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Abstract

This research examines language ideological change in the Irish context through a longitudinal analysis of variety choice in radio advertising in Ireland from 1977 to 2007. The study extends the growing body of research on variation and change in Irish English to examine this variety as it operates within the context of the genre of radio advertising. A corpus of radio ads from the years 1977, 1987, 1997 and 2007 is analysed using both quantitative and qualitative methods. Bakhtin’s (1981) concept of heteroglossia is applied to accent and dialect as well as genre as they relate to the ads. The analysis is based on Sussex’s (1989) ad components of Action and Comment which relate to the genre of the discourse. The corpus is analysed firstly at the inter-varietal level in relation to the range of varieties in the corpus, predominantly Irish English and Standard Southern British English (SSBE). Based on the decline of SSBE in the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora, the second part of the analysis is at the intra-varietal level and focuses on accent sub-varieties of Irish English. The study explores the manifestation of standard and nationalist ideologies, the conversationalisation of discourse and the ideological construction of authenticity, employing a number of factors; variety choice and location in terms of ad components, the juxtaposition of prestige and vernacular varieties and sub-varieties in the ad components, indexical value of variety, and accommodation strategies including audience and referee design. Nationalist language ideologies and vernacular authenticities are reflected in the use of Irish English rather than the use of the Irish language. Standard language ideologies prevail throughout the corpus but take on a new guise in the later years in the form of prestige Irish English sub-varieties rather than SSBE. These prestige Irish English forms can be seen as a merging of nationalist and standard ideologies and of traditional establishment and vernacular authenticities. The notion of authenticity is found to be moving away from traditional conceptions and is based on more creative constructions.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1 Context and background

The relationship between the media and ideologies of language has been well researched and documented (for example, Spitulnik 1998; Johnson and Ensslin 2007; Coupland 2010). In relation to the medium of radio, for example, Spitulnik (1998) points out that, as well as having a role in the establishment of language ideologies, this medium is also shaped by such ideologies. Johnson and Ensslin (2007, p. 13) claim that, the media are ‘social systems interacting with other social systems, which make up their observable, salient environment’ and as a result they ‘mirror, and hence implicitly promote… ideological frameworks’. They observe how...

...every media performance reflects the interpretations, perspectives and attitudes as well as... the personal, institutional and corporate ideologies of media producers together with those of other social actors who are similarly authorized to stage themselves and their agendas medially.

(Johnson and Ensslin 2007, p. 13)

Coupland points out that the mass media are ‘a powerful resource promoting and disseminating linguistic change’ and highlight their influence on ‘the evaluative and ideological worlds in which language variation exists in late modernity’ (2010, pp. 56, 69).

Turning more specifically to the area of advertising in the media, the use of variety in this domain has received considerable attention during the past two decades (for example, Bell (1991a), Cook (1992), Lee (1992), Koslow, Shamdasani and Touchstone (1994), Spitulnik (1998), Piller (2001; 2003), Bishop, Coupland and Garrett (2005),...
Kelly-Holmes (2005a). The importance to the medium of advertising of being in touch with the consciousness of the receivers of the advertisement, both in terms of getting their attention and promoting a positive attitude toward the product advertised has been highlighted (Vestergaard and Schroder 1985, p.121). These authors point out that because advertisers are required to reflect the attitudes and aspirations of their audience, the analysis of advertising can function as a way of ‘taking the ideological temperature’ in a particular society (Vestergaard and Schroder 1985, p.120). Similarly, Lee (1992, p.171) points out that advertisements are ‘the meeting place of many different ways of speaking, many discourses’, which reflect the discursive practices of the society in which they function. Lee’s research illustrates not only how advertisements echo societal discourse, but also highlights ideological dimensions of variation in advertising. Kelly-Holmes (2005a) looks at multilingualism in advertising, in terms of its value both as a direct means of communication and its symbolic value in the associations it generates. This symbolic value, while it might appear to be ‘part of the natural order’ and ‘a thing in itself’ (Kelly-Holmes 2005a, p.24) is of course, by necessity, linked to and dependent on language ideologies.

The issue of the changing nature of the sociolinguistic situation of any given country and the importance of taking this into account when looking at how it interacts with market discourses has been highlighted (Kelly-Holmes 2005a). Indeed, Kelly-Holmes’ case study of the Irish context serves to whet the appetite for more extensive treatment of the subject of the ideological basis of variety choice in advertising in Ireland, an area which has been largely neglected until now. Therefore, in order to examine the relationship between language ideologies and variety choice, this study exploits what Kelly-Holmes (2005, p. 116) refers to as the ‘interesting case-study’ provided by the Irish context.
While under the Irish Constitution, Irish is the first official language of Ireland, Irish English\(^1\) is the variety used by the majority of the population in Ireland in everyday life today. The Irish context provides an interesting focus for the research in that Irish English has effectively replaced the Irish language as the first language of the majority of the population for all practical purposes; this has come about as a result of Ireland’s colonisation by Britain up to the early twentieth century as well as factors such as famine and emigration (Filppula 1999, pp. 9 -11). In spite of ongoing efforts to revive the Irish language (at least as a second language) which began in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, according to the 2011 Census (CSO 2011), only an approximate forty percent of the population declare themselves as able to speak Irish and the number who use Irish on a daily basis is far lower. This situation is further complicated by the fact that Irish continues to play an important and complex role in everyday life in Ireland, while not being the main language of communication for the majority of the population and in a situation in which there are effectively no monolingual speakers.

In looking at Ireland’s linguistic situation and its potential in the context of advertising, Kelly-Holmes (2005a, p.117) observes three elements available for exploitation by advertisers in Ireland; the Irish language as a symbol of Irishness, the Irish language as a communication tool in relation to the minority of the population who are everyday speakers of Irish and finally, English with an Irish accent or dialect. Although not unique to the Irish context, additional varieties available for exploitation are other varieties of English (e.g. Standard Southern British English, American English etc.), foreign language elements (e.g. French and German words), and English spoken with a ‘foreign’ (e.g. French) accent. The choice of variety is necessarily influenced by the operation of particular ideologies of language, for example the use of Standard Southern

\(^1\) See section 1.2 for clarification of terminology
British English can be indicative of the prevalence of standard language ideology.

