



## UHI Research Database pdf download summary

### How to turn the tide

Smith-Christmas, Cassie; NicLeòid, Sileas

*Published in:*  
Language Policy

*Publication date:*  
2020

*Publisher rights:*  
© 2020 Springer Nature Switzerland AG. Part of Springer Nature.

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

*The Document Version you have downloaded here is:*  
Peer reviewed version

*The final published version is available direct from the publisher website at:*  
[10.1007/s10993-019-09541-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-019-09541-0)

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

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Smith-Christmas, C., & NicLeòid, S. (2020). How to turn the tide: The policy implications emergent from comparing a 'Post-vernacular' FLP to a Pro-Gaelic'FLP'. *Language Policy*, 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-019-09541-0>

#### 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](mailto:RO@uhi.ac.uk) providing details; we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

## How to turn the tide: The policy implications emergent from comparing a ‘Post-vernacular’ FLP to a ‘Pro-Gaelic’ FLP

### Abstract

This paper compares the sociolinguistic trajectory of a semi-speaker mother to that of a new speaker mother. Drawing on Shandler (2004), it introduces the term ‘post-vernacular FLP’ as a means to conceptualise the semi-speaker mother’s emblematic use of Gaelic with her child as a ‘seed’ from which language revitalisation can be cultivated, rather than a terminus. The paper discusses how the semi-speaker mother’s current ideological landscape in many ways encapsulates the ‘tepidity’ of the older generation’s ideological landscape. This contrasts to the new speaker mother, who has undergone the ideological transformation necessary to take an activist stance towards the language and implement a ‘pro-Gaelic’ FLP. The paper then considers the linguistic confidence barrier as described by both mothers, particularly those in terms of using child-directed speech (CDS) in Gaelic, and shows how the new speaker mother overcame this particular barrier. The paper concludes by discussing the policy implications of this analysis, and poses the crucial question: what specific on-the-ground measures can be taken to transform post-vernacular FLPs to pro-Gaelic FLPs?

Keywords: family language policy; post-vernacular; new speakers; semi-speakers; Scottish Gaelic

### Introduction

Recent years have seen a growing interest in the emergent field known as ‘Family Language Policy’ (‘FLP’), defined here using King, Fogle, and Logan-Terry’s (2008, p. 907) well-known definition of ‘explicit (Shohamy 2006) and overt (Schiffman 1996) planning in relation to language use within the home among family members.’ Parallel to work on language policy at the macro-level (see Spolsky, 2004), FLP has revealed the highly complex and often reflexive relationship between language ideologies and linguistic practices. Language ideologies—defined here using Silverstein’s (1979, p. 193) definition of ‘sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalisation or justification of perceived language structure or use’—are integral in understanding *how* and *why* caregivers enact their particular FLPs in the way they do (Curdt-Christiansen, 2009; Kirsch, 2012; Spolsky, 2012; King and Lanza, 2017). Like any ideology, language ideologies are mediated by broad social and historical forces as well the formative experiences which comprise any one individual’s personal history (see Canagarajah 2008). Further, language ideologies are fluid across time and space, as well as often entwined with other ideologies, such as for example those concerning personhood, parenthood, etc. (e.g. King and Fogle, 2006; Catedral and Djuraeva, 2018). Thus, although caregivers’ ideologies which value the minority language and its maintenance often result in what Altman, Feldman, Yitzhaki, Lotem, and Walters (2014) term ‘pro-minority language FLPs’ in terms of actual language *practices*, this is not necessarily always the case (Schwartz, 2008; Lanza, 2018). Ó hIfearnáin (2013) emphasises that any one FLP is comprised of a mosaic of language ideologies, both covert and overt. He draws on Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer (1998) in illustrating how these ideologies often are in competition with each other. In Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer’s analysis, overt support for the minority language are sometimes thwarted by less overt but no less potent ‘ideologies of

contempt' (Dorian, 1998) which historically have contributed to the language's shift. Ó hÍfearnáin's discussion of the family language support programme *Tús Maith* in the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht shows that even if these ideologies of contempt are overcome, significant intervention may also be needed in order to enact a change in the actual linguistic practices used by caregivers.

Recently, a vein of work within FLP research has centred specifically on families in which the parents are not 'native' speakers of the language that they are attempting to transmit to their children (see Piller, 2001 for much more thorough discussion of the term 'native' speaker). Some prominent examples of this work include Fogle's (2012) research on transnational adoptive families; King's work on native English-speaking mothers using Spanish with their children (Fogle and King, 2013); Nandi's (2016) analysis of 'new speaker' parents of Galician (i.e. parents who were not socialised in Galician in the home as children; see also Ramallo and O' Rourke, 2014; O' Rourke and Ramallo, 2015); and Armstrong's (2013) discussion of parents learning Gaelic after enrolling their children in immersive Gaelic education in Scotland. These studies also demonstrate the complex relationship between ideologies and practices, and in particular, the hierarchical nature of ideologies as described in Ó hÍfearnáin (2013). Nandi (2016, p. 153) for example shows how despite what could be considered purist orientations (in this case, correcting the child's use of Castilian Spanish '*cuchara*' to the Galician '*culler*,' meaning 'spoon'), the parents also appeared to show tacit acceptance of the dominance of Castilian Spanish. Similarly, Armstrong (2013) shows how parents' efforts to negotiate the use of Gaelic in the home were sometimes pitted against ideologies that framed language management as unnatural and authoritarian, which was further complicated by the fact that a number of the parents had limited skills in the language. For endangered languages such as Scottish Gaelic, understanding how FLPs involving new speakers and 'potential new speakers' (i.e. those with limited linguistic skills; see Carty, 2018) may become increasingly important to the future continuity of the language (see Smith-Christmas, Ó Murchadha, Hornsby, and Moriarty, 2018).

This article will build on the growing body of research focused on diverse caregiver speaker profiles other than the 'native' caregiver speaker profiles which have dominated the field thus far. It will therefore look at the FLPs and the sociolinguistic trajectories of two mothers living in Stornoway, on the Isle of Lewis, Scotland, which is the main urban centre in what is considered the Gaelic-speaking heartlands of the Outer Hebrides. One of these mothers—Jenny<sup>1</sup>—is 'new' speaker of Scottish Gaelic, which for the purposes of this paper, is defined using McLeod and O' Rourke's (2015, p. 154) definition of Gaelic new speakers as speakers 'who did not acquire Gaelic in the home when growing up, but have nevertheless acquired a significant degree of competence in the language and are now making active use of the language in their lives.' As will be demonstrated in the paper, Jenny practices a 'pro-Gaelic' FLP and the article will centre on the ideological transformation and the change in practices over time which led to this pro-Gaelic FLP. The other mother—Shonagh—aligns with what

---

<sup>1</sup> Jenny can also be considered a 'heritage speaker' as per Armstrong's (2013) definition of a heritage speaker being someone who has a direct familial connection to the language and who often had a level of exposure (albeit minimal) to the language in the home, but then undertook formal opportunities to learn and use the language. The choice to use 'new' speaker here is based not only on the fact that for the purposes of this article, we feel it better encapsulates the difference between the two speakers, but it also based on the fact that Jenny grew up in Glasgow and her Gaelic-speaking family members are from the Isle of Skye, not Lewis. The centrality of 'place' to how particular speaker may be perceived and/or position themselves as 'new' or 'heritage' is described in much more detail in Author 1 (XXXX).

