instance, a certain ideology of Anglophone privilege is dominant in Ireland, we could ask how that ideology was advanced in the first place, how is its dominance maintained, and how is it contested by advocates of counter-ideologies.

Language ideology (or linguistic ideology) is also variously defined throughout the social sciences (Kroskrity 2004; Woolard and Schieffelin 1994; Woolard 1998). Here, I define a language ideology as a constellation of beliefs, attitudes and social norms, often concerned with the connection between language and identity or ethnicity, but also with reference to ontology, epistemology, history, politics, language structure and language use. A language ideology is a more-or-less coherent combination of these various elements that answers two simple questions: what is the value of a given language and how should that language be used? The word 'should' is key to this definition and how language ideology is identified in the data in this study. Language ideology always implies a judgment of social correctness. Language ideology is programmatic or prescriptive.

People create and enact language policy at all levels of society: from the home to communities, businesses, local government, the state and on up to include super-state polities (Spolsky 2004). Conventionally, language policy is understood as predominantly a macro-level activity and the province of governments and perhaps businesses, but there is a growing awareness in the field that policy at the micro level is more common and more important than may have been originally assumed (Baldauf 1994, 2006; Curdt-Christiansen 2009; King et al. 2008). The government of the Republic of Ireland's involvement in the Irish Language Revival is an example of a government attempting to effect change in the language-use of its citizens through top-down policy and planning (Ó Croidheáin 2006; Ó Laoire 2005; Walsh and McLeod 2008). The Irish Language Revival has met with mixed success, and it has been suggested that a more bottom-up approach might be more effective (Mac Giolla Chríost 2006). Joshua Fishman has proposed that ideological clarification plays an important role in the success of language revitalization as a social movement (1991; 2001b; discussed in Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer 1998). If so, the research questions about the circulation of ideology posed above become interesting policy questions at the micro-level and take on practical significance. How exactly is an appropriate ideology for language revitalization clarified in an organization, in a community or in a particular site or domain of language use? What is best practice when it comes to planning language ideology at the micro level?

The language policy of a group can be understood as an instance or an expression of the language ideology of those with the power to mandate that policy. For instance, parents may make a language policy for the family, insisting that multilingual children speak a particular language in the home, and this policy would not only be informed by the parents' understanding of the value and proper use of languages, but also by their beliefs in their own agency and their right to make these decisions for their children, beliefs about language and parenthood that are not necessarily universal. Further, in implementing this family language policy, the parents may attempt to impart their own beliefs about the value and proper use of languages to their children, may attempt to pass on or disseminate their own language ideology in the family. In this way, language policy may be both a product of language ideology and a vehicle for its circulation (Shohamy 2006).

Some of the most promising work on policy and ideology at the micro level can be found in the field of Organizational Theory, and specifically, in Simons and Ingram's research on the circulation of ideology in the Kibbutzim in Israel (Ingram and Simons 2000, 2002; Simons and Ingram 1997, 2004). Simons and Ingram start with the simple observation that an organization can manage the ideology of its members in two ways: it can select members based on ideology and/or it can socialize members to the desired ideology (1997; discussed in Sheaffer et al. 2010). Simons and Ingram understand that all organizations are profoundly ideological, but that some organizations must work harder to manage ideology than others. Organizations that operate under an ideology similar to the dominant ideology in society can largely ignore the ideology of their members, confident that most new members will come to the organization imbued with an appropriate ideology and with little need for selection or socialization to manage that ideology (Simons and Ingram 1997). In contrast, we would expect that the *Gaeltachtaí nua*, founded in direct opposition to the dominant Anglophone ideology of Irish society, would have to work quite hard to establish and maintain a language ideology among their members that would lead to

Irish use. In the following analysis, I borrow and expand on Simons and Ingram's framework to describe the flow of ideology in the three communities in question.

The definition of ideology used here harmonizes with Simons and Ingram's conception of ideology on two key points. The first is that ideology is understood as a guide to action (Simons and Ingram 1997), or as I phrased it above, that language ideology is a link between language ability and language use. The second is that, like Simons and Ingram (1997), I make a distinction in my analysis between ideology and behavior, or in this case, between language ideology on the one hand and language use on the other. I did not systematically collect data on language use in the *Gaeltachtaí nua*, and in my analysis, I do not read language ideology from language use. Rather, I read language ideology from explicit, metalinguistic statements about the value and proper use of language embedded in the texts that form the data for this study, e.g. policy documents, websites, publicity literature, and particularly, interview transcripts.

The Circulation of Ideology in the Three *Gaeltachtaí Nua*

The ideological process in the Shaw's Road community was shaped by the structure of the group, and that structure was based on the preferred organizational strategy of some of its founders, an organizational strategy that was rooted in the *zeitgeist* of the Irish Language Revival in Belfast in the nineteen-sixties and seventies, a strategy summed up in the Irish phrase, *ná habair é – déan é*, 'don't talk about it – do it'. This strategy was founded on an ideology of structurelessness (Freeman 1975), combining self-reliance with a general suspicion of formal group process and meetings. The strategy developed in part as a reflection of the general do-it-yourself ethic in West Belfast that was in turn a necessary response to the lack of basic public services in the area during the Troubles, but it also developed as a specific response by some in the Irish Language Revival to what they understood as a 'talking-shop mentality' that hobbled Irish Language Revival organizations in Ireland at that time.

This ideology was particularly elaborated at an important Irish-language club in West Belfast, *Cumann Chluain Ard* (for a history of the club, see Ó Fiaich 1990 and Mac Póilin 2006). The club was unique at the time for enforcing its own strict Irish-only language policy and several of the oldest *Gaeltacht* members reported that much of the ideology of the community, concerning group structure, and particularly concerning language use, originated at this club,

The majority of us were connected with one branch of the Gaelic League which was *Cumann Chluain Ard* [...] which had a fairly radical view of promoting the preservation of the Irish language, who believe very strongly in using the language and in doing all its business through the medium of the Irish language. We were very much... you could even have said that we were fanatics at the time in the sense that we were really dedicated to speaking Irish and promoting it as much as we could in our own lives as well as outside.