In order to look at how language ideologies and changes in these ideologies are reflected in variety choice in the context of broadcast advertising in Ireland, this study exploits a corpus of radio advertisements from an Irish radio channel broadcast over a thirty year period, from 1977 to 2007. The corpus is subdivided into four sub-corpora, each comprising a set of ads from the years 1977, 1987, 1997 and 2007 and is analysed both quantitatively and qualitatively. While an initial examination of the corpus indicated some use of the varieties mentioned above (e.g. the symbolic use of the Irish language, the use of American English, pseudo-French accents etc.), the predominant varieties exploited were Standard Southern British English and Irish English. As Lee (1992, p.160) points out, ideological issues associated with standard and non-standard varieties are especially visible in the colonial situation which involves power inequalities between the colonisers and the colonised, together with manifest linguistic differences between standard and non-standard varieties. In light of the colonial history of Ireland and the history of shared media boundaries between Britain and Ireland and in view of the predominance of Standard Southern British English and Irish English in the corpus, the main focus of the study is therefore on changes in relation to these varieties.

Having established the context and background for the study, the chapter goes on to clarify terminological issues before outlining the research objective and the research questions. The theoretical basis for the formulation of the research questions is then described. Following this, the limitations of the study are outlined and the chapter concludes with a description of the structure of the thesis.

---

2 See section 1.2 for clarification of terminology
1.2 Terminology

Before looking at the main objective and the research questions, it is important to clarify the terminology in relation to variety used in the study.

**Irish English:** Irish English is used here as a general term to refer to English as it is spoken in Ireland and encapsulates both accent and dialectal features (these terms are explained more fully below). This term, advocated as far back as 1909 by Hayden and Hartog has become more widely used in recent studies as opposed to Hiberno-English, favoured by Filppula (1999, p.34). This latter term, according to Amador Moreno (2010, p.8), is somewhat limiting, due in part to its focus on the influence of the Irish language on Irish dialects of English.

Broadly speaking, Ireland can be divided, in linguistic terms, into two sections; one section is the north (or the province of Ulster), comprising the six counties of Northern Ireland (which are part of the UK) but also the Republic of Ireland county of Donegal. (Hickey 2004a, p.30); the second section is that of the south which comprises the provinces of Munster, Connacht and Leinster, encompassing the remaining counties of Ireland. Hickey (2013) observes that Ulster varieties are different from those of the south due to the plantations of the seventeenth century which led to Lowland Scots and forms of northern English being brought to Ulster. Notwithstanding this, there are some features which are common to both varieties, northern and southern. As the study is based on a corpus from a southern Irish radio station, the variety of Irish English described is that of southern Irish English. Therefore references in this thesis to Irish English can be understood in terms of this variety.

**Standard English / Standard (British) English:** ‘Standard English’ is defined by
Hughes, Trudgill and Watt (2012, p.13) as the dialect of ‘educated people throughout the British Isles’. Their definition refers to varieties differentiated by grammar and vocabulary (not accent) and views Standard (British) English as a dialect of English.

**Standard Southern British English (SSBE):** This term refers to accent as distinct from dialect and thus to variations in pronunciation rather than grammar and vocabulary (Hughes et al 2012, pp. 3,13). SSBE is a newer ‘less evaluative’ term for Received Pronunciation (RP). This accent is associated with high social status as regards education, income and profession rather than being associated with a specific region (Hughes et al 2012, p.3). The term SSBE has come about due to negative associations with the term RP and also due to recent changes in the phonetic features of RP. This prestige pronunciation form is associated with radio and television in the British context and is used in particular by BBC newsreaders and presenters (Hughes et al 2012 pp.3-4).

In the context of the present study, SSBE, which indicates the standard British accent, contrasts with the Irish English accent, and therefore is identified predominantly by syllable–final /r/ deletion as this is the main feature differentiating it from Irish English\(^3\) (see chapter 2, section 2.4.2 ); other identifying phonetic features of this accent are not examined. Therefore attempts at the emulation of SSBE through syllable–final /r/ deletion, by speakers of Irish English are classified as SSBE. While the term refers to accent rather than dialect (in terms of grammar and vocabulary), in the context of this particular study, in all cases where SSBE accents (or simulations of such accents) were employed in the corpus, these accents combined with ‘Standard English’ (as defined above) features, in relation to grammar and vocabulary; therefore, for the purposes of the study, the term ‘Standard Southern British English (SSBE) will imply standard dialectal (grammatical and lexical) as well as pronunciation features.

\(^3\) See also definition of ‘non-standard British English’
The term ‘**standard British English**’ (note lower case *s* in *standard* to differentiate this
term from that used to denote dialect as defined above) is used on occasion in this study
to refer generally to standard British English in terms of accent and dialect.

**Non-standard British English:** The term ‘non-standard British English’ refers to
regional sub-varieties of British English which display non-standard features in terms of
accent or dialect. Where such features are identified, albeit as part of a non-rhotic
British accent sub-variety, this sub-variety is identified as ‘non-standard British
English’.

**Variety:** ‘...the distinction between dialect and language is a problematical one. For this
reason the term *language variety* is often used by linguists where such questions of
status can be avoided’ (Graddol, Cheshire, Swann 1994, p.5) The term *variety*, in the
context of this study, is used as an umbrella term for language variation; it is used in
relation to languages which are not mutually intelligible (e.g. French, English etc.), but
also in relation to varieties of the same language (e.g. Irish English, Standard Southern
British English, North American English etc.). Variations at this level are referred to as
*inter*-varietal variation. Therefore the inter-varietal analysis can include distinct
languages as well as distinct varieties of English. This term encompasses accent and
dialectal features in relation to the particular variety.

**Dialectal variety:** The term dialect refers to varieties differentiated by differences of
grammar and vocabulary (Hughes et al 2012, pp.3, 130) e.g. Standard (British) English,
Irish English dialectal variety. The term *dialectal variety* is used in reference to such
varieties in cases where it is important to distinguish them from accent. It is important to
note here that although Hughes et al (2012, p.13) define ‘Standard English’ (in terms
of grammar and vocabulary) as subsuming Standard English English (England and
Wales), Standard Scottish English and Standard Irish English and indicate the presence of regional features considered as ‘standard’ in the latter two varieties, in this study, dialectal items relating to Irish English are treated separately and referred to as Irish English dialectal variety. This is dealt with more comprehensively in chapter 2 (section 2.3.6) and chapter 4 (section 4.5).