Dorian (1981) would term a ‘semi-speaker’<sup>2</sup> in that Shonagh has limited proficiency in the language but due to her socialisation in a Gaelic-speaking family and community, possesses all the culturally-appropriate cues and shibboleths associated with frequent Gaelic language use. In characterising Shonagh’s limited use of Gaelic with her child, we will draw on Shandler’s (2004) theoretical construct of ‘post-vernacularity,’ a concept which has become increasingly utilised in research on autochthonous minority language communities (e.g. Sallabank, 2013; Costa, 2015; Hornsby, 2017). As the name implies, post-vernacularity occurs when the language ceases to be used as a vernacular among interlocutors; in other words, language shift. What conceptually differentiates post-vernacularity from language shift, however, is that post-vernacularity also entails the use of the language in a way that is emblematic and emotive, and, importantly as Hornsby (2017) emphasises, the metaphorical fertile field in which revitalisation efforts are sown. Our motivation therefore in invoking the term ‘post-vernacular FLP’ to characterise Shonagh’s language practices with her child is two-fold. First, as will be explained later in more detail, although on the surface Shonagh’s language practices *look* like non-transmission, referring to them in this way ignores the emblematic, emotive Gaelic phrases she *does* use with her child. Secondly, and most crucially for the policy implications of this paper, we wish to highlight that rather than conceptualising these practices as an end point, this emblematic use of language and the ideologies underlying this type of use can be conceptualised as the ‘seed’ from which Shonagh could potentially develop a more pro-Gaelic FLP, given the implementation of effective support mechanisms. In order to identify these potential support mechanisms, we will compare and contrast Jenny and Shonagh’s sociolinguistic experience to understand how Jenny underwent the ideological transformation necessary to implement a pro-Gaelic FLP and then overcame the confidence barrier that Shonagh describes as the main impetus for her lack of Gaelic use. In doing so, we hope to shed some light on what can be done to turn the tide of language shift on Lewis so that intergenerational transmission can continue into the future.

## Gaelic and Stornoway, Isle of Lewis

As of the most recent (2011) census, 57, 375 people in Scotland (1.1% of the population) have the ability to speak Gaelic. Parallel to other minority language situations, the decline of Gaelic can be attributed to sociohistorical and political realities that led to the disenfranchisement of its speakers and to their language becoming associated with backwardness and poverty (see Withers, 1988; MacKinnon, 1991, Devine 1994 for in-depth discussions of this minoritisation process). The roots of this trajectory can be traced back to the late Middle Ages with the emergent divide between the fertile, more urbanised areas known as the ‘Lowlands’ and the less populous mountainous north and western areas known as the ‘Highlands.’ Over the intervening centuries, demographic decline of Gaelic speakers in the Highlands meant that Gaelic became largely confined to the islands<sup>3</sup> off the northwest coast of Scotland known as the Hebrides and in particular, to the westernmost of these islands, known as the Outer Hebrides. The longstanding Lowland/Highland divide accounts largely for the fact that unlike its Celtic language geographic neighbours Wales and Ireland, Gaelic has remained distant from a sense of Scottish identity. Thus, despite wider policy measures such as the Gaelic Language (Scotland) Act 2005 to reverse this decline, Gaelic occupies an

<sup>2</sup> This definition is based on Shonagh’s reported proficiency and language use in her interview, not an assessment of her linguistic capabilities.

<sup>3</sup> Lewis is the largest (both in terms of population and landmass) as well as the northernmost of these islands.

ambiguous position within the Scottish ideological landscape, perhaps best summarised by McLeod (2001, p. 27): “The position of Gaelic in Scottish public life and discourse is contradictory: a dominant softcore, romanticised support coexists with a residual contemptuousness that borders on racism.” This point will be revisited later in examining language ideologies at the individual level and how they relate to the two mothers’ enactments of two very different FLPs.

Currently in the Outer Hebrides, 52% of the population (14, 066 speakers in total) have the ability to speak Gaelic (NRS, 2013). In Stornoway<sup>4</sup> specifically—the main centre for civic and commercial life in the Outer Hebrides—the percentage of speakers is even less (43.5%), and as early as 1961, the Scottish Council for Research in Education (p. 31) observed that an ‘English pale’ was developing around Stornoway. In terms of current day-to-day use of Gaelic, Birnie’s (2018) recent study of interactions in the public space in Stornoway finds that interlocutors use Gaelic in less than 10% of their encounters with each other, a finding that is echoed in the earlier 2005 WILPP report (pp. 23-24), which discusses how even though speakers may know that they can use Gaelic in a particular public space or with a particular interlocutor, little than half actually do so. The precarious state of Gaelic in Lewis is underscored strongly in Munro, Armstrong, and Taylor’s (2011) findings of their case study of Shawbost, a community on the west side of the island (p. 4), in which more than half of the residents (66%) are fluent speakers of Gaelic. However, despite this relative high proportion of fluent speakers and also despite what the authors characterise as a ‘great goodwill’ towards the language, the authors conclude that ‘intergenerational transmission has all but ended in Shawbost’ and that ‘the language is falling apart and may be dead as a community language in Shawbost within one or perhaps two generations.’ Although a similar case study has not been conducted on intergenerational transmission in Stornoway, given Stornoway’s historical and current legacy of occupying the most advanced state in the language shift within the Outer Hebrides, it is estimated that Stornoway is a generation ahead of the language shift in other areas, meaning that the majority of current Stornoway-born parents would have been socialised primarily through English when they were younger, while the majority of their peers in rural areas would have been at least partially socialised in Gaelic.

Despite this decline, there have been areas of revitalisation as well. The inception and expansion of the immersive form of education known as Gaelic Medium Education (GME) is credited for instance with the slight increase in Gaelic speakers in the under-20 age bracket in the most recent Scottish census (Dunmore, 2018). GME follows from a long legacy of exclusion of Gaelic from education, enshrined in the 1872 Education Act and borne out in day-to-day practice, as reportedly until the 1930s in Lewis students were still punished for speaking the language in school (MacKinnon, 1974, p. 55). The first GME unit<sup>5</sup> opened in a village on the west side of Lewis, initially with four pupils, in 1986. Enrolment in GME is based on parental choice and according to the most recent available Scottish Pupil Census (2017), 3, 965 students nationally were enrolled in GME at the primary level. GME is available in 20 out of 22 primary schools in Lewis and is available at both primary schools in Stornoway: Stornoway Primary and Laxdale Primary. Laxdale Primary served as one of the three case study sites in Stockdale, MacGregor and Munro’s (2003) study of migration and parental choice regarding GME. Of the three sites, Laxdale Primary had the lowest

---

<sup>4</sup> Population approximately 6,000.

<sup>5</sup> The word ‘unit’ is used here because with a few exceptions, GME exists only as ‘units’ within wider English-medium schools.

percentage of enrolment in GME, with only 14% of pupils enrolled in GME, compared to 86% of pupils enrolled in English-medium education. This is despite 51% of Laxdale parents reporting some ability in Gaelic, with 19% of these parents classifying themselves as ‘fluent or native’ speakers of the language. Thus, it is clear that the majority of Gaelic-speaking parents whose children attend Laxdale Primary are choosing *not* to enrol their children in GME.

## Methodology

As emphasised in the introduction, one of the key impetuses behind conceptualising Shonagh’s English-dominant language practices with her child as a ‘post-vernacular’ FLP rather than ‘non-transmission’ is that it allows us to think of these practices as a ‘seed’ as opposed to a terminal point. This in turn will allow us to postulate how language policy measures can better support this potential growth. In order to do this, we compare and contrast Shonagh’s sociolinguistic trajectory to the sociolinguistic trajectory of a mother who has achieved this growth and has successfully implemented a pro-Gaelic FLP. The choice to take this case study approach was borne out of the need for our analysis to be grounded in detailed knowledge about speaker’s linguistic trajectories and how they impact on language use in the family. In first navigating the ‘rich points’ in the data (see Hornberger, 2015) and using Nexus Analysis framework (see Scollon and Scollon, 2007; Hult, 2017) as a guiding point, we were able to see how certain themes emerged across the two speakers’ experiences and how these resonated with wider discourses on language in Lewis and Scotland as a whole, and with other formative moments in each speaker’s individual trajectory (i.e. ‘discourses in place’ and ‘historical body’ in Nexus Analysis respectively).

The analysis in this article is drawn from semi-structured interviews with Shonagh and Jenny, augmented by the authors’ extensive ethnographic observations gleaned from living on Lewis for a combined total of over eight years. Although Shonagh and Jenny’s interviews form part of two different projects, both Shonagh and Jenny were initially interviewed by Author 1 in their own respective homes in Stornoway on the same date of December 9, 2016. One of these studies is an exploratory study of intergenerational transmission of the rural community in Lewis in which Author 2 was living at the time (Shonagh’s ‘home community,’ i.e. where she lived until she left for university on the mainland). The other study is Author 1’s Irish Research Council-funded (IRC) project comparing FLP on the Isles of Lewis and Harris with FLP in the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht in Ireland, respectively. Shonagh’s interview was the final interview that Author 1 conducted as part of the project on intergenerational transmission in the rural community where Author 2 resided. Initially Shonagh was not meant to be included in this study due to the fact her main residence is in Stornoway. However, after Author 1 interviewed Shonagh’s three sisters who still reside in Shonagh’s home community, it was decided that excluding Shonagh’s experiences based on the fact that she lived in Stornoway would be taking a quite narrow (i.e. prototypical ‘nuclear’ family) view of FLP, as it was clear that Shonagh, her sisters, and their children all interacted together a frequent basis.