In all of the three communities, members frequently differed in their understandings of community language policy and community norms of language use; however, in the Shaw's Road *Gaeltacht*, interviewees did generally agree that the language policy of the community was

not only concerned with Irish use amongst adults, but also with family language policy and raising the next generation as Irish speakers, as an early member of the community explained:

Well, the idea is [...] if you're going to be living here, then you have to be speaking Irish. If you have children, then rear them speaking the language as well. And send them to one of the *bunscoils* [Irish-medium primary schools].

As a new community, the Shaw's Road *Gaeltacht* established its linguistic ideology relying on selection, recruiting a cohort of visionary and committed members from the pool of Irish speakers in West Belfast, and specifically from patrons of *Cumann Chluain Ard*. Members reported that the group's structure did not provide a regular forum for the discussion and debate of the norms of Irish use in the community. The *Gaeltacht nua* was formally organized, and the community held regular meetings in the early years, but according to the members, the meetings focused almost exclusively on the pressing business of running the community's Irish-medium primary school. As the administration of the school gradually passed out of the community's hands, the community met less and less frequently.

The school to one side, there was little planned, overt socialization reported in the Shaw's Road *Gaeltacht*, for Irish language ability or for language ideology, particularly any socialization targeted specifically at adults. This is not to say that members were not socialized to particular language norms over the years, but it is interesting that members reported that much of that socialization happened outside of the community. The community used several external socialization sites, 'on loan' so to speak, to reinforce the norms of Irish use among its members. Certainly *Cumann Chluain Ard* remained important and members of the first and second generation reported that they continued to frequent the club up until the time of research. But the Shaw's Road *Gaeltacht* made use of other socialization sites as well. Young members were sent to summer colleges in the traditional *Gaeltacht* and members of all ages would vacation in the traditional *Gaeltacht*. Members reported that these experiences were also important for reinforcing language ideology in the community,

Now I was a bit different because we went off at a very young age to summer colleges [...] and the one that we went to was a very strict one and it was like one sentence in English and you were gone. So I would come back [...] and I would still have that mentality, you know, Irish, Irish, Irish and some of the [other children] would laugh and joke about me and I had a kind of a moral standing that I had to speak Irish.

This second-generation member explains how the strong norms of Irish use he acquired at an Irish-language summer college travelled with him back to the community when he was young, and this member remains one of the most ideologically committed members of the group to this day.

In contrast to the Shaw's Road *Gaeltacht*, the *Gaeltacht* initiative in Carntogher is an example of a group that works to establish a new ideology and new norms for Irish use in their community almost entirely through socialization rather than selection. As an established community, the activists involved in the *Gaeltacht* initiative have no choice but to promote their new ideology

among the current residents of the area. As detailed above, the core group behind the *Gaeltacht* initiative is a community association composed of experienced and successful community development activists, and it was clear in interviews with these activists that they promote their Irish-language ideology following a carefully thought-out strategy. In strategy documents, promotional literature, websites, press releases, handbills, road-side signs, posters and mailings, the members of the Community Association assiduously advance their vision of Carntogher as a future *Gaeltacht*, and as they understand it, a community of bilingual Irish and English speakers that uses Irish as the normative community language (Armstrong 2011a).

They are particularly focused on raising the status of the language in the community, first, by connecting the language with the history of the area and advancing the argument that, until relatively recently, the Carntogher area was an Irish-speaking district (for a discussion of vestigial Irish-speaking areas in Northern Ireland, see Mac Giolla Chríost 2002), and also, by connecting the language to economic progress in the present (Armstrong 2011b). As an example, the Community Association has produced a set of posters promoting the *Gaeltacht* initiative that they display at community events around the area, and on these posters, they make the argument that they are not so much aiming to build a new *Gaeltacht* as they are aiming to re-establish a historical *Gaeltacht* in the area,

It is fitting that in one of the last *Gaeltacht* areas in County Derry, Irish is now re-emerging with a renewed vigour [...] it is entirely feasible that Carntogher/Slaughtneil could gain recognition as the first rural area in Ulster to formally reassert itself as a *Gaeltacht*.

And on the same set of posters, they also argue for the labor-market advantage of being bilingual in Irish and English,

It is now a fact that the ability to speak Irish creates many more employment opportunities within Ireland than being able to speak any other Modern European Language!

Activists on the Community Association reported that establishing new norms for Irish use in the community involves striking a difficult balance between promoting Irish use on the one hand, and welcoming new people into the project on the other, with tensions sometimes arising between those who would put more of an emphasis on strengthening Irish-language norms among Irish speakers in the community, and those who put an emphasis on reaching out to and including community members who did not yet have Irish. One would expect that this tension would be a feature of almost any language revitalization movement (Dorian 1998; Fishman 2001a), but it would be particularly difficult balance to achieve in Carntogher where Irish is still very much a minority-language and the Irish-language network in the community is still small and fragile (Armstrong 2011b). The Company Secretary of the Carntogher Community Association, Niall Ó Catháin, explained the balance between advancing strong norms and full community involvement as a compromise,

[...] in many ways there is a compromise involved in terms of how much the [Irish] language is used in public events and activities [...] if you go too heavy on speaking

Irish all the time and insisting that everything is in Irish only [...] it does put people off and it narrows the involvement, or the possible involvement of the entire community.

Ó Catháin and other Community Association members explained that, as they understand it, establishing new norms in the Carnogher community is a consensus-building process, and that they are careful to operate inside the current community consensus about the role of Irish, as they continually work to move that consensus in the direction of greater Irish use (Armstrong 2011b). At a practical level, interviewees explained that building this new consensus involved, on the one hand, marketing the goals of the *Gaeltacht* initiative to the local community, and on the other, using carefully pitched entreaty to establish and defend new norms of Irish use in key domains. As an example of this second process, a worker at the Community Centre, An Carn, narrated an interesting exchange between herself and Niall Ó Catháin about the language used on signs in the Centre,

Niall said to me, "Why should my child walk into An Carn and see a sign in English and not in Irish?" They're like, "Daddy why's that not in Irish?" This is all they know until they get to school is Irish. I can see where it's coming from and that sort of reminded me, at the end of the day, why shouldn't they have it both ways [i.e. signs in Irish and English]?