**Accent variety**: The term *accent* refers to variations in pronunciation (Hughes et al 2012, p.3, 130) e.g. Standard Southern British English (SSBE)\(^4\) also termed Received Pronunciation (RP), Irish English accent. The term *accent variety* is used in this regard in cases where it is important to distinguish it from dialect.

**Accent sub-variety**: This term is used to refer to accent sub-categories of Irish English (e.g. local Dublin, advanced Dublin English etc. which are described in chapter 2, section 2.3.8) in the *intra*-varietal analysis. Technically, SSBE (also termed RP) and non-standard British English accents could be classed as accent sub-varieties of British English; however, given that SSBE is the predominant variety in the corpus, and that it is this standard variety rather than British English as a whole which is analysed in relation to Irish English accent at the inter-varietal level, SSBE is referred to as an accent *variety* rather than a *sub*-variety.

**Broad inter-varietal features**: In this study, the analysis in relation to ‘broad inter-varietal features’ (see chapter 5, section 5.2) is used to refer to the examination of different varieties (in relation to languages which are not mutually intelligible (e.g. French, Irish etc), as well as to varieties of the same language (e.g. Irish English, North American English etc.) as described above in relation to the definition of ‘variety’.

---

\(^4\) As noted above in the definition of SSBE, while this term technically refers to accent, in this study it also implies standard dialectal features.
order to establish the main varieties exploited in the corpus, an initial analysis was
carried out with regard to all varieties displayed in the corpus. With regard to this broad
inter-varietal analysis *only*, the study does not distinguish between accent and dialectal
items relating to the particular variety and is based on the presence of any feature
(phonological, lexical, grammatical or pragmatic) indicative of the particular variety.

1.3 Objectives and research questions

The main objective of the research is to examine language ideological change in the
Irish context. The study attempts to accomplish this through an examination of variety
choice in radio advertising in Ireland in the thirty year period from 1977 to 2007 and an
analysis of how language ideologies and changes in such ideologies are reflected in such
choice.

The study aims to expand existing internationally situated research in relation to variety
choice in advertising (for example, Bell (1991a); Lee (1992); Koslow, Shamdasani and
Touchstone (1994); Piller (1997; 2001). More specifically, it attempts to build on the
work of Kelly-Holmes (2005a) who recognises the Irish advertising situation as an
interesting context in which to explore aspects of variation in advertising in attempting
to reproduce or imitate ‘normal everyday communication, including accent and dialect’
(2005a, p. 16).

In addition, in light of Coupland’s (2009a) remarks on the necessity to look for links
between changes in the world of the media and that of ‘everyday’ communication, this
study utilises the growing body of research on variation and change in Irish English (for
example Hickey 2004a; 2005; 2013; Amador-Moreno 2010; Moore 2011) and extends it
to examine this variety as it operates within the context of the genre of radio advertising
together with the ideological issues pertaining to its existence and employment in such an environment. The relatively recent establishment of the Irish English accent sub-variety, termed *advanced Dublin English* (Hickey 2013), as the new mainstream accent in Ireland, for example, is a particularly interesting locus for the examination of how authenticity is being constructed in more complex and creative ways in late modernity (Coupland 2001a).

In order to direct and guide the focus of the research, the following research questions are formulated.

**Research Question 1:**

*To what extent are language ideologies and changes in such ideologies manifested through variety choice at the inter-varietal level in radio advertising in Ireland?*

This question is addressed through the following research sub-questions:

**Research sub-questions:**

1.1 Are there longitudinal changes in (a) the occurrence of varieties in their broad sense (as defined in section 1.2 above) and (b) in the functions of such varieties within the ads, as indicated by their location according to the advert components of ‘Action’ and ‘Comment’? (Sussex 1989)?

1.2 Are there longitudinal changes in (a) the occurrence of Standard Southern British English (SSBE) and Irish English (accent and dialectal variety) and (b) in the functions of Standard Southern British English (SSBE) and Irish English (accent and dialectal variety) within the ads as indicated by location of these

---

For an explanation of the terms ‘Action’ and ‘Comment’, see section 1.4.
varieties according to advert component?

1.3 To what extent is the strategy exploited in the corpus of juxtaposing, in ‘Action and Comment’ type ads, Irish English accent in the Action component against that of SSBE in the Comment, thus appealing to the ‘contrasting values’ associated with status and solidarity (Lee 1992, p. 179-180)?

1.4 What are the indexical values associated with SSBE and Irish English (accent and dialectal variety) in the ad corpus?

1.5 What accommodation strategies, particularly audience and referee design strategies, relating to SSBE and Irish English (accent and dialectal variety) are visible in the corpus?

**Research Question 2**

*To what extent are language ideologies and changes in such ideologies manifested through variety choice at the intra-varietal level in radio advertising in Ireland?*

As with the inter-varietal analysis, the question is addressed through the research sub-questions below:

**Research sub-questions:**

2.1.1 Are there longitudinal changes in (a) the occurrence of ‘local’ and ‘non-local’ accent sub-varieties of Irish English and (b) in the functions of ‘local’ and ‘non-local’ accent sub-varieties of Irish English within the ads as indicated by location of these accent sub-varieties according to advert component?

---

6 ‘Local’ and ‘non-local’ accent sub-varieties of Irish English are described in chapter 2, section 2.3.8.
2.1.2 To what extent is the strategy exploited in the corpus of juxtaposing, in ‘Action and Comment’ type ads, local accent sub-variety in the Action component against non-local in the Comment, thus appealing to the ‘contrasting values’ associated with status and solidarity (Lee 1992, p. 179-180)?

2.1.3 What are the indexical values associated with different accent sub-varieties of Irish English in the ad corpus? 2.1.4 What accommodation strategies, particularly audience and referee design strategies, relating to accent sub-varieties of Irish English are visible in the corpus?

A more specific focus on the Irish English accent sub-variety of advanced Dublin English (see chapter 2, section 2.4.4) expands on and develops the intra-varietal analysis, guided by the following sub-questions relating to this sub-variety.

2.2.1 Are there longitudinal changes in (a) the occurrence of advanced Dublin English and (b) in the functions of advanced Dublin English within the ads as indicated by its location according to advert component?