Author 1 already had an in-depth knowledge of Jenny’s sociolinguistic trajectory before interviewing Jenny in December 2016. Author 1, who lived in Stornoway from 2012-2014, had been close personal friends with Jenny and her husband for approximately four years before commencing the specific project from which Jenny’s interview is drawn. Although the interview is primarily about Jenny’s linguistic trajectory, her husband also participates in

the interview. The initial interview in December lasted approximately two hours, which was then continued for an additional hour in January 2017 when Author 1 returned to Stornoway for the second component of the IRC project. This second component involved recording the family's spontaneous interactions in the home environment and looked especially at how Jenny's two sons (aged 7 and 9 at the time of recording) used and oriented to the use of English and Gaelic in the home. This resulted in approximately six additional hours of audio-recorded interactions. Both the interview and the interactional data were transcribed by Author 1.

Despite the disparity in data (Shonagh's half-hour interview versus Jenny's three-hour interview plus extensive interactional data), the authors feel that they are able to make fruitful comparisons across the two mothers' FLPs and the ideological underpinnings of these two very different FLPs. First, the interviews of Shonagh's four sisters<sup>6</sup> helped form an in-depth picture of both of Shonagh's language socialisation when she was younger and also the contemporary language practices and ideologies within her extended family. Secondly, Author 2's extensive ethnography of Shonagh's home community, including the weekly parent-child playgroup which Shonagh attended at the time of the research, further augmented our understanding of Shonagh's sociolinguistic experiences. Shonagh and her sisters' interviews were collectively analysed in NVivo for content and emergent themes. From this initial analysis emerged a core theme which coincided with the authors' collective long-term ethnographic observations: while there appeared to be a tangible sense among some parents that they *should* speak Gaelic to their children, their actual use was limited to emblematic and emotive use, which in turn was often rationalised by parents as manifesting from their own lack of confidence in speaking Gaelic. As Shonagh's interview was the clearest illustration of this premise, the authors focused in more detail on her interview, and through subsequent analysis began to conceptualise her linguistic practices as a type of 'post-vernacular FLP' in that given the right support, they could potentially be catalysed to form a more 'pro-Gaelic FLP.'

In order to theorise about how this catalysing process could work, the authors focused on one of the pro-Gaelic FLPs as part of Author 1's IRC project. The choice to focus on Jenny rather than the other two mothers who took part in the IRC project was borne of Jenny and Shonagh's overlaps in sociolinguistic experience. Both Jenny and Shonagh live in Stornoway and in both cases, their father was the main agent (i.e. speaker) in their immediate family who could potentially transmit Gaelic, as neither of their mothers were fluent Gaelic speakers. In Jenny's case, however, her father did not speak the language to her, so the only time Jenny heard Gaelic was weekly car trips to church where her father conversed in Gaelic to his mother and mother's friend. As will be discussed in greater depth in the analysis, Shonagh's father spoke some Gaelic to her, as did her grandparents. Another reason we chose to focus on Jenny is that she specifically mentions the difficulty she had in initially acquiring the emblematic, emotive use of Gaelic which forms the core of Shonagh's post-vernacular FLP. Jenny also explicitly details how she overcame the confidence barrier that Shonagh cites the main obstacle to Gaelic use in her own family. After giving more detail about what each speaker's FLP looks at on the interactional level, we will describe the ideologies and practical challenges (in this case, the confidence barrier) underpinning these FLPs and then move onto the policy implications of our analysis.

---

<sup>6</sup> Shonagh's sister who now lives in an urban area of the mainland was interviewed by Author 2 in January 2017.

## ‘Pro-Gaelic FLP’ versus a ‘Post-Vernacular FLP’

In this section, we will give a more-detailed and contextualised explanation of what we mean by a ‘pro-Gaelic FLP’ versus a ‘post-vernacular FLP,’ beginning with Jenny’s ‘pro-Gaelic’ FLP. Jenny primarily uses Gaelic with her children, despite their persistent use of English. In her previous work, Author 1 (XXXX) terms this strategy the ‘stand your ground approach to language choice’ in order to encapsulate how, despite its relative neutrality to other language management strategies (see Lanza, 1997), this strategy is highly pro-active and resists what Gafaranga (2011) terms ‘talking language shift into being,’ whereby the adult switches to the child’s choice of the majority code. Further, in her interview, Jenny herself comments on the intense effort it takes for her to speak Gaelic to the children when they answer in English: *‘tha e cho doirbh bruidhinn ri clann sa Ghàidhlig aig amannan ’s tha iad ’n còmhnaidh freagairt sa Bheurla’* (‘It’s so difficult speaking to children in Gaelic sometimes with them always answering in English’).

In contrast to Jenny’s pro-Gaelic FLP, Shonagh uses English with her son John (aged two and a half) except in specific circumstances, which she describes below:

so, he's [John's] just got like some phrases like things that I say to him all the time like *'suidh sìos'* [‘sit down’] or when I'm putting him in the car seat, I'll say *'lànhan suas'* [‘hands up’] and *'sguir sin'* [‘stop that’], things that you’re saying all the time, that's more kind of what I speak to him

Here, we see the emblematic, ritualised use of the language, particularly in terms of Shonagh’s directives to her son. This type of use was also common among other mothers in the parent-toddler playgroup which Shonagh and Author 2 attend. For example, most of the mothers—although they never spoke Gaelic to each other or Author 2— would use the Gaelic word *"balach"* ('boy') when either talking to or about a boy, either in combination with other emblematic Gaelic phrases (e.g. *"trobhad"* 'come here') or in otherwise exclusively English conversations ("Did I hear a new *balach* had arrived" [someone talking about a newborn boy]).

This ritualistic use also extends to Gaelic when praying, which Shonagh describes below:

like I'll always say grace in Gaelic and he can say it himself in Gaelic, like em but a lot of his wee friends don't have any [Gaelic] or their parents wouldn't even think to [use Gaelic with them] whereas it's kind of in the back of my mind, probably just from the way I was brought up [...] a lot of them wouldn't even think to speak ANY Gaelic to them [their children] or would say 'oh, that's so nice, I wish I did that'

In the introduction, we discussed that part of our motivation in characterising Shonagh’s language use with her son as a ‘post-vernacular FLP’ as opposed to ‘non-transmission’ lies in the ritualistic, emblematic use of Gaelic, such as seen here with the example of saying grace in Gaelic. The other component of our motivation lies in the need for policy and planning measures to see this type of language use as a ‘seed’ rather than a terminal point and to effectively devise ways to catalyse the ‘growth’ of this seed. We see this excerpt as a clear indication of the potential for a new beginning as encapsulated in the seed metaphor: in subtly critiquing the parents who do not speak *any* Gaelic to their children, Shonagh indicates that at some level, she believes it is important for her son to speak Gaelic and therefore engages in the ritualistic use of Gaelic as described in these two excerpts. In Shonagh’s



words, this belief is mediated by ‘the way I was brought up,’ which is taken to index the fact that Shonagh was socialised in Gaelic in her younger years. The following will look more deeply into Shonagh and Jenny’s socialisation experiences and will show certain competing ideologies have filtered into Shonagh and Jenny’s own ideological landscapes, i.e. their ‘residual’ ideologies. The section will argue that while certain formative experiences within Jenny’s historical body have enabled her to overcome the ideologies of contempt inherited from her early socialisation experiences, Shonagh has not undergone such a transformation, which in turn accounts in part for her low use of Gaelic with her child.