In this worker's narration, Niall Ó Catháin used the example of young native Irish speakers as an effective warrant in negotiating for a norm of Irish use, that is, that signs in the Community Centre should be in Irish and English rather than English-only. Throughout the interviews, activists indicated that socialization to a new language ideology is an on-going feature of the Carnogher *Gaeltacht* initiative.

As a temporary, new community, we would expect that the norms of Irish use in the Trinity College Residential Scheme, the Irish-language student residences in Dublin, would be established mostly by selection, and indeed, in the academic year of 2006-2007, selection played an important role in the circulation of ideology in the residence scheme. The growth and success of the Irish-language residence scheme at Trinity College is remarkable given that the College was traditionally associated with promoting Anglophone ideology in Ireland (McDowell and Webb 1982). One of the initial administrators of the Scheme, Mícheál Ó Murchú, former *Oifigeach na Gaeilge* (Irish Officer) at Trinity College, described the community as "a mini-*Gaeltacht*, a mini Irish-speaking community" and he explained that it was expected in the Scheme that "the students speak Irish among themselves on a daily basis and elsewhere in college when that's feasible." As a small Irish-language community in the centre of campus, the scheme would be promoting a language ideology and a set of Irish-language norms that would be directly opposed to the dominant ideology of the institution, at least traditionally. But much has changed at Trinity College in its relationship to the Irish language, and as described below, strong support for the Scheme from the College's administration was critical for the Scheme's success.

In general, living spaces on campus at Trinity are both highly sought-after and very limited. The founders of the Scheme reported that the Trinity College administration was supportive from the

start and willing to set aside some of these valuable housing spaces for the Scheme each year. With the enticement of sought-after housing in the centre of campus, the administrators of the Scheme were able to attract a pool of suitable applicants that far exceeded the number of spaces available, and this in turn allowed them to be quite selective. The application process was designed to select students who were to some degree already involved in Irish-language activism and therefore likely to speak Irish together with little outside direction. The application process involved a brief application form and then, for the short-list of potential students, an interview with the administrators of the Scheme. Two questions on the application form asked about prior involvement with the Irish language (original in Irish with my translation),

Cén pháirt atá glactha agat in imeachtaí Gaeilge taobh amuigh den Choláiste go dtí seo?

What part have you played in Irish-language events outside the College up to now?

Cén pháirt atá glactha agat in imeachtaí Gaeilge sa Choláiste go dtí seo?

What part have you played in Irish-language events at the College up to now?

At the very least, a prior involvement with the Irish language would likely mean that the applicant had been socialized for Irish-language use elsewhere, such as in an Irish-language summer college, in an Irish-medium school, at home in an Irish-speaking family or in an Irish-language advocacy organization, before they arrived at Trinity College. As an example, the following student grew up in an Irish-speaking family outside of the traditional *Gaeltacht*, and in his interview, he explained how the Irish-language policy in the Scheme mirrored the language policy in his home,

[...] in my house at home, as I've said, over the last four or five years, Irish was the dominant language, so it wasn't really that huge a change from my home to the *Scéim* [Scheme]. It was a very similar kind of outlook. I mean I'd speak Irish in the house - I'd go outside and speak English.

This reliance on prior outside ideological socialization in the Trinity College Irish-language residential scheme is similar to the way in which the Shaw's Road *Gaeltacht* used external socialization sites 'on loan' to establish and reinforce their own norms of Irish-language use. But even in a short-lived community like the Trinity College Residential Scheme, and with a strong selection process, norms were at times contested and members reported that they resorted to entreaty to reinforce Irish-language use in the Scheme, or in other words, that selection by itself was insufficient to establish Irish-language norms, and that members turned to mutual socialization to defend Irish-language use. In the following example, a student in the Scheme recounts an instance where he entreated fellow members of the Scheme to use Irish at an Irish-language event they were hosting for the College at large,

So the girls were speaking English to customers coming in, "Five euro ticket," and I just turned to them and I said, "Come on *cailíní* [girls], let's spread the word," that's what *Seachtain na Gaeilge* [Irish-language Week] is supposed to be all about, you know, just to remind them. And they were saying, "Aw yea, Jesus," you know? So just everyone was speaking Irish then [...]

This member of the Scheme relates how his fellow members were working the door at the event, but greeting people in English, and how he successfully used entreaty to negotiate Irish use in this situation. Members of the Scheme reported that while Irish use was normal in the Scheme, none the less, not all the members of the Scheme understood the norms of use in the same way, particularly, as above, in situations outside of the residences, and that in such cases, members would take it upon themselves to entreat each other to speak Irish.

Language and Identity in the *Gaeltachtaí Nua*

So far, the discussion has focused on the establishment and defense of Irish-language norms, but our understanding of the circulation of ideology in the three *Gaeltachtaí nua* would be incomplete if we did not also consider how the members of these communities understand the connection between their identity and the Irish language. In the main, activists campaign for the revitalization of a threatened and lesser-used language like Irish because its continued acquisition and use is connected to an important identity (Edwards 2003, 2009; House 2003; Romaine 2006). There are certainly instrumental reasons for learning and using Irish, particularly in the Republic of Ireland, where Irish is the first official language of the Republic, and where it remains institutionalized in public life to some degree. Above, we saw that the Carntogher Community Association promotes Irish, in part, by arguing that a fluency in Irish is valuable skill in the labor market in Ireland. However, all adult speakers of Irish are also fluent English speakers, and there is therefore no communicative imperative for revitalizing the Irish language. Identity is frequently a central element of a language ideology, and speakers may reference identity in support of language norms. It would be difficult to defend the use of a language if it didn't have some value to its speakers, so to fully understand how norms of language use are advanced, we have to understand how the language in question is valued, and with a threatened and lesser-used language like Irish, that value is often found in its connection to speakers' identity.