2.2.2 To what extent is the strategy exploited in the corpus, of juxtaposing, in ‘Action and Comment’ type ads, local Irish English accent sub-variety in the Action component against advanced Dublin English in the Comment, thus appealing to the ‘contrasting values’ associated with status and solidarity (Lee 1992, p. 179-180)?

2.2.3 What are the indexical values associated with advanced Dublin English in the ad corpus?

2.2.4 What accommodation strategies, particularly audience and referee design strategies, relating to advanced Dublin English are visible in the corpus?
The theoretical basis for the formulation of the research sub-questions is described below.

1.4 Theoretical basis for the research questions

In considering the language ideological dimension of variety choice in the context of radio advertising in Ireland, it is useful to refer to the dimensions of status (concerned with language ‘prestige’) and solidarity (concerned with the socio-psychological need for national, ethnic group, social group or interpersonal solidarity), which are derived from the matched-guise technique study relating to language attitudes (Lambert, Hodgson, Gardner and Fillenbaum 1960). In his study of a corpus of ads broadcast in a Swiss-German channel in 1989, Lee (1992) uses these concepts in analysing the aims of the ads in terms of the contrasting values relating to these aims (Lee 1992, p.179). The aims of the ads, according to Lee, are on the one hand to generate acceptance of the product through allowing the consumer to identify with the actors who ‘represent’ the product, and on the other hand to sanction the action of purchase through a voice which is perceived as having authority or expertise. With regard to particular language ideologies, nationalist ideologies, for example, come into play with regard to the use of Irish English in Ireland and its ability to act as a substitute for the national language and therefore as a marker of identity. The exploitation of this variety may be based on its potential in creating solidarity with the listener. On the other hand, standard language ideologies are evident where SSBE is exploited as a marker of status and authority. These standard language ideologies may in turn have a bearing on the status of Irish English as a ‘real’ language and thus render it unsuitable for particular functions of the ad. With regard to the use of different accents and varieties or ‘voices’ in a text, which Bakhtin (1981) terms heteroglossia or multi-voicedness, Kelly-Holmes (2005a, p.118)
points out that, to the extent that heteroglossia has now become a media phenomenon, it is part of what Fairclough (1992;1994) describes as the democratisation and conversationalisation of discourse. These processes weaken the boundaries between public and private discourse and allow for less formal forms of discourse, and non-standard varieties in the public domain. This, on the face of it, suggests that heteroglossia in advertising indicates a movement away from standard ideologies of language and can be said to be motivated by a desire to create solidarity with the receiver of the communication. Coupland (2009a, p.37) observes how standard or ‘high’ dialects are increasingly being seen as ‘posh’; as Coupland puts it ‘Posh cuts away the ideological underpinnings of the concept of ‘standard’...Posh de-natures the Establishment voice, cutting though its links to authenticity...’ This calls into question the ‘authenticity’ of the speakers of standard varieties, suggesting that they are less ‘authentic’ than speakers of non-standard varieties.

However, the notion of authenticity and what constitutes an ‘authentic’ speaker of a language is also ideologically constructed. Coupland’s (2003) categorisation of traditional ‘establishment’ and ‘vernacular’ authenticities is useful in allowing us to see how authenticity as a concept can be associated with both status and solidarity dimensions; standard varieties, for example, can be said to be authentic in terms of establishment authenticities and are associated with status while non-standard varieties can be said to have vernacular authenticity and associated with the creation of solidarity. The necessity to re-examine notions of authenticity has been proposed by researchers such as Thornborrow and van Leeuwen (2003) and Coupland (2001a). Coupland (2001a), for example, looks at new strategies for authentication which move towards a resolution of the conflict between vernacular and establishment authenticities by employing vernacular forms in reflexive and strategic ways.
Referring back to the varieties available for use by advertisers in the Irish context in section 1.1, the choice of these varieties can potentially reflect the ‘ideological temperature’ (Vestergaard and Schroder 1985, p.120) of Irish society at a linguistic level. The influence of these ideologies can be manifested and measured in the corpus through a number of factors which have formed the basis for the research sub-questions outlined in section 1.3 and which we will examine below.

The impact of changing ideologies of language, for example, the movement away from standard ideologies and the trend towards informalisation through the conversationalisation of discourse (Fairclough 1994), may be indicated through longitudinal change in variety choice. As the trend towards decreasing respect for standard forms is said to have begun in the 1960s (Mugglestone 2003), we could expect standard language features to be on the decline in the corpus as the decades progress.

Additionally, the operation of language ideologies and any change in relation to such ideologies may be indicated through the function of particular varieties within adverts and changes in relation to this function. In identifying the function, it is useful to look at the individual advert in terms of distinct components which are related to genre. Referring back to the notion of heteroglossia as encompassing the ‘voices’ of different accents, dialects and varieties in a text, as discussed above, heteroglossia may also be characterised by the voices of different genres (Cook 2001, p.186). Lee (1992 p. 171) observes that while a genre in itself, advertising also includes many other genres, for example conversations in a shop or pub, banter, joking and so on, thus reflecting the discourses of the particular society in which they function; therefore, in a similar way to the genre of the novel as discussed by Bakhtin (1981), advertisements can also be characterised by heteroglossia. Lee sees the format of the genre as the most important
element in code choice in advertising texts, and uses Sussex’s (1989) advertisement components of ‘Action’ and ‘Comment’ in examining choice of variety in advertisements. The Action component is generally comprised of dialogic interaction in specific contexts while the Comment component (which names and provides general information on the product), on the other hand, tends to be monologic and decontextualised. This division of the ad in terms of Action and Comment components is based on the genre of the discourse; Lee found that discourses of ‘power and authority’ tend to be associated with the Comment voice while discourses of ‘everyday informal interaction’ are associated with the Action and that these discourses are in turn related to variety (Lee 1992, p.172-3). As Lee observes, a major function of the discourse of power is the supply of ‘privileged information’ (Lee 1992, p.172-3) and the choice of variety in that section of the ad which supplies this information may be impacted by language ideologies. The use of SSBE, for example, in the Comment component may signify the influence of standard language ideology.