## The transformation versus stasis of residual language ideologies

As previously mentioned, the only time Jenny heard Gaelic spoken as a child was in the car going to church each week, as her father conversed with his mother and his mother’s friend in Gaelic, but never to Jenny in Gaelic. As seen below, Jenny attributes this practice to her father’s ideologies of contempt winning out over his personal emotional attachment to the language:

*bha e creidsinn, uill, tha mi cinnteach gu bheil gaol aige air Gàidhlig agus tha e brònach gu bheil Gàidhlig a’ crìonadh ach air an laimh eile chaidh a teasgadh dha chan eil feum ann an cànan agad chan fhaigh thu adhart [...] chan fhaigh thu adhart ann am beatha mura a h-eil Beurla agad*

He believed, well, I’m sure that he had a love for Gaelic and that he is sad that Gaelic is declining but on the other hand it was taught to him, there’s no use in your own language, you won’t get ahead [...] you won’t get ahead if you don’t speak English

In this excerpt, the competing ideologies are demarcated clearly, with the ‘love for Gaelic’ and sadness at seeing it at an end pitted against the idea that Gaelic is useless because it offers little or no economic rewards in comparison to English, thus aligning with the discourses in place discussed previously. In her interview, Jenny describes how she too struggled with these residual ideologies of contempt not only in terms of initially learning the language, but also in the naissance of her pro-Gaelic FLP. Here, Jenny details how this internal struggle was one of the main reasons her initial attempts to use Gaelic with her first-born child were thwarted<sup>7</sup>:

*adhbhar eile a bha e a’ fàs ro dhoirbh- bha mi a’ strì leis na attitudes dona agam nuair a bha mi òg an aghaidh na Gàidhlig so bha aon taobh- bha tòrr gaol agam tòrr gaol agam air Gàidhlig ach bha agam ri strì a-rithist nuair a thòisich mi Gàidhlig ionnsachadh*

Another reason why it was growing too difficult, I was struggling with the bad attitudes I had when I was young against Gaelic so there was one side- I had a lot of love- a lot of love for Gaelic but I had to struggle again when I started learning Gaelic

As in the last excerpt, here Jenny also clearly describes competing ideologies, this time her own ‘love for Gaelic,’ pitted against the ‘bad attitudes’ of her younger years, i.e. the residual ideologies of contempt. Overcoming this struggle therefore is seen to be the result of an ideological transformation. In navigating the content of Jenny’s interview, and in augmenting

<sup>7</sup> The other reason was the fact that the family was living in Switzerland at the time.

this navigation with Author 1's ethnographic observations of Jenny over the years, this ideological transformation appears to stem from how Jenny's experiences over space and time—especially those abroad—led to her to associate Gaelic strongly with a sense of Scottish identity, and how this identity became entwined with an a concrete sense of Gaelic as *her* language. This sense of identity also intersected with experiences of multilingual language rights, which stood in opposition to the 'one nation one language ideology' that characterised her sociolinguistic experiences growing up in the UK. These more macro conceptions of language and relation to place evolved in tandem with her deep emotional connection to the language. The following is a synthesis of the critical moments in Jenny's historical body which led to her ideological transformation. Quotes from her interview are integrated into the text using Author 1's translation of Jenny's interview quotes.

Jenny frames the catalyst for her initial conscious decision to learn Gaelic as a highly emotive experience. She describes how 'the tears were streaming' in listening to 'Teach Yourself Gaelic' tape, in that hearing Gaelic phonemes brought back memories of the way her grandmother and older relatives spoke. The reason for exploring the 'Teach Yourself Gaelic' book and tape in the first place stemmed from the fact that she was 'living in England at the time' and 'homesick for Scotland,' which underlines the emotional potency of this particular life event. This particular framing also is a way in which Jenny discursively links Gaelic to a sense of Scottish identity, which over the years has been further strengthened by Jenny's husband's<sup>8</sup> sense of Irish as his own language emanating from Irish's status as the official language of Ireland and the policies (e.g. compulsory Irish in education, which enabled him to become proficient in the language) related to this status. Jenny and her husband jointly narrate how they once stayed at a hostel in the Isle of Skye (Jenny's father's native island) with a sign that read 'Your mother doesn't live here, wash your own dishes' in a number of languages. Her husband wrote a version of the sign in Irish, and then encouraged Jenny to write it in Scottish Gaelic. Jenny expresses a feeling of shame at not being able to write the sign in Gaelic and having had no access to what she positions as *her* language. The sentiment also comes across in Jenny's narration of the couple's experiences abroad, namely in the multilingual nation-state of Switzerland, where the couple lived for a number of years. Jenny recalls for example being in a café in Switzerland and listening to people code-switch fluidly between German and French and feeling shame not only that she could not do that with other languages, but also the feeling that, although she did have competency in Gaelic by the time she lived in Switzerland, she was not a fluent speaker of her *own* language. In relating this experience, Jenny also discusses the daily enactment of language rights and the institutional and normalised multilingualism she witnessed in Switzerland; for instance, she specifically mentions that one could go into a shop and speak a language and expect to be spoken to in that language, and that one could not get a job in a bakery, for instance, if one did not have at least French and German.

Although Jenny's ideological transformation appears to have taken place prior the family's move to Stornoway in 2008, Jenny's descriptions of the frustration and disappointment in negotiating Gaelic in the public space in Stornoway as compared to the day-to-day enactment of language rights in Switzerland suggest that her ideological transformation transcended simply overcoming her initial ideologies of contempt; and that in witnessing the low institutional and community use of Gaelic in Stornoway, Jenny adopted a very activist stance towards the language. Jenny not only implemented a pro-Gaelic FLP first with her youngest

---

<sup>8</sup> It should be emphasised that Jenny's husband has been supportive of her Gaelic language learning journey and that he is currently learning the language as well.

child (who was born in Stornoway) and then with her older two children, whom she both enrolled in GME upon moving to Stornoway, but she also practiced activism on other fronts, such as working for a Gaelic organisation. In making these observations of how Jenny's ideological transformation came into being, it is important to emphasise that these resonate with Will's (2012) observation that in-migrants to the Isle of Lewis are more likely to see Gaelic in broader identity and activist terms than the local population. In tracing Jenny's various experiences, however, we see that her activist and identity orientations are the result of a complex sociolinguistic trajectory over space in time and cannot be attributed solely to the fact that she is a migrant to Lewis. In essence, Jenny's very pro-Gaelic stance in both in her personal and professional life is seen to be the manifestation of her strong familial and emotional connection to Gaelic evolving and eventually becoming entwined with wider understandings of language, identity, and what language rights *could* look like.

In contrast to Jenny, Shonagh does not appear to have undergone an ideological transformation, but rather, her ideologies appear to reflect the conflicting ideologies into which she was socialised in her younger years. These ideologies are encapsulated by the quotes below, which discuss her father's and her grandparents' use of Gaelic with her:

- 1 Researcher and then your dad, did he speak Gaelic to you?  
 2 Shonagh yeah, he would like em not all the time but he would  
 3 Researcher and was he home a lot or  
 4 Shonagh yeah he was a [type of worker] so [...] he would just go out to the garage and do his [type of work] in between and like come in for lunch you know, things like that so  
 5 Researcher and was it important to him that you had Gaelic or  
 6 Shonagh I think so I mean, he wasn't like really keen like he never really pushed it or anything and he'd never really teach us, like he would if you asked him things but he wasn't like super keen for us all to have Gaelic he liked the idea of it
- 1 Shonagh [...] they would speak to us in Gaelic and sometimes I would answer in English, sometimes I would answer in Gaelic but it just depended on the mood  
 2 Researcher do you think it was important to them that you had Gaelic?  
 3 Shonagh yeah, they would always try and speak in Gaelic, well my grandfather especially he would try to encourage it, but- they never forced it, but they liked the idea of it

Although Jenny's description of her father's conflicting ideologies was much more vivid in its contrast—the 'love' pitted against the clear ideologies of contempt—it is argued that here too we see evidence of caregivers' conflicting ideologies. While at the same time the caregivers *are* speaking Gaelic to Shonagh and her sisters, and, as Shonagh puts it, 'like the idea of Gaelic,' not only is their Gaelic use inconsistent ('not all the time' in the case of her father and 'sometimes' in the case of her grandparents), but her father was not 'super keen for us all to have Gaelic.' This last point is underscored by the comment that her father would 'never really teach us, like he would if you asked him things.' Thus, her caregivers weakly orientate to a Gaelic FLP, a premise encapsulated also by Shonagh's description of her father as 'he never really pushed it [Gaelic]' and her grandparents as 'they never forced it [Gaelic].' Although Shonagh does not elaborate on the specific ideologies underlying what appears to

be her caregivers' tepid orientations to the language, based on the authors' collective eight years ethnographic experiences on Lewis, this tepidity in Shonagh's parents and grandparents' generation is seen to be a cumulative effect of centuries of ideologies of contempt (such as those described in Jenny's interview, e.g. the concept that one could not 'get ahead in life' without English) being tempered by the reality that for most speakers, Gaelic was still the language of their family and their community. The result appears to be a net neutrality, so to speak, and means that while Gaelic speakers like Shonagh's father may 'like the idea of it,' they are not necessarily willing to do much about Gaelic language revitalisation aside from occasional use within the family, a finding strongly echoed in Munro, Taylor and Armstrong's study (2011) of Shawbost.