In the interviews, several identity positions were expressed in connection to the Irish language, and these identities varied somewhat between the different *Gaeltachtaí nua*. Certainly, the most frequently cited identity was one of straight-forward linguistic nationalism. This identity was common to all three *Gaeltachtaí nua*. The following clear example is from a member of the Shaw's Road community,

[Irish is important] because a language is what makes a country. [...] If you went to France and all the French were speaking in English, it wouldn't be very French. I think it sort of makes me... I can say I'm Irish, and I can speak my language, so I'm Irish; it gives you identity. There's that phrase, *Tír gan teanga, tír gan anam*. [A land without a language, a land without a soul.]

This interviewee unambiguously connects the Irish language and the Irish national identity and asserts that a unique language is a central feature of a national identity in general. This Irish linguistic nationalism is deeply embedded in the Irish nationalist project (Crowley 2005; French 2009; Hutchinson 1987 a&b), and it is unsurprising that it appears as a common identity in all three *Gaeltachtaí nua*. However, common as it was, this was not the only identity connection

made to the Irish language, and interviewees from both Carntogher and the Trinity College Residential Scheme enunciated two interesting additional identities.

As evident above, the Carntogher Community Association attests in their promotional material that their area was until relatively recently an Irish-speaking community. In fact, very little of the promotional material produced by the Community Association can be read as a manifest expression of linguistic nationalism, but rather, the Community Association consistently advances an identity of local belonging that is tied to knowledge and use of the Irish language. In contrast to Irish linguistic nationalism, which would connect the Irish language to an idealized national Irish community, an "imagined community" (Anderson 1983), the Irish-language identity advanced in the posters, press releases, strategy documents and website produced by the Community Association is both local and specific. As one example, on the same promotional posters mentioned above, the Community Association reproduced a list of all the names of local Irish speakers from the 1901 census, as well as a list of all the local Irish speakers and enthusiasts who took part in *Feis Loch nEathach*, an Irish-language festival and contest held in 1905, in the expectation that community members would recognize the names of recent ancestors in the lists.

It may be that the Community Association advances this particular identity because a local identity is more affective and salient in a small rural community like the little settlements around Tirkane. But this preference for a local rather than national Irish-language identity should also be understood in the context of the politics of Northern Ireland. The rural districts around Tirkane are largely Catholic, and therefore generally politically Nationalist, but it is still a mixed community, with a significant minority population of Protestants also living in the area. The conventional stereotype is that Catholics in Northern Ireland would be expected to identify with the Irish language while Protestants would be expected to identify with Ulster-Scots⁵, but the Carntogher Community Association makes an effort to reach out to local Protestants and include them in the *Gaeltacht* initiative, and one would expect that a language ideology based on Irish Nationalism would not be palatable to many of these generally British Unionist community members (cf. Muller 2010; Pritchard 2004; Ó Riagáin 2007).

In addition to the common Irish linguistic-nationalist identity, students involved in the Trinity College Residential Scheme also articulated a novel, emergent identity in their interviews, that of the *Gaeilgeoir*. The label, *Gaeilgeoir*, can be understood in a number of ways, as a Irish-speaker in general or as a learner of Irish specifically (Ó Dónaill 1977); however, in popular discourse in Ireland, the epithet is often used as a slur, as we read here in an opinion piece that appeared in the Dublin-based *Irish Independent* daily newspaper,

Mind you, Irish can claim to be the primary language of argument. When the Gaeilgeoirs opened their mouths this year, all we seemed to hear was discord. [...] If the Erse-speakers want more of us to speak more than the *cupla focail* [couple words, i.e. limited school Irish] perhaps they should stop speaking Irish and instead learn to listen a bit more (Chambers 2005).

⁵ Ulster-Scots is a language closely related to Scots and English, brought to Northern Ireland by Scottish migrants from the seventeenth century onward (cf. Crowley 2007).

In this case, the label *Gaeilgeoir* is coupled with another slur for Irish speakers, Erse-speakers⁶, and used in a way that is clearly not meant as a complement. Students involved in the Scheme at Trinity also used the label in reference to themselves, but if we contrast the above newspaper excerpt with the following excerpt from an interview with a student, we can see that they used it in a very different way, that they used it as a positive identity,

The language is growing around the campus and the *Cumann* [*An Cumann Gaelach*, the student Irish-language society] had 700 members this year. Like I said, the *Gaeilgeoirs* have been acknowledged in the last year as a significant group within college [...] and I'd say a good bit of that is partly related to the *Scéim* [Scheme], the fact that we have a good central location here [...]

The student in this interview takes some pride in the success of the Irish language at Trinity College, and refers to his fellow Irish-speaking student activists at the College as *Gaeilgeoirs*. Irish, Scottish and Manx Gaelic speakers would have a traditional emic identity, the Gael (MacCaluim 2007; Ó hIfearnáin 2006), but the label Gael was very rarely used in interviews with students involved in the Scheme. Rather, the students articulated this newer identity, the *Gaeilgeoir*, not based on ancestry or race, but on Irish-language use alone, as an identity for Irish-language activists and enthusiasts (cf. Kabel 2000). In reference to Basque nationalism, Daniele Conversi (1990) has argued that an inclusive shift from an identity based on race or ancestry to one based on language offers activists a better avenue for successful political mobilization. In this respect, the identity, *Gaeilgeoir*, is particularly apposite in the context of language revitalization because it is specifically used as an identity of pride by speakers involved in advancing norms of Irish language use.