This juxtaposing within a particular ad of a prestige or standard variety in the Comment with the use of vernacular varieties in the Action can also be indicative of the operation of particular language ideologies in that this strategy is designed to achieve the dual aim of the ad in terms of status and solidarity dimensions (Lee 1992). The choice of particular varieties relating to status and solidarity is ideologically based. This strategy of juxtaposition of variety within the ad can also highlight the indexical value of the particular variety. The notion of ‘indexicality’ which is based on Peirce’s (1893-1913/1998) theories of sign relationships, has been explained as ‘The link between an expression or form and what it meaningfully stands for’ (see Coupland 2007, p.2). This relates to the observation of how ideologies ‘locate, interpret, and rationalize sociolinguistic complexity’ and identify linguistic forms with ‘typical’ persons in order
to explain difference among linguistic practices (Gal and Irvine 1995, p.972). The notions of *first-order indexicality* (the association of linguistic form or variety with a social group) and *second-order indexicality* (relating to the awareness, discussion and rationalisation of first-order indexicality) have been proposed by Silverstein (1992; 2003). Milroy (2004, p.167) observes that it is from this second-order indexicality that ideologies are derived. In the context of this study, the exploitation of first-order indexicality by advertisers can be seen as a product of second-order indexicality (the awareness or noticing of associations between variety and social group leading to choice of the specific variety in particular contexts) and thus is indicative of (changing) ideologies of language in the period to which the study relates.

The importance of language choice in achieving social approval and in creating a relationship with the receiver of the communication is crucial to the concept of the advertising message (Koslow et al 1994). Key to an understanding of this notion is the concept of speech accommodation encompassing the notion of convergent and divergent linguistic behaviour and the related concepts of audience and referee design. According to Bell (1991a), in mass communication, speakers can only accommodate to a stereotype of the speech of their audience; the construction of such a stereotype is necessarily impacted by and can thus reflect language ideologies.

Language ideologies and changes in these ideologies, therefore, can be manifested through:

- Longitudinal changes in variety choice
- Function of variety and longitudinal changes in function within the ad (as suggested by its location within the Action or Comment component).
• Function of variety and longitudinal changes in function within the ad (as suggested by the juxtaposing of different varieties in ‘Action and Comment’ ads).

• Indexical values in relation to variety and longitudinal change in such values.

• Accommodation strategies and audience and referee design (based on the construction of stereotype) and longitudinal change in such strategies.

These factors can be seen as vehicles for the manifestation of particular language ideologies and are the basis for the formulation of the research questions outlined above. The thesis is therefore based on an examination of these factors in the radio advertisement corpus.

1.5 Limitations of the study

As discussed above, the study is mainly concerned with the inter-varietal analysis of Standard Southern British English and Irish English in its broad sense as well as with the intra-varietal examination of accent sub-varieties of Irish English. While other, less prevalent varieties visible in the corpus are discussed in terms of how they operate with these main varieties, they do not form a central part of the study.

The research is broadly concerned with ‘Standard Southern British English’ (SSBE) as it relates to or contrasts with Irish English. Therefore SSBE in the study is identified by syllable-final /r/ deletion predominantly. Although patently non-standard forms of British English are identified in the corpus on which the study is based, the research does not concern itself with other phonetic properties of SSBE.

While the research refers to the advertisement compilation as a ‘corpus’ of ads, it is
important to point out that a corpus linguistic methodological approach is not employed. While the qualitative analysis involves the transcription of salient ads based on the quantitative findings, the study is not based on transcription of the entire corpus. Such an approach may be appropriate in the case of analysis based mainly on dialectal features; however, the focus of this study is predominantly on phonological features for which an aural analysis was deemed most suitable. The paucity of Irish English dialectal tokens rendered a manual analysis feasible with regard to these items (cf Van Gijsel, Speelman and Geeraerts 2008).

1.6 Organisation of the thesis

The thesis is organised as follows. In order to establish the context for the study, chapter 2 devotes itself to an examination of the variety which is the main focus of the study, Irish English, and looks at its origins, development and present position in the linguistic environment of Ireland. It traces the history and development of the English language in Ireland. In order to provide a background for analysing this variety in relation to ideologies of language, it examines vernacular Irish English in broad terms and describes prominent phonological, grammatical and lexical features with regard to this variety. Prestige varieties in the Irish context are discussed including the notion of a ‘standard’ Irish English. This prefaces a general discussion on language ideologies as well as their relationship to the media and to the Irish context.

The second part of this chapter identifies and describes particular language ideologies which may be associated with variety choice in the context of the study. Nationalist ideologies of language come into play with regard to the choice of Irish English in broad terms and its ability to act as a substitute for the national language and therefore as a marker of identity and a creator of solidarity with the listener. A discussion of standard
language ideology follows; this examines how standard language ideology impacts on choice at both inter-varietal (Irish English as opposed to SSBE) and intra-varietal levels (vernacular or ‘local’ as opposed to prestige or ‘non-local’ forms of Irish English). The notion of a ‘standard’ Irish English is discussed; based on this discussion, a more general term of ‘non-local’ Irish English accent sub-variety is found to be more appropriate in the context of this study to refer to ‘standard’ or prestige varieties in the Irish context. Categories of ‘local’ and ‘non-local’ Irish English accent sub-variety are identified for the purpose of analysis of variety in the study.

More recent language ideological shifts are also considered in relation to variety choice. Fairclough’s (1992; 1994) notions of the democratization and conversationalization of discourse allow for a blurring of the boundaries between public and private discourse and permit less formal forms of discourse and non-standard varieties in the public domain. In addition, the notion of authenticity as an ideological construct and in relation to media contexts is also outlined; this concept is relevant to choice of variety based on what Coupland (2003) categorises as ‘establishment’ (associated with the status dimension) and ‘vernacular’ authenticities (associated with the solidarity dimension) and also the emergence of new versions of authenticity. The chapter then goes on to describe the latest development in ‘non-local’ Irish English, the emergence of the accent sub-variety of ‘advanced Dublin English’ (Hickey 2013) which, based on its origins and representation in media reports, provides an interesting context for a discussion of the ideological dimension of authenticity.