The tepidity encapsulated in Shonagh's descriptions of her father's and grandparents' language ideologies appear to have filtered into her own ideological landscape as the underlying roots of her 'post-vernacular' FLP. Given Shonagh's earlier account of her occasional use of Gaelic with her son as stemming from 'the way I was brought up'—which we understood to index a positive orientation to the language in terms of familial continuity and provide the 'seed' for further revitalisation efforts—the fact that she is not doing much to increase her Gaelic use leads us to conclude that Shonagh 'likes the idea of Gaelic' but is not 'really keen,' to echo her earlier description of her father. Further, Shonagh's word choice in framing her caregivers as they never 'pushed' or 'forced' Gaelic is also revealing. These characterisations are taken to mean that Shonagh's caregivers did not sanction Shonagh's use of English (which is corroborated by her description of 'sometimes I would answer in English, sometimes I would answer in Gaelic but it just depended on the mood') and also that they did not consistently use Gaelic with her, which is corroborated by the points made earlier. Invoking the word 'pushed' or 'forced' in terms of hypothetical language management strategies and high use of the minority language aligns with Armstrong's (2014, p. 577) analysis of parents with children enrolled in GME: 'self-consciously defending a norm of Gaelic use in the family could be understood as "forcing" the language on children and therefore, could be understood as bad parenting.' This ideology in turn is a reflex of, and in turn contributes to, a monolingual English ideology: that anything besides English requires a degree of coercion, i.e. 'forcing' or 'pushing' it. This also aligns with Dunmore and Smith-Christmas' (2015, p. 93) analysis of a former GME pupil who worked in Gaelic development but who characterised monolingual Gaelic use and strong enthusiasm for the language as the practices of an 'evangelist' (see also Dunmore, 2017, p. 733 discussion of other former GME pupils characterising the revitalisation of Gaelic in areas they did not perceive as 'Gaelic' areas as '*putadh na Gàidhlig*' which translates to 'forcing Gaelic').

This tepid stance towards Gaelic is also evident through Shonagh's discussion of why she may enrol her son in GME in future. At the time of the interview, Shonagh was unsure of whether or not she will enrol John in GME, which she attributed to her perception that her husband<sup>9</sup> would be unequipped to help John with his homework. Here, however, she explains why she believes GME may be beneficial for her son:

---

<sup>9</sup> Shonagh's husband was raised in Stornoway in an English-speaking household; it appears that his parents were the first generation in their respective families not to have acquired Gaelic, supported the earlier premise that Stornoway is a generation ahead of most other places on the island in terms of the language shift. Shonagh characterises her husband as 'easy-oasy' (i.e. he does not care either way) about whether their son John acquires any Gaelic or not.

'cause I just think, I'm not very good with languages and I think if he starts from a young age then um you know, for learning other languages and things and even jobs like to have a chance with- more of a variety of jobs would be good

In this excerpt, Shonagh frames the value of Gaelic in terms of learning other languages and its role in employment opportunities, which aligns both with observations of parents' motivations for enrolling their children in GME specifically and bilingual education more generally (King and Fogle 2006; O'Hanlon, McLeod, and Patterson, 2010; Piller and Gerber, 2018). This framing also aligns with the discourses in place, in particular campaigns coordinated by *Bòrd na Gàidhlig* to encourage parents to enrol their children in GME. For instance, the most recent poster in this campaign, which was visible in the Stornoway airport at the time the interviews were conducted, features the English text 'Give your child a flying start—learn Gaelic. Having more than one language offers more career opportunities.' Notably absent both in Shonagh's framing, as well as the message in the poster, is any orientation to the value of *Gaelic as a language*: that is, its value in terms of culture and identity, or its instrumental value, for although both the poster and Shonagh's framing are centred on an instrumental value, this value does not relate to any inherent qualities of Gaelic *as a language*, but rather, the fact that Gaelic is simply *another* language, thereby enabling the child to become bilingual. This sentiment is echoed in Armstrong's (2018, p. 26) analysis of parents' struggle to establish a free-standing GME school in Edinburgh and the underlying tensions over *how* and *if* a truly Gaelic ethos would be a component of the school: 'If strong language ideology and language policy are advanced in a Gaelic school, will this put off those parents who are more interested in GME as immersion education for bilingual advantage, those without much interest in the Gaelic revival *per se*?' (see also Jaffe, 2007; Heller and Dûchene 2012, for discussion of such issues in relation to other languages). Thus, here too, Shonagh shows a tepid orientation towards Gaelic: that she desires her son to acquire the language through school, but that this desire does not relate to any qualities of Gaelic itself, but rather, her belief that it would be a stepping stone to learning other languages and therefore enabling his greater career prospects.

As seen from this discussion, Shonagh does not appear to have undergone an ideological transformation that was argued to be the case for Jenny. Rather, Shonagh appears to have inherited the tepid ideological landscape of her caregivers, which has been further reinforced by the discourses in place, perhaps most notable of which is the discourse that high use of Gaelic somehow constitutes coercion, i.e. 'forcing' the language. Thus, although Shonagh does not explicitly cite any clear ideologies of contempt when speaking about her lack of Gaelic with her son, this stasis is seen to account for her low use. As seen with Jenny's story, after all, not only do any residual ideologies of contempt need to be overcome, but this ideological journey further needs to evolve in activist orientations towards the language in order to initiate a pro-Gaelic FLP. The following will examine the linguistic challenges that Shonagh may face in hypothetically instituting such an FLP, and will centre on the reason Shonagh herself cites for her low Gaelic use: her lack of confidence in speaking the language. It will then turn to examine how Jenny overcame this barrier—particularly in terms of gaining confidence in child-directed speech (CDS) in Gaelic—and will use this analysis in embarking on the policy implications to be discussed in the conclusion of this paper.

## The Confidence Barrier and Child-Directed Speech (CDS)

The issue of confidence as an obstacle to using a particular minority language is well-established in studies involving Gaelic specifically (e.g. Munro, Taylor and Armstrong, 2011; Will 2012) as well as other studies of new and heritage speakers of minority languages (e.g. Basham and Fatham, 2008; Jaffe, 2015) and also second language speakers more generally (Dörnyei, 2010). Indeed, in this paper we refer to Shonagh as a ‘semi-speaker’ in that she positions herself as such in the interview. Given the weak Gaelic FLPs into which Shonagh was socialised as a child, it is perhaps not surprising that Shonagh lacks confidence in Gaelic. Further, as we saw in the last section, Shonagh characterises herself as ‘not very good with languages,’ which also underscores her low linguistic confidence. Similarly, Jenny’s exposure to Gaelic as a child was virtually non-existent save for the weekly car trips to church and thus like other new speakers, she has struggled with confidence issues in her new speakerhood journey and also in integrating this ‘new’ language into the home sphere. These sentiments are encapsulated in the quotes below, drawn from Shonagh and Jenny’s interviews respectively:

Researcher: do you think if there was more support do you think that would be helpful for you as a parent?