Discussion

Social norms of behavior are a fundamental and universal feature of human life, but they are often misunderstood. It is a common truism among language activists that you can't force someone to speak a language, or as one interviewee put it, "you're not going to get anywhere if you try and shove [Irish] down somebody's throat." And at one level, this is certainly true. Language activism, like any social activism, is most effective when it is savvy and carefully pitched. As we saw above, the Carntogher *Gaeltacht* initiative is particularly noteworthy for the patient way the central activists on the Community Association balance advancing new language norms on the one hand and drawing new people into the movement on the other. On this level, it is undoubtedly sound practical advice that language activists, policy makers and planners should take care not to alienate their constituencies in the process of promoting new language norms. But at another, more fundamental level, this truism is a misapprehension of the nature of social life. Very little of our behavior is a matter of free choice alone (Bourdieu 1989; Clayton 2008), and in particular, the choices we make about language use are circumscribed by language norms in the over-all context of the dominant language ideologies in our societies (cf. Armstrong 2011a).

If one wishes to revitalize or revive a threatened language against the dominant language ideology, one must promote a counter-ideology that normalizes or re-normalizes the use of the

⁶ 'Erse' is a Scots word meaning 'Irish.'

threatened language in some sites, domains or situations. Successful language revitalization or revival will involve promoting a new ideology about the value of the language and its use (Armstrong 2011a). This would certainly be true of new speech communities like the three *Gaeltachtaí nua* under consideration here, but it would also be true of traditional speech communities such as the traditional *Gaeltachtaí* in Ireland. Indeed, traditional speech communities may have an even longer ideological distance to travel if they would revitalize their languages. If traditional linguistic ideologies no longer adequately support the language, and if more recent ideologies of contempt (Dorian 1998; King 2000) for the traditional language undermine its use, traditional speech communities must ideologically reinvent themselves, must find new value in their old language and must advance new norms for its use that are adapted to the encroaching modern world, and this new ideology will undoubtedly be very different from the ideology traditionally associated with the language. Messing and Rockwell have described an example of this process in their research on indigenous Mexicano (Nahuatl) language communities in Tlaxcala, Mexico. Mexicano speakers are under pressure to shift to Spanish, and Messing and Rockwell describe how individual teachers in the local schools function as language promoters working to reverse this shift by engaging "in changing the current of existing linguistic ideologies and practices" in their communities (2006: 249). They explain how teachers use the school as a venue to socialize students to a *pro-indígena* (pro-indigenous) ideology and new norms of Mexicano use in formal, non-private situations (Messing and Rockwell 2006; see also Messing 2007). While they are realistic about the chances of reversing the shift to Spanish, and caution that the teachers are isolated and face serious obstacles in promoting the language, Messing and Rockwell assert that this ideological socialization is a "key first step" in the revitalization of the Mexicano language (2006: 273).

But ideological socialization is costly, costly socially, and also possibly costly economically. Specifically considering the costs associated with norms, new norms are established and defended through sanctioning, and sanctioning can take the form of any number of a wide range of social tactics, varying in both social cost and coercive force, from gossip, reproof and mild entreaty at one end of the spectrum to violence and expulsion at the other. But mild or militant, all these forms of sanctioning will entail some social risks and costs to the sanctioners (Fehr and Fischbacher 2004; Horne 2001; Plüss 2007; Posner and Rasmusen 1999). Given the costs, it would be reasonable to expect that individuals and groups would avoid ideological socialization if possible, and indeed, in the three *Gaeltachtaí nua* studied here, we can see a clear pattern: where it was possible to avoid socialization and establish ideology through selection, the groups elected to use selection. As new communities, both the Shaw's Road *Gaeltacht* and the Trinity College Residential Scheme relied heavily on selection to establish strong norms of Irish-language use, norms members acquired at socialization sites outside the communities. Further, we have seen how the Shaw's Road *Gaeltacht* continued to reinforce the Irish-language norms of the community by taking advantage of several external socialization sites 'on-loan' as the community grew and aged. Only in Carntogher, as an established community, would selection be largely precluded, and as expected, the activists in Carntogher explained that they have to work hard on socialization and ideological clarification to establish a new Irish-language ideology in their community.

But we can also infer from the results of this research that there are at least two problems with relying on selection to establish new language norms in a language revitalization group, one

problem local to the group in question, and one global problem for the revitalization movement as a whole. The local issue is that it appears that selection, by itself, was insufficient to establish and maintain Irish-language norms in any of the three *Gaeltachtaí nua*. Even in a new, temporary community like the Trinity College Residential Scheme, with very strong selection in place, members reported that they still resorted to some mutual socialization to maintain norms of Irish use. These results support the recommendation that organizations involved in language revitalization should purposefully plan for ongoing ideological clarification in order to establish the appropriate language ideology amongst their members and as good practice in the implementation of language policy at the micro level. In democratic, egalitarian groups, like these three *Gaeltachtaí nua* considered here, a regular community forum or established channels of communication would be vital to this clarification process. Such a forum would ensure that norms of language use remain clear and appropriate as circumstances and group membership change over time. In all three *Gaeltachtaí nua*, when norms broke down or failed to adequately match circumstances, members reported that a breakdown in communication often exacerbated the problem. In democratic, egalitarian groups, a regular forum for discussing, debating, re-adjusting, agreeing on and clarifying language ideology and expectations of language use would be beneficial in this respect.

The global issue is that while it is usually less costly for a group to establish a language ideology amongst its members by selection, ideological socialization still has to happen somewhere. Ultimately, and considering a language revitalization movement as a whole, language ideology has to be established in some socialization sites, by some groups, somehow. It is significant that most of the socialization sites in Ireland mentioned in the interviews were aimed at children. Interviewees often seemed to be more comfortable with the idea of enforcing norms of Irish use among children and expressed some discomfort at the thought of managing the language use of other adults. As one interviewee put it, "The only people who I would force [Irish] actually on are my kids." This interviewee was speaking ironically, but there is some truth in the jest. When asked how norms of Irish-language use were established and defended in their communities, interviewees often seemed to understand the question as a stark binary choice between a *laissez-faire* approach to language use on the one hand or extreme sanctioning on the other, without resort to socialization strategies between these two poles. Some voiced suspicion of the idea of engaging in ideological clarification among fellow adults in general, that clarifying norms might amount to 'forcing' the language on other people. However, it seems unlikely that a new language ideology could be established broadly as part of a language revitalization movement based on childhood socialization alone and without the support of many socialization sites aimed at adults as well. In this respect, groups like *Cumann Chluain Ard* in Belfast are particularly valuable as socialization sites that establish new norms of language use specifically amongst teenagers and young adults, and thereby propagating a new ideology generally about the value and use of the Irish language in this important cohort. It is noteworthy that, as well as the founders of the Shaw's Road *Gaeltacht*, several of the key Irish-language activists in Carntogher also reported that they socialized at *Cumann Chluain Ard* as teenagers and young adults.