Chapter 3 focuses on the factors which we have established in section 1. 4 as ways in which language ideologies may be manifested. The chapter can be divided according to production related aspects of variety choice which centre largely around the structure of
the ad (variety choice and location in terms of ad components together with the juxtaposition of prestige and vernacular varieties and sub-varieties in the ad components) and reception-oriented aspects which are centred on the receivers of the ads (indexical value of variety in its association with the ‘implied reader’ of the ad’ (Piller 2001) and accommodation strategies including audience and referee design).

The chapter begins with a discussion of the concept of heteroglossia (Bakhtin 1981) which underpins the theoretical framework of ‘Action and Comment’ employed in the study; it explains how the notion of heteroglossia is used in this research to refer to the voices of different genres (discourses of authority and discourses of everyday interaction) as well as the use of accent and variety within these genres. The framework employed for the classification of the ad components, that of ‘Action and Comment’ (Sussex 1989; Lee 1992) which is based on the genre of the discourse is described. The strategy of juxtaposing varieties in the Comment and Action components of the ad, appealing to both status and solidarity related values, is also discussed.

In relation to reception centred aspects of variety choice, the Peirician notion of ‘indexicality’ (Silverstein 1992; 2003, Milroy 2004) is explained and related to the study. This concept, in that it indexes ‘typical’ persons or groups can be related to Piller’s (2001) research on characteristics associated with the implied ‘reader’ or receiver of the ad. In this way it links with speech accommodation theories and the related concepts of audience and referee design, a further means by which language ideology may be manifested. A particular focus on categories of referee design forms an important part of a broader based examination of theories of accommodation and convergent and divergent linguistic behaviour.

Chapter 4 describes the research methodology for the study. The chapter begins with a
brief account of the background and history of Irish radio advertising. It describes the economic and social context for the corpus before providing a description of the corpus itself and the process for its compilation. The research method employed and the basis for the analysis is established with reference to the research questions posed by the study. The criteria used for identifying and categorising particular features, relating to accent and dialectal variety and sub-variety are outlined. The processes for both the inter-varietal and intra-varietal quantitative analyses are described and explained. The approach to the qualitative analysis is explained and the basis for this analysis is described with reference to the research questions.

Chapter 5 is the first of three analysis chapters. This chapter addresses the first main research question concerning the manifestation of language ideologies through inter-varietal choice in the ad corpus. It describes the findings in relation to the research subquestions. It focuses firstly on inter-varietal choice in relation to broad inter-varietal variation in the corpus and then narrows its focus to look at inter-varietal choice in relation to SSBE and Irish English. This analysis is carried out, first of all, across the corpus as a whole and then refining its focus to concentrate on the earlier two sub-corpora in which SSBE predominates, thus allowing for comparison between these two main varieties. With regard to the research sub-questions, both quantitative and qualitative data are employed. The qualitative data are based on the analysis of particular ads which demonstrate the main quantitative findings.

While the main focus of chapter 5 is on the use of SSBE as against Irish English in its broad sense, chapter 6 addresses research question 2 in relation to choice at the intra-varietal level, focusing on the exploitation of particular accent sub-varieties of Irish English. As Irish English in broad terms dominates the two most recent sub-corpora
(1997 and 2007), it is on these sub-corpora that the intra-varietal analysis is based. As with the inter-varietal analysis in relation to SSBE and Irish English, the analysis addresses the research sub-questions with qualitative data augmenting the quantitative findings.

Chapter 7 responds to the second part of research question 2 in relation to intra-varietal choice. This chapter extends and develops the analysis of Irish English accent sub-varieties in the corpus by directing its focus more specifically on the sub-variety of advanced Dublin English pronunciation (Hickey 2013) which Hickey (2004a, p.46) considers as the most important case of language change in modern-day Ireland. The research sub-questions are addressed by revisiting the quantitative findings, outlined in chapter 6, in relation to changes in the occurrence overall of this pronunciation form as well as its patterns of location within the ad components; qualitative data in relation to the sub-questions are based on particular ads which illustrate the findings.

In chapter 4 which outlines the research methodology and in the three analysis chapters (chapters 5, 6 and 7), reference is made to appended tables. Appendix A contains a table which lists and provides a brief description of all the ads in the corpus, indicating the reference number of the ad, the company or brand name, the country with which it is associated (e.g. Irish, French, international etc.), the product or service advertised, the sub-corpus to which the ad belongs and a brief description of the ad. Appendix B contains tables which relate to each of the four sub-corpora of ads; the tables list each ad in the sub-corpus, showing particular features in relation to accent and dialect according to ad component of Action and Comment. Further tables beneath these main sub-corpus tables show further details relating to the quantitative analysis.

Chapter 8 concludes the thesis. The chapter summarises the thesis and revisits and
brings together the findings in relation to the specific research sub-questions, which are designed as vehicles for the manifestation of language ideologies and changes in such ideologies (occurrence and function of variety, juxtaposition of contrasting varieties in Action and Comment components, indexicality and accommodation and audience and referee design strategies). These findings are then consolidated by relating them explicitly to the language ideologies described in chapter 2, standard language ideology, nationalist language ideology, the conversationalisation and democratisation of discourse and the notion of authenticity as an ideological construct. The chapter concludes by proposing future directions for research in the area.
Chapter 2. Irish English: Sociolinguistic and ideological context

2.1 Introduction

As we have seen in chapter 1, the study focuses on the extent to which language ideologies are manifested through variety choice in radio advertising in Ireland, firstly at the inter-varietal level focusing mainly on Irish English (in its broad sense) and Standard Southern British English (SSBE) in the corpus, and secondly, at the intra-varietal level in relation to particular sub-varieties of Irish English in the corpus. The aim of this chapter is to examine Irish English in a sociolinguistic and language ideological context both in relation to SSBE and with regard to intra-varietal variation. This involves looking at the way in which Irish English and its sub-varieties operate in Irish society, particularly in relation to Standard Southern British English and also in examining variety choice in relation to particular ideologies of language.