Shonagh: yeah, definitely yeah I think so I think like joint-learning because I want him to have it [Gaelic] but I’m not confident in it so if there was something like that that would just keep you kind of practicing

Jenny: [...] *uill cha robh mi uabhasach misneachdail- mo chuid Ghàidhlig an eagal orm gun cuireadh gun cuireadh e na clann cearr you know agus bha mi a' smaoineachadh nach robh e ceart os cionn 's nach robh mi- nach robh Gàidhlig agamsa bho thùs*

well I wasn’t very confident- my Gaelic- frightened it would put- put the children wrong, you know and I thinking I wasn’t it wasn’t right, because I wasn’t- because I wasn’t raised with Gaelic

It is clear to see from both these quotes the barrier confidence plays in the potential integration of Gaelic use in the home sphere. Jenny, however, managed eventually to overcome this barrier, despite her fears that not being socialised in Gaelic as a child might result in passing on certain grammatical aberrations to her own children as seen here. Although this concern was not explicitly mentioned in Shonagh’s interview, in their collective eight-year ethnography of Lewis, the authors encountered a number of parents who were similar to (and in some cases, more fluent than) Shonagh. These parents often expressed their fear that what they considered their ‘imperfect’ Gaelic (often positioned along the lines of ‘my Gaelic is not as fluent as my parents’ and/or my grandparents’ Gaelic;’ see also Mac an Tàilleir, Rothach and Armstrong, p. 155) would lead not only to their child’s incomplete acquisition of the language, but may also impede their linguistic development as a whole (i.e. the child’s acquisition of English). This belief, coupled with the tepid ideological orientations discussed in the last section, is seen to be the crux of the lack of international transmission in Lewis. As seen from Jenny’s quote, it is clear that Jenny did worry that being a new speaker might negatively impact her children’s acquisition of Gaelic; however, she does not appear to worry that this could then impact their linguistic development *as a whole*. Part of the reason for the apparent absence of this concern may lie in the fact that when the family lived in Switzerland, to some extent Jenny integrated her other ‘new’ language—German—into the home and saw that it impeded neither her children’s German nor English acquisition. This advantage in terms of Jenny’s linguistic awareness however was stymied by

the fact that in Stornoway, Jenny lacked suitable models for parent-child use, as the gap in intergenerational transmission meant that Jenny did not often hear child-directed speech (CDS) in Gaelic:

*cha robh na faclan gu lèir agam no abairtean geur so bha i doirbh you know feumaidh mi eoirp a dhèanamh bha e nas fhasa dhomh ann an dòigh Germailtais a bhruidhinn ris na clann na Gaidhlig os cionn 's gun robh mi air mo chuairteachadh le Germailtais bha mi a' chluinntinn parantan eile a' bruidhinn Germailtais [...] ach an seo cha chluinn thusa you know tha e doirbh doirbh doirbh mura h-eil, you know, os cionn 's nach robh mi Gaidhlig air chluinntin nuair a bha mise òg cha robh duine a' cleachadh you know briathrachas seo ach am briathrachas a dh' ionnsachas tu ann an clas airson inbhich chan eil e freagarach airson bruidhinn ri clann tha i rud beag- you know, chan eil thu ag ionnsachadh 'cur ort do bhrògan' you know cha chanadh sinn, you know, ri inbhich eile- tha thu ag ionnsachadh dè an uair a tha am bus air falbh- am bus air falbh, ann an Inbhir Nis no rudeigin mar sin you know*

I didn't have all the words or wee expressions so it was hard, you know, I have to make an effort. It was easier for me in a way to speak German to the children than Gaelic because I was surrounded by German and I was listening to other parents speaking German [...] but here you won't hear-you know it's very, very difficult if- you know because I didn't hear Gaelic when I was young, people weren't using the vocabulary- but the vocabulary you would learn in an adult class, it's not suitable for speaking to children, there's something- you know, you don't learn 'put on your shoes,' you know, we wouldn't say that you know to another adult- you're learning what time does the bus leave, the bus leave, in Inverness, nor something like that you know

Here, Jenny contrasts the relative ease of integrating German into the home sphere while the family lived in Switzerland, where she heard other parents speaking German to their children, with her initial experiences in Stornoway, where she did not witness such parent-child interactions in Gaelic. As a new speaker of the language, and thus as someone who never heard these 'words and wee expressions' growing up, Jenny has to rely on her adult learning trajectory to provide her with the linguistic tools for child-directed speech. However, Jenny emphasises that her adult classes did not provide her with the vocabulary 'suitable' for CDS. It could be argued that if one has relative competence in the language, by virtue of its simplified nature, CDS should be relatively straight-forward (*cf.* 'foreigner talk'; see Saxton, 2009); however, the authors agree with Jenny, and we contend that although like as in other languages, CDS in Gaelic involves simplification, certain idiomatic features of the language means that this register necessarily entails quite complex morphological features that are primarily learned through idiom (*cf.* Kempe and Brooks 2001 study of CDS and L2 learners of Russian; see also Author 2's XXXX specific discussion of idiom acquisition). In Gaelic, this mainly has to do with its system of prepositions that are inflected for person and gender, referred to as 'prepositional pronouns.' In this example, Jenny draws on the expression '*cur ort do bhrògan*' ('put on your shoes') which contains a preposition pronoun (the pronoun *air* + 2<sup>nd</sup> person, resulting in *ort*) in illustrating her point that adult classes do not necessarily equip parents for integrating Gaelic into the home. Although in this case, the prepositional pronoun is relatively 'logical' for its English equivalent, other expressions involving prepositional pronouns may not appear as 'logical' and simply have to be learned by rote for

the particular context; for example, ‘I love you’ *‘tha gaol agam ort’* which literally translates to ‘there is love at me (*agam*, aig ‘at me’ + 1<sup>st</sup> person, *agam*) on you (*ort*, as discussed previously).’ Although some expressions involving prepositional pronouns are normally acquired early on in adult learning classes (e.g. *‘tha X agam’* (‘I have X’<sup>10</sup>)), the point is that their highly idiomatic nature means that the learner may feel less confident when encountering a new context and thus has to learn that expression by rote, rather than constructing it through prior morphological knowledge of Gaelic. Another example of the idiomatic use of Gaelic has to do with the verbs. The point actually comes from Shonagh’s interview, in which in explaining how her father, like her, uses Gaelic with her son in issuing short commands, saying that ‘if he’s [her father] wanting him [her son John] to come off the couch or something he’ll say something in Gaelic,’ ‘Coming off’ the couch as opposed to ‘getting off’ the couch is a calque from Gaelic, as in ordering someone to get off something, one would say *‘thig dhe’* (literally ‘come off [of it]’). If one has not encountered this expression beforehand, it would not be intuitive.

There of course can be a high degree of idiom in *any* language involving verbs and prepositions; the point is that in most language learning situations, learners are not learning this other language with the main goal of speaking it to their children. In general, adult foreign language pedagogy centres on adult-to-adult communication. Gaelic language pedagogy for adults follows suit and illustrated by Jenny’s comments, as well as discussed at length in Armstrong and Smith-Christmas (2014), this means that the features of CDS which may be accessible only through knowledge of certain idiom may be de-emphasised or wholly absent from the adult classroom. It is completely conceivable that someone learning Gaelic could go quite a long time without ever hearing *‘thig dhe,’* for instance. Secondly, also discussed at length in Smith-Christmas and Armstrong (2014), and as Jenny points out with the example of learning how to ask what time the bus leaves, adult Gaelic language pedagogy tends to follow the foreign language model in emphasising language most useful for travel, such as transportation or booking a hotel, for instance, which is not necessarily conducive for speakers whose express goal is to integrate Gaelic into the family. Jenny therefore not only had to overcome the confidence barrier in terms of her general acquisition, but also in terms of specifically acquiring and gaining practice in using CDS in Gaelic. Overcoming this barrier was achieved primarily through two means. At that time, Jenny was already participating in ‘Homework Help,’ a home assistance programme designed for parents with children in GME, as her two older children were enrolled in GME. Although Jenny reports that she found this programme helpful, the emphasis on written work (e.g. going through the children’s assignments) meant that it did not necessarily help her acquire and gain confidence in using Gaelic CDS. She therefore specifically sought out an older native Gaelic-speaking female mentor to help her learn the vocabulary associated with CDS. This mentor then came to Jenny’s house each week and Jenny describes how the mentor was very helpful in Jenny’s acquisition of the ‘day to day’ vocabulary. The mentor also encouraged Jenny to set up the parent-toddler group *Pàrant is Pàiste* group in Stornoway; although there were such groups in other parts of Lewis, one was not available in Stornoway. Jenny and three friends who were not Gaelic speakers but in Jenny’s words, wanted their children to be bilingual (*cf.* the earlier discussion of GME) then petitioned *Bòrd na Gàidhlig* for funding to set up such a group in Stornoway, and once that started, Jenny found that it too was very useful in her acquisition of the Gaelic CDS.