The analysis here is founded on a particular understanding of how language revival or revitalization may succeed and of the connection between language vitality at the micro level and language policy at the macro level. I have focused on language ideology at the micro level as I believe that successful language revitalization may be more a result of bottom-up social activism

than top-down social management (Armstrong 2010; see also Wright 1995; Spolsky 2004). As suggested at the outset, language policy at the micro level may be at least as important as policy at the macro level, but up until fairly recently, researchers and theorists have concentrated particularly on language policy debates in regional, national and supra-national government bodies, with relatively less emphasis on investigating language policies enacted autonomously in small organizations, communities and families. The Irish Language Revival is a clear example of the limits of top-down language management (Ó Laoire 2005) and the importance of language activism by individuals and small groups at the community level (Ó Croidheáin 2006). Given the importance of the local in language revitalization, it is encouraging that more researchers are now publishing work that investigates language policy and practice at the micro level.

Both the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland are peppered with small organizations with an Irish-language focus that serve as linguistic and ideological socialization sites for the Revival, as well as functioning as nodes in Irish-language networks outside of the traditional *Gaeltacht*. These organizations would include Irish-medium schools, both state-funded and independent, Irish-language theatres, community centers, pubs and Irish-language clubs, Irish-language businesses, restaurants and cafés, Irish-language summer colleges and youth camps and so on. These organizations resemble small, semi-autonomous language planning cells (Nahir 1989), advancing a new Irish-language ideology and creating structural support for Irish-language use in associated Irish-language networks. In common with the *Gaeltachtaí nua*, we would expect that these organizations would struggle with the same general language policy problem described in this study: how does one establish a new Irish-language ideology in an organization and defend new norms of Irish-language use in the midst of an otherwise English-language-dominant society?

In the face of a dominant ideology favoring the use of a majority language, it is unlikely that a counter ideology favoring the use of a threatened minority language will prevail in an organization without planning. Language activists, educators and policy makers will be more successful in promoting the use of a threatened language if they self-consciously plan the language ideology of their organizations. The above analysis suggests a number of questions one might ask about the desired value and use of a threatened language in an organization as a first step in that process: As precisely as possible, how would one describe the planned norm of language use in the organization? Who will use the language, in what situations, and also, why? How does the organization understand the value of the threatened language and how will this value be communicated to members? Once an organization has clarified its language policy in this way, members can avail themselves of both selection and socialization to build a consensus in the organization around the desired norms of language use, creating a group that is not only able to use the minority language but also willing and positively motivated to do so. The data presented demonstrates that all three of these *Gaeltachtaí nua* successfully engage in this process in one way or another, but the Carntogher Community Association is particularly noteworthy for the purposeful, explicit way they advance their vision of the value and use of Irish in their small rural community.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Iain Mac an Tàilleir, Robert Dunbar, Eoin Mac Cárthaigh, Diarmaid Ua Bruadair, Niall Ó Catháin, and Liz NicIllEathain who read and commented on drafts of this paper. This research was made possible by a generous grant from the trustees of Sabhal Mòr Ostaig, the Gaelic college on the Isle of Skye in Scotland.

- Amery, R. (2001). Language Planning and Language Revival. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 2(2&3), 141-221.
- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined Communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. Verso: London.
- Armstrong, T. C. (2010). Nàdarrachd agus Ùghdarrachd ann an Ideòlas-cànain an Ath-bheothachaidh ann an Èirinn. In: M. Watson and L. Milligan (Eds.), *From Vestiges to the Very Day: New Voices in Celtic Studies* (pp. 91-98). Aberdeen: Center for Irish and Scottish Studies.
- Armstrong, T. C. (2011a). Bilingualism, Restoration and Language Norms. In: J. M. Kirk and D. P. Ó Baoill (Eds.), *Strategies for Minority Languages: Northern Ireland, the Republic of Ireland, and Scotland* (pp. 172-179). Belfast: Cló Ollscoil na Banríona.
- Armstrong, T. C. (2011b). Co-aonta agus Ro-innleachd; Iomairt Charn Tóchair agus ath-leasachadh-cànain aig ìre na coimhearsnachd. In: R. A. V. Cox and T. C. Armstrong (Eds.), *Cleachdadh na Gàidhlig; slatan-tomhais ann an dìon cànain sa choimhearsnachd* (pp. 1-16). Slèite: Clò Ostaig.
- Baldauf, R. B. Jr (1994). 'Unplanned' Language Policy and Planning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 14, 82-89.
- Baldauf, R. B. Jr (2006). Rearticulating the Case for Micro Language Planning in a Language Ecology Context. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 7(2&3), 147-170.
- Bourdieu, P. (1989). Social Space and Symbolic Power. *Sociological Theory*, 7(1), 14-25.
- Bourdieu, P. (2005) [1977-1985 French]. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Central Statistics Office of Ireland (2007). *Census 2006 Volume 9 - Irish Language*. www.cso.ie/census/census2006_volume9.htm. Accessed 28 February, 2011.
- Chambers, J. (25 December, 2005). All great gas as Erse-speakers have their say. *The Irish Independent*. www.independent.ie/unsorted/features/all-great-gas-as-ersespeakers-have-their-say-475837.html. Accessed 27 February, 2009.
- Clayton, S. (2008). The problem of 'choice' and the construction of the demand for English in Cambodia. *Language Policy*, 7(2), 143-164
- Coady, M. and Ó Laoire, M. (2002). Mismatches in language policy and practice in education: the case of Gaelscoileanna in the Republic of Ireland. *Language Policy*, 1(2), 143-158.
- Conversi, D. (1990). Language or race?: the choice of core values in the development of Catalan and Basque nationalisms. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 13(1), 50-70.
- Crowley, T. (2005). *War of words: The politics of language in Ireland 1537-2004*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2009). Invisible and visible language planning: ideological factors in the family language policy of Chinese immigrant families in Quebec. *Language Policy*, 8, 351-375.
- Dauenhauer, N. M. and Dauenhauer, R. (1998). Technical, emotional, and ideological issues in reversing language shift: examples from Southeast Alaska. In: L. A. Grenoble and L. J.