In order to establish the sociolinguistic and ideological background for this discussion, the chapter begins by tracing the history and development of the English language in Ireland. Following this, vernacular Irish English is discussed in broad terms and its salient features described. The notion of prestige varieties of English in the Irish context is introduced and this is used as a starting point for a discussion on the language ideologies which may come into play in choosing between vernacular and prestige varieties. Following a review of definitions of the concept of language ideology and the idea of language ideology as a social construct, the issue of its relationship to the media is discussed. The chapter then focuses on particular language ideologies which are deemed relevant to the study. The nationalist ideology of language is discussed, both on
a general basis and in the Irish context, and the issue of variety as expressing Irish identity is raised; this is followed by a discussion of standard language ideology and its impact on choice at both inter-varietal (Irish English as opposed to SSBE) and intra-varietal levels (vernacular as opposed to prestige forms of Irish English). Research into the viability of the notion of a ‘standard’ Irish English is outlined and, based on this, a more general term of ‘non-local’ Irish English is established to cover ‘standard’ or prestige varieties. Particular categories of Irish English which may fall under this umbrella term are identified and their salient features examined.

The discussion then moves on to identify and examine more recent ideologies of language which may impact on the exploitation of such prestige or standard varieties. These include the concept of the democratization and conversationalization of discourse (Fairclough 1992; 1994) and the notion of authenticity ‘in crisis’ which has led to newer ideological constructions of the concept of authenticity (Coupland 2003). Following a discussion of these ideologies and how they relate to media contexts, the way in which the now mainstream ‘non-local’ pronunciation form of Irish English, that of advanced Dublin English (Hickey 2013), reflects these and other language ideologies is discussed.

2.2 Irish English: Background and description

As we have seen in chapter 1, the term Irish English is used here to refer to English as it is spoken in Ireland and for the purposes of this study implies southern Irish English as described in section 1.2 (chapter 1). We will look briefly at the origins and development of this variety.

2.2.1 History and development of Irish English

Up until the twelfth century, the Irish language, derived from the Celtic branch of the
Proto-Indo-European language, was the main language of Ireland. The Norman invasion of 1169, however, led to the introduction of English and Norman French into Ireland. These languages established themselves as vernacular languages existing together with Irish. Although English was used more widely than Norman French, especially during the thirteenth century, neither language was able to withstand the pressure of the Irish language, which dominated in both urban and rural areas up to the fifteenth century. Indeed, so dominant was the Irish language and so pervasive the assimilation of Anglo-Normans into the native Irish culture that laws known as the Statutes of Kilkenny were passed in 1366 which attempted to prohibit the use of Irish among the English and Norman settlers. Despite these laws, Irish remained strong up until the end of the fifteenth century. In the sixteenth century, reformation legislation led to a union of ‘Old English’ settlers and native Irish against the Protestants. The result of this was that the Irish language became associated with Catholicism. Around this time, English began to gain ground in the major urban centres as well as in baronies in south Wexford and north Dublin (Filppula 1999, pp. 4-6). These Anglo-Irish dialects, which derived mainly from south-western English, had developed ‘certain distinctive features of their own’ due to their lack of contact with the English spoken in England (Adams 1986, p.23). Conflicting views exist on the position of English at the end of the sixteenth century and on whether the ‘Old English’ continued to some extent as a spoken language in the sixteenth century, thereby connecting it to the ‘New English’ associated with the plantations of the seventeenth century (Bliss 1977; Kallen 1994; Filppula 1999).

Notwithstanding these arguments regarding the link between medieval and modern Irish English, the plantations, of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, which involved the confiscation of land in Ireland and its allocation to English and Scottish settlers, are seen as a watershed in the linguistic history of Ireland. The ‘Cromwellian Plantations’ of the
1650s were most significant in the growth and spread of the English language. This was because, with the exception of the province of Connacht, the landowners were English-speaking Protestants and according to Bliss (1979) in the ‘great houses’, ‘tenants and servants alike had to learn some English in order to communicate with their masters’. Despite this, Irish continued to be spoken during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in Ireland. Amador- Moreno (2010, p.19) points out that the language contact and bilingualism that came about after the plantations formed the conditions for Irish English to emerge. She encapsulates the situation well in this citation from Bliss (1972):

This seventeenth-century English was acquired, gradually and with difficulty, by speakers of Irish; and in the process of their acquisition of it they modified it, both in pronunciation and in syntax, towards conformity with their own linguistic habits. Because of the social conditions existing in Ireland, Irish speakers rarely had the opportunity of prolonged contact with speakers of Standard English, and learned their English from those whose English was already less than perfect; so that the influence of the Irish language was cumulative, and remains strong even in those parts of Ireland where Irish has long ceased to be spoken

(Bliss 1972, p. 63)

Despite gaining ground in Ireland, up until the end of the eighteenth century the English language still had only second-language status, with Irish persevering as the main language of the majority of the population. During this period, the Penal Laws, which prohibited Catholics from education and from participating in political and social life, were introduced. To counter this, small groups of students were often taught in what were termed ‘hedge-schools’ and in many cases the English language was taught in these schools as it was seen as necessary for social and economic advancement. However, as pointed out by Hindley (1990), the nineteenth century saw a change in the linguistic situation, with bilingualism giving way to a major language shift from Irish to English. A number of factors have been cited as contributing to this shift (Filppula 1999; Amador-Moreno 2010).

---

7 Makeshift schools often located under a hedge or wall or in a shed or barn. (Dolan 2004)
One such factor was the prohibition on the use of Irish in the national school system which came into being in 1831. Additionally, English was the medium of instruction in the education for the Catholic priesthood in Maynooth College, which was founded in the late eighteenth century. This contributed to English becoming the *de facto* official language of the Church in Ireland (O’Rahily, 1932, 1976; Hindley, 1990, cited in Filppula 1999, p. 9). The Catholic Emancipation Act was passed in 1829 through the efforts of the political leader, Daniel O’Connell. Although himself a native Irish language speaker, O’Connell encouraged the speaking of English in Ireland, seeing it as essential in order for Ireland to take its place in the modern world (Amador-Moreno 2010, p.22). English came to be associated with opportunity and success and Irish with poverty and illiteracy (Filppula 1999, p.9). The position of the Irish language was further exacerbated by the potato famine of the 1840s which led to the loss of over two million native Irish speakers through death and emigration. An additional factor in the decline of Irish was the development of the railway lines between Belfast and Dublin, the two main English-speaking cities in Ireland. Also, migration, both seasonal and long-term, contributed to the language shift, in that knowledge of the English language was essential for emigration to Britain and the United States, the main destinations for emigrants (Amador-Moreno 2010, p. 23).