---

<sup>10</sup> This construction is why Shonagh says ‘I want him to have it’ [Gaelic] in the earlier example, as to say one speaks a language, one says they *have* that language: *‘Tha Gàidhlig agam’* means ‘I speak Gaelic.’



As seen from Shonagh's interview, CDS in the form of short directives such as '*thig dhè*' form the core of what is termed Shonagh's 'post-vernacular FLP.' However, despite Shonagh's familiarity with this register, her interview also indicates that learning initiatives designed around CDS may go some way in addressing her own confidence issues. In the earlier excerpt, Shonagh indicated that she would like more 'joint-learning' (i.e. parent and child) opportunities. This is in reference to 'Bookbug', a national Scottish initiative in which children and their parents attend weekly half-hour sessions where they listen to a story and learn the songs together. At the Stornoway Library, these are available alternately in Gaelic and English, and here Shonagh describes the role that the Bookbug has played in re-activating her latent language skills (see also Basham and Fatham's 2008 work on re-activating latent language skills):

that [Bookbug] was good for me as well cause there's like the songs and that kind of helped me- brought back words and made it a little bit easier for me to speak-

In speaking of what she would like to see in such hypothetical joint-learning initiatives, Shonagh underscores the need for opportunities to help with 'everyday words and things like that,' which aligns with Jenny's description of her self-initiated mentoring programme described earlier. It is clear to see from both these interviews, therefore, that a programme designed specifically around the needs of parents could play a role in addressing the confidence issues expressed by semi-speakers and new speakers. This point will be discussed further in the following section.

## Conclusion: Policy Implications

This paper has introduced the term 'post-vernacular FLP' as a means to explore how a caregiver's emblematic, sporadic use of Gaelic can be conceptualised as a 'seed' which can be 'grown' rather than a terminal point in intergenerational transmission. Indeed, on the face of it, it does look like intergenerational transmission of Gaelic has reached a terminus on Lewis, as most clearly illustrated by Munro, Taylor and Armstrong's (2011) observation of Shawbost (the 'best case' community) eight years earlier. However, just as the authors of the Shawbost report were still hopeful about the future of Gaelic *if certain support mechanisms were to be implemented (and quickly)*, so too are we hopeful that the tide can be turned and that intergenerational transmission can continue both in Lewis and the 'heartland' of the Outer Hebrides as a whole. Jenny's story after all showed that significant challenges can be overcome, both in terms of ideologies as well as the linguistic mechanics of implementing a pro-Gaelic FLP. Below is our specific policy recommendations that follow from this comparative case study analysis.

Beginning with the issue of confidence and CDS, our analysis in the last section suggests that programmes designed specifically to support parents in their re-activation and/or acquisition of lexicon and linguistic structures commonly used in CDS could be highly beneficial. This point has already been made in the Shawbost report as well as in Smith-Christmas and Armstrong (2014) but we would like to emphasise it here and discuss the forms that such programmes may take. Jenny's self-initiated mentoring programme (where an older native speaker came to her house each week and facilitated Jenny's acquisition and confidence using Gaelic CDS) is exactly what the *Tús Maith* programme as described in Ó hIfearnáin (2013) does in the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht. Individual mentors visit individual families, and the strength of the programme lies not only in the fact that the mentors tailor their visits

to each family's specific linguistic needs, but also, especially for speakers like Shonagh, it gets caregivers *used* to speaking to children in Irish in a range of home situations. Such a programme in the Outer Hebrides could therefore address not only the confidence issue, but could also potentially get parents, as well as grandparents, *used* to speaking Gaelic to children. As seen from Shonagh's interview for instance, the only Gaelic input her son John receives from his Gaelic-speaking grandparent is in the form of directives (e.g. to 'come off the couch'), and thus a programme that facilitated grandparents to use Gaelic in types of other types of talk—especially affective talk—could be highly conducive not only to the child's Gaelic acquisition but also to fostering the child's positive relationship with the language (see Ruby, 2012; Author, XXXX). Getting the older generation to become more 'used' to speaking Gaelic has the potential to filter into other areas; for example, the playgroup that both Author 2 and Shonagh attend is run by older Gaelic speakers and despite Author 2 consistently asking them to use Gaelic with her child, they speak English, which appears a facet of their lack of familiarity with speaking the minority language with the children (see Kulick, 1997 for a parallel situation with Taiap). In Corca Dhuibhne, the home visit programme is run in tandem with other parent-child and child-centred initiatives, and links could be made to support and further expand already-existing initiatives, such as the Gaelic Bookbug, *Pàrant is Pàiste*, and *Thig a Chluich*, the new initiative that Shonagh's sisters particularly praised in their interviews.

In comparing Shonagh's 'tepid' ideological landscape to Jenny's ideological transformation, one aspect that becomes clear is the role that relating Gaelic to a particular *place* (in Jenny's case, primarily the Isle of Skye and Scotland) and emotive resonance with personal and family history can have help overcome residual ideologies of contempt (see also Author 1, XXXX). Initiatives centred specifically on emphasising the uniqueness of Lewis or the Outer Hebrides as a whole, and the role of language in this uniqueness, may help in 'raising the temperature' so to speak of the 'tepid' ideological landscape. Ideally, of course this would be in tandem with a radical shift to valuing Gaelic on a wider (i.e. national) level, but here, we would like to focus the need for the language to be seen as integral part of what makes an area special and consequently, the need to maintain that language. Again to draw on an example from the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht, emphasis on 'place' and 'language' in the Oidhreacht Corca Dhuibhne's courses designed primarily for 'new' speakers of Irish have been identified as one of the impetuses behind the success of these courses (Author 1, XXXX). As well, would like to capitalise on GME's potential role in inducing ideological transformation. Both Dunmore (2016) and Armstrong (2018) have highlighted that GME despite being taught *through* Gaelic it is not designed to necessarily foster a *Gaelic identity*. Instilling a Gaelic identity in GME pupils may, through conversations with their parents, reflexively help bring about the transformation among the parent generation, as well as provide the ideological groundwork for the pupils to then potentially implement their own 'pro-Gaelic' FLPs in the future. A recent video from the Western Isles Council made to promote GME (much like the posters mentioned earlier) as well other promotional videos on the Western Isles Council's GME page appear to be moving towards instilling a place-and-identity-based ethos rather than solely relying on the lure of bilingualism to attract potential GME students. It is hoped that this type of thinking continue.

## References

- Altman, C., Burstein Feldman, Z., Yitzhaki, D., Armon Lotem, S., & Walters, J. (2014). Family language policies, reported language use and proficiency in Russian – Hebrew

bilingual children in Israel. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 35(3), 216–234.

Armstrong, T. C. (2013). “Why Won’t You Speak to Me in Gaelic?” Authenticity, Integration, and the Heritage Language Learning Project. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 12(5), 340–356.

Armstrong, T. C. (2014). Naturalism and ideological work: How is family language policy renegotiated as both parents and children learn a threatened minority language? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 17 (5), 570–585.

Author 1 XXXX

Author 1 XXXX

Author 1 XXXX

Author 1 XXXX

Author 2 XXXX

Basham, C., & Fathman, A. K. (2008). The Latent Speaker: Attaining Adult Fluency in an Endangered Language. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 11(5), 577–597.

Birnie, I. (2018). Gaelic language use in public domains. In M. MacLeod & C. Smith-Christmas (Eds.), *Gaelic in Contemporary Scotland: The Sociolinguistics of an Endangered Language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Catedral, L., & Djuraeva, M. (2018). Language ideologies and (im)moral images of personhood in multilingual family language planning. *Language Policy*, 17(4), 501–522.

Canagarajah, S. (2008). Language shift and the family: Questions from the Sri Lankan Tamil diaspora. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 12(2), 143–176.