- Whaley (Eds.), *Endangered Languages, Current issues and future prospect* (pp. 57-98). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dorian, N. C. (1998). Western language ideologies and small-language prospects. In: L. A. Grenoble and L. J. Whaley (Eds.), *Endangered Languages, Current issues and future prospects* (pp. 3-21). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: an introduction*. Verso: London.
- Edwards, J. (2009). *Language and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Edwards, J. (2003). The Importance of Being Bilingual. In: J. Dewaele, A. Housen and L. Wei (Eds.), *Bilingualism: Beyond Basic Principle* (pp. 28-42). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fehr, E. and Fischbacher, U. (2004). Social norms and human cooperation. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 8(4), 185-190.
- Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing Language Shift*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Fishman, J. A. (2001a). Why is it so Hard to Save a Threatened Language. In: J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Can Threatened Languages Be Saved?* (pp. 1-22). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Fishman, J. A. (2001b). From Theory to Practice (and Vice Versa): Review, Reconsideration and Reiteration. In: J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Can Threatened Languages Be Saved?* (pp. 451-483). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Freeman, J. (1975). Political Organization in the Feminist Movement. *Acta Sociologica*, 18(2/3), 222-244.
- French, B. M. (2009). Linguistic science and nationalist revolution: Expert knowledge and the making of sameness in pre-independence Ireland. *Language in Society*, 38, 607-625.
- Gal, S. (1998). Multiplicity and Contention among Language Ideologies. In: B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard and P. V. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language Ideologies, Practice and Theory* (pp. 317-313). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gerring, J. (1997). Ideology: A Definitional Analysis. *Political Research Quarterly*, 50(4), 957-994.
- Government of Ireland (2010). *20 Year Strategy for the Irish Language 2010-2030*. www.pobail.ie/en/IrishLanguage/Strategy/StrategyEnglish.pdf. Accessed 4 March 2011.
- Harris, S. (1994). 'Soft' and 'Hard' Domain Theory for Bicultural Education in Indigenous Groups. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 62(2), 140-153.
- Horne, C. (2001). The Enforcement of Norms: Group Cohesion and Meta-Norms. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 64(3), 253-266.
- House, J. (2003). English as a lingua franca: A threat to multilingualism? *The Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(4), 156-178.
- Hornberger, N. H. and King, K. A. (1996). Language Revitalisation in the Andes: Can the Schools Reverse Language Shift? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 17(6), 427-441.
- Hutchinson, J. (1987a). Cultural Nationalism, elite mobility and nation-building: communitarian politics in modern Ireland. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 38(4), 482-501.
- Hutchinson, J. (1987b). *The Dynamics of Cultural Nationalism: Gaelic Revival and the Creation of the Irish Nation State*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Ingram, P. and Simons, T. (2000). State Formation, Ideological Competition, and the Ecology of Israeli Workers Cooperatives, 1920-1922. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45, 25-53.
- Ingram, P. and Simons, T. (2002). The Transfer of Experience in Groups of Organizations: Implications for Performance and Competition. *Management Science*, 48(12), 1517-1533.

- Jensen, K. B. (2002). The qualitative research process. In: K. B. Jensen (Ed.), *A Handbook of Media and Communication Research, Qualitative and Quantitative Methodologies* (pp. 235-253). New York: Routledge.
- Kabel, L. (2000). Irish Language Enthusiasts and Native Speakers: An Uneasy Relationship. In: G. McCoy and M. Scott (Eds.), *Aithne na nGael; Gaelic Identities* (pp. 133-138). Belfast: The Institute of Irish Studies.
- King, K. A. (2000). Language Ideologies and Heritage Language Education. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 3(3), 167-184.
- King, K. A., Fogle, L. and Logan-Terry, A. (2008). Family Language Policy. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 2, 907-922.
- Kroskrity, P. V. (2004). Language Ideologies. In: A. Durant (Ed.), *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology* (pp. 496-517). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MacCaluim, A. (2007). *Reversing Language Shift: The Social Identity and Role of Scottish Gaelic Learners*. Belfast: Cló Ollscoil na Banríona.
- Mac Giolla Chríost, D. (2000). The Irish Language and Current Policy in Northern Ireland. *Irish Studies Review*, 8(1), 45-55.
- Mac Giolla Chríost, D. (2002). Language Planning in Northern Ireland. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 3(4), 425-76.
- Mac Giolla Chríost, D. (2006). Micro-level Language Planning in Ireland. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 7(2&3), 230-250.
- Mac Póilin, A. (2006). Irish in Belfast, 1892 – 1960: from the Gaelic League to Cumann Chluain Ard. In: F. de Brún (Ed.), *Belfast and the Irish Language* (pp. 114-135). Dublin: Four Courts Press.
- Mac Póilin, A. (2007). Nua-Ghaeltacht Phobal Feirste: ceachtanna le foghlaim? In: W. McLeod (Ed.), *Gaidhealtachdan Ùra: Leasachadhna Gàidhlig agus na Gaeilge sa Bhaile Mhòr / Nua-Ghaeltachtaí: Cur Chun Cinn na Gàidhlig agus na Gaeilge sa Chathair* (pp. 31-60). Dùn Èideann: Ceiltis agus Eòlas na h-Alba Oilthigh Dhùn Èideann.
- Maguire, G. (1991). *Our Own Language: an Irish initiative*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- McDowell, R.B. and Webb, D. A. (1982). *Trinity College Dublin, 1592-1952, an academic history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Messing, J. (2007). Multiple ideologies and competing discourses: Language shift in Tlaxcala, Mexico. *Language in Society*, 36, 555-577.
- Messing, J. H. E. and Rockwell, E. (2006). Local language promoters and new discursive spaces: Mexicano in an out of schools in Tlaxcala. In: H. Hidalgo (Ed.), *Mexican Indigenous Languages at the Dawn of the Twenty-first Century* (pp. 249-279). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Muller, J. (2010). *Language and Conflict in Northern Ireland and Canada; A Silent War*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nahir, M. (1998). Micro language planning and the revival of Hebrew; A schematic framework. *Language in Society*, 27, 335-357.
- Ní Bhrádaigh, E., McCarron, S., Walsh, J. and Duffy, P. (2007). Using GIS to map the evolution of the Gaeltacht. *Irish Geography*, 40(1), 99-108.
- Nig Uidhir, G. (2006). The Shaw's Road urban Gaeltacht: role and impact. In: F. de Brún (Ed.), *Belfast and the Irish Language* (pp. 136-46). Dublin: Four Courts Press.
- Northern Ireland Census (2001). <http://www.ninis.nisra.gov.uk>. Accessed 10 March, 2011.

- Northern Ireland Department of Education (2007). *Primary School Census Data 2007-2008*. <http://www.deni.gov.uk>. Accessed 25 March, 2011.
- Ó Baoill, D. P. (2007). Origins of Irish medium Education: The Dynamic Core of Language Revitalization in Northern Ireland. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(4), 410-427.
- Ó Buachalla, S. (1984). Educational Policy and the Roll of the Irish Language from 1831 to 1981. *European Journal of Education*, 19(1), 75-92.
- Ó Croidheáin, C. (2006). *Language from Below, The Irish Language Ideology and Power in 20th Century Ireland*. Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Ó Dónaill, N. (1997). *Foclóir Gaeilge-Béarla*. Bailte Átha Cliath: An Gúm.
- Ó Fiaich, B. (1990). "Fál" agus "Dearcadh" – fealsúnacht úr ag Gaeilgeoirí Bhéal Feirste sna Caogaidí. Masters Thesis, University of Ulster.
- Ó hIfearnáin, T. (2006). *Beartas Teanga, An Aimsir Óg, Páipéar Ócáideach 7*. Baile Átha Cliath: Coiscéim.
- Ó Laoire, M. (2005). The Language Planning Situation in Ireland. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 6(3), 251-314.
- Ó Riagáin, P. (2007). Relationships between Attitudes to Irish, Social Class, Religion and National Identity in the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(4), 369-393.
- Ó Torna, C. (2005). *Cruthú na Gaeltachta 1893-1922*. Baile Átha Cliath: Cois Life.
- Pawley, A. (1986). On Speech Formulas and Linguistic Competence. *Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics*, 11, 57-87.
- Plüss, C. (2007). Analyzing non-doctrinal socialization: re-assessing the role of cognition to account for social cohesion in the Religious Society of Friends. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 58(2), 253-257.
- Posner, R. A. and Rasmusen, E. B. (1999). Creating and Enforcing Norms, with Special Reference to Sanctions. *International Review of Law and Economics*, 19, 369-382.
- Pritchard, R. M. O. (2004). Protestants and the Irish Language: Historical Heritage and Current Attitudes in Northern Ireland. *The Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 25(1), 62-82.
- Romaine, S. (2006). Planning for the Survival of Linguistic Diversity. *Language Policy* 5, 441-473.
- Saussure, F. de (1986). *Course in General Linguistics*. Chicago: Open Court.
- Schmidt, R. Sr. (2007). Defending English in an English-dominant world: The Ideology of the 'Official English' movement in the United States. In: A. Duchêne and M. Heller (Eds.), *Discourses of Endangerment* (pp. 197-215). London: Continuum.
- Sheaffer, Z., Honig, B. and Carmeli, A. (2010). Ideology, Crisis Intensity, Organizational Demography, and Industrial Type as Determinants of Organizational Change in Kibbutzim. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 46(3), 388-414.
- Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language Policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. Routledge: Abingdon.
- Simons, T. and Ingram, P. (1997). Organization and Ideology: Kibbutzim and Hired Labor, 1951-1965. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42, 784-813.
- Simons, T. and Ingram, P. (2004). An ecology of ideology: theory and evidence from four populations. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 13(1), 33-59.
- Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Urla, J. (1993). Cultural Politics in an Age of Statistics: Numbers, Nations, and the Making of Basque Identity. *American Ethnologist*, 20(4), 818-843.
- Walsh, J. and McLeod, W. (2008). An overcoat wrapped around an invisible man? Language legislation and language revitalisation in Ireland and Scotland. *Language Policy*, 7(1), 21–46.
- Warren, C. A. B. (2001). Qualitative Interviewing. In: J. F. Gubrium and J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of Interview Research, Context and Method* (pp. 83-101). London: Sage.
- Woolard K. A. (1998). Language Ideology as a Field of Inquiry. In: B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard and P. V. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language Ideologies, Practice and Theory* (pp. 3-50). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Woolard, K. A. and Schieffelin, B. B. (1994). Language Ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 23, 55-82.
- Wright, S. (1995). "Language and the State: Israel and Ireland." *Current Issues in Language and Society*, 2(3), 173-175.

Author Biography

Timothy Currie Armstrong is the Soillse research fellow based at Sabhal Mòr Ostaig, the Gaelic college on the Isle of Skye in Scotland. He has taught language policy and planning at Sabhal Mòr Ostaig and researches language revitalization, particularly focusing on language policy and planning at the micro level.