Carty, N. (2018). New speakers, potential new speakers, and their experiences and abilities in Scottish Gaelic. In C. Smith-Christmas, N. Ó Murchadha, M. Hornsby, & M. Moriarty (Eds.), *New Speakers of Minority Language: Ideologies and Practices* (pp. 253–270). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Costa, J. (2015). New speakers, new language: on being a legitimate speaker of a minority language in Provence. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 2015 (231), 127–45.

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(4), 351–375.

Dauenhauer, N. M., & Dauenhauer, R. (1998). Technical, Emotional, and ideological issues in reversing language shift: examples from southeast Alaska. In L. A. Grenoble & L. J. Whaley (Eds.), *Endangered Languages: Current Issues and Future Prospects*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Devine, T. M. (1994). *Clanship to Crofters' War: The social transformation of the Scottish Highlands*. Manchester: University of Manchester Press.
- Dorian, N. C. (1981). *Language Death: The Life Cycle of a Scottish Gaelic Dialect*. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press.
- Dorian, N. C. (1998). Western language ideologies and small-language prospects. In L. A. Grenoble & L. J. Whaley (Eds.), *Endangered Languages: Current Issues and Future Prospects* (pp. 3–21). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dornyei, Z. (2010). *The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition*. London: Routledge.
- Dunmore, S. (2017). Immersion education outcomes and the Gaelic community: identities and language ideologies among Gaelic medium-educated adults in Scotland. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38(8), 726–741.
- Dunmore, S. (2018). When School is Over and Done With: Linguistic Practices and Sociodemographic Profiles of Gaelic-medium Educated Adults. In C. Smith-Christmas & M. MacLeod (Eds.), *Gaelic in Contemporary Scotland: The Revitalisation of an Endangered Language* (pp. 62–78). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Dunmore, S., & Smith-Christmas, C. (2015). Voicing the 'Other' Code-switching in discourses of Gaelic language ideologies. In E. Torgersen, S. Hårstad, B. Mæhlum, & U. Røyneland (Eds.), *Language Variation- European Perspectives V* (pp. 87–98). Amsterdam: Johns Benjamins.
- Fogle, L. W. (2012). *Second language socialization and learner agency*. Adoptive family talk. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Fogle, L.W. and King, K. A. (2013). Child Agency and Language Policy in Transnational Families. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 19(0), 1–25.
- Gafaranga, J. (2011). Transition space medium repair: Language shift talked into being. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(1), 118–135.
- Heller, M., & Duchene, A. (2012). Pride and Profit: Changing Discourses of Language, Capital, and Nation-State. In *Language in Late Capitalism: Pride and Profit* (pp. 1–21). London: Routledge.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2015). Selecting Appropriate Research Methods in LPP Research: Methodological Rich Points. In F. M. Hult & D. C. Johnson (Eds.), *Research Methods in Language Policy and Planning* (pp. 9–20). Oxford: John Wiley and Sons.
- Hult, F. (2017). Nexus analysis as scalar ethnography for educational linguistics. In M. Martin-Jones & D. Martin (Eds.), *Researching multilingualism: Critical and ethnographic perspectives* (pp. 89–104). London: Routledge.
- Jaffe, A. (2007). Minority Language Movements. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Bilingualism: A Social Approach* (pp. 50-70). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Jaffe, A. M. (2015). Defining the new speaker: theoretical perspectives and learner trajectories. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2015(231), 21 – 44.
- King, K. A., Fogle, L., & Logan-Terry, A. (2008). Family Language Policy. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 2(5), 907–922.
- King, K., & Fogle, L. (2006). Bilingual Parenting as Good Parenting: Parents' Perspectives on Family Language Policy for Additive Bilingualism. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(6), 695–712.
- King, K. A., & Lanza, E. (2017). Ideology, agency, and imagination in multilingual families: An introduction. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 1–7. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006916684907>
- Kirsch, C. (2012). Ideologies, struggles and contradictions: an account of mothers raising their children bilingually in Luxembourgish and English in Great Britain. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(1), 95–112.
- Lanza, E. (1997). *Language mixing in infant bilingualism: a sociolinguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lanza, E. (2018). Multilingualism across the lifespan: The family as a space for language learning, and practices and policies. In R. Mesthrie & D. Bradley (Eds.), *The Dynamics of Language* (pp. 257–263). Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Mac an Tàilleir, I., Rothach, G., & Armstrong, T. C. (2010). *Barail agus comas cànanain [Language abilities and attitudes]*. Inverness: Bòrd na Gàidhlig.
- MacKinnon, K. (1991). *Gaelic: A Past and Future Prospect*. Edinburgh: Saltire Society.
- MacKinnon, K. (1974). *The Lion's Tongue: The Original and Continuing Language of the Scottish People*. Inverness: Club Leabhar.
- McLeod, W. (2001). Gaelic in the New Scotland: Politics, Rhetoric and Public Discourse. *Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe*, 2001, 1–33. O' Hanlon, F., McLeod, W., & Patterson, L. (2010). *Gaelic-medium Education in Scotland: choice and attainment at the primary and early secondary school stages*. Inverness: Bòrd na Gàidhlig.
- McLeod, W., & O' Rourke, B. (2015). “New speakers” of Gaelic: perceptions of linguistic authenticity and appropriateness. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(2), 151–172.
- Nandi, A. (2016). *Language policies on the ground: Parental language management in urban Galician homes*. Unpublished PhD Thesis: Heriot-Watt University.
- National Records of Scotland (NROS). 2013. “*Statistical Bulletin – Release 2A*”. Retrieved from: <http://www.scotlandscensus.gov.uk/documents/censusresults/release2a/StatsBulletin2A.pdf>

- Ó hIfearnáin, T. (2013). Family language policy, first language Irish speaker attitudes and community-based response to language shift. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 34(4), 348–365.
- O'Rourke, B. and Ramallo, F. (2015) 'Neofalantes as an active minority: understanding language practices and motivations for change amongst new speakers of Galician', *International Journal for the Sociology of Language*, 231, 147-165.
- Piller, I., & Gerber, L. (2018). Family language policy between the bilingual advantage and the monolingual mindset. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1503227>
- Ramallo, F. and O'Rourke, B. (2014) 'Profiles of new speakers of Galician'. *Digitum*, no. 16. Available from: <https://www.raco.cat/index.php/Digit/article/viewFile/304441/394160>
- Ruby, M. (2012). The role of a grandmother in maintaining Bangla with her granddaughter in East London. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33(1), 67–83.
- Sallabank, J. (2013). *Attitudes to Endangered Languages: Identities and Policies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schiffman, Harold. (1996). *Linguistic culture and language policy*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Schwartz, M. (2008). Exploring the Relationship between Family Language Policy and Heritage Language Knowledge Among Second Generation Russian–Jewish Immigrants in Israel. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 29(5), 400–418.
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2007). Nexus analysis: Refocusing ethnography on action. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11(5), 608–625.
- The Scottish Council for Research in Education. (1961). *Gaelic- Speaking Children in Highland Schools*. London: University of London Press.
- Shandler, J. (2004) Postvernacular Yiddish: Language As a Performance Art, *TDR: The Drama Review* 48 (1), 19–43.
- Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and new approaches*. London: Routledge.
- Silverstein, M. (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. In R. Clyne, W. Hanks, & C. Hofbauer (Eds.), *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels* (pp. 193–247). Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society.
- Smith-Christmas, C., & Armstrong, T. C. (2014). Complementary reversing language shift strategies in education: the importance of adult heritage learners of threatened minority languages. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 15(3), 312–326.

Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spolsky, B. (2012). Family language policy – the critical domain. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33(1), 3–11.

*Western Isles Language Plan Project (WILPP)*. (2005). Stornoway. Retrieved from <http://www.linguae-celticae.org/dateien/planaire1.pdf>

Will, V. K. A. (2012). *Why Kenny Can't Can: The Language Socialization Experiences of Gaelic-Medium Educated Children In Scotland*. Unpublished PhD thesis: University of Michigan.

Withers, C. W. (1988). *Gaelic Scotland: The Transformation of a Culture Region*. London: Routledge.

## Acknowledgements

This research that forms the basis of this article was made possible by the Irish Research Council [grant number GOIPD/2016/644].