According to de Fréine (1977, p.86), with regard to the language shift, ‘by the year 1900 the transformation was almost complete’. As a response to the decline in the Irish language, the Gaelic Revival and Irish Literary Revival of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries attempted to re-establish an Irish identity through the promotion of the Irish language and culture. Efforts were also made, following Ireland’s independence from Britain in 1921, to re-establish Irish as the main medium of communication in all spheres; indeed Irish is still, at the time of writing, a compulsory subject in primary and
secondary schools in Ireland. Irish and English are recognised in the Irish Constitution as the official languages of Ireland but in practice, English is the language used predominantly by the majority of the population and although there are speakers who are bilingual in Irish and English, there are no longer any monolingual Irish speakers.

Amador-Moreno (2010, p.26) observes that the influence of the Irish language on English as it is spoken in Ireland is an important, although not the only factor in the evolution of this variety. With regard to the distinctive grammar of Irish English, Filppula (1999, p.282) points out that it owes much of its character to the substratal influence while acknowledging also the superstratal input in terms of earlier forms of English. Filppula (1999, p.281) claims that Irish English can be considered as a contact vernacular in that it has come about in a situation of intensive language contact and where language shift occurred at a rapid pace. With regard to contact varieties, he observes that in the early stages of contact, bilingualism is prevalent and necessary for emergence of contact variety but as the contact variety becomes established, it is no longer dependent on bilingualism, (Filppula 1999, p.15) as is the case with Irish English. These observations highlight the relationship of Irish English with the Irish language and the potential of the former variety to replace the Irish language as a marker of identity (see also Henry 1977; Lass 1990; O’Muuiithe 1977).

2.2.2 Irish English: Vernacular and prestige varieties

While written English in the Irish context equates broadly to standard British English (Harris 1997) (in terms of lexical and grammatical features), Irish English is most

---

8 Substratal refers to those elements in the contact variety which transfer from the indigenous substratum language of the population shifting to another language and which are carried on in the speech of subsequent generations. (Filppula 1999, p.15).

9 Superstratal represents the input from the target language (superstratum) which may have more prestige and hold a socially superior position in the speech community (though this is not necessary) (Filppula 1999, p.15)
distinguishable from standard British English\(^\text{10}\) in its spoken rather than its written form, in terms of lexical, grammatical and phonological features. Filppula (1999, p.12) points out that Irish varieties of English are easily recognisable with regard to phonetics and phonology and that elements which are common to speakers of all regions, as well as different social and educational backgrounds, exist in Irish English. However, researchers (for example White 2006, p.220) refer to the notion of a ‘standard’ Irish English and the prestige value of such a variety in relation to vernacular varieties. This suggests that in the context of the English language in Ireland, the options available to advertisers are not only standard British English (understood as ‘Standard English’ in terms of dialect and SSBE in terms of accent in this study) but also ‘standard’ or ‘prestige’ varieties of Irish English as well as vernacular Irish English.

Whilst these options are based on very broad categorisations, nevertheless they provide a framework in which to look at how Irish English may be exploited in the context of radio advertising in Ireland and how this may reflect distinct language ideologies. As we have seen in section 2.2, the Irish language has been replaced by English as the main medium of communication in Ireland. The extent to which Irish English is distinct from Standard (British) English and SSBE may have potential repercussions for how nationalist ideologies operate in relation to Irish English, particularly vernacular Irish English. In order to provide a background for such a discussion, the next section will describe vernacular Irish English in terms of phonological, lexical and grammatical features.

### 2.2.3 Vernacular Irish English

Although, as discussed in the previous section, Irish English can be distinguished from

\(^{10}\) See chapter 1, section 1.2 for definitions of ‘standard’ English used in this study.
standard British English more so in its spoken rather than its written form, nevertheless a written variety of Irish English has developed as a result of both its use in literature and the informalisation process (Fairclough 1992), which has led to a movement towards the use of less formal forms of discourse in the public domain, as discussed by Kelly-Holmes 2005a). While in this study, the focus is obviously on spoken forms, nevertheless the emergence of a written variety can have implications for the valorisation of the variety in general.

We will look briefly now at the main features of vernacular Irish English in terms of phonological, grammatical and lexical features.

As discussed above, Filppula (1999, p.12) observes that, in general, Irish varieties of English are easy to recognise at the levels of phonetics and phonology and have a number of elements which are common to speakers of all regions. Hickey (2011, p.7) briefly summarises the range of shared phonological features in vernacular varieties for the south of Ireland as follows:

1) Lenition of alveolar stops to fricatives in positions of high sonority, e.g., city [siti]
2) Use of clear [l] in all positions in a word (now recessive), e.g., field [fi:ld]
3) Retention of syllable-final /r/, e.g., board [bo:rd]
4) Distinction of short vowels before /r/ (now recessive), e.g., tern [tern] versus turn [tərn]
5) Retention of the distinction between /ʍ/ and /w/ (now recessive), e.g., which [ʍitʃ] and witch [witʃ]

While the above list refers to common features of vernacular southern Irish English varieties, Hickey (2004a, pp.30-34; 2013) provides detailed lists of phonological features on a regional basis; the ‘east band’ encompasses counties from Dundalk (in Co. Louth) down to Dublin and Waterford, the ‘south and west’ region covers Cork up to Limerick, Galway and Sligo, and the ‘northern’ region covers the counties in the north
of Ireland and the border counties. Hickey \(\text{ibid}\) provides descriptions of phonological features associated with each of these broadly based regions.

In addition to shared features in vernacular varieties as outlined in the list above (Hickey 2011, p.7), Filppula (1999, p.12) points out that some features of Irish English are common to speakers of different social and educational backgrounds. Retention of syllable-final /r/, for example, is a feature which is common to prestige and vernacular varieties of Irish English alike, with the exception of ‘lower class’ Dublin English which is non-rhotic or only weakly rhotic (Hickey 2005, p.28). However, Hickey (2011, p.5) tells us that, due to the effect of ‘standardisation’ (which will be discussed below), through which speakers adopt ‘less local’ pronunciation, some vernacular features are not evident in supraregional varieties.

On the other hand, Hickey (2013) refers to some features of vernacular Irish English as being regarded by Irish people as ‘strongly vernacular’ and claims that Irish people can be sensitive to such realisations. One such feature, as described by Amador-Moreno (2010, p.78) is the realisation in many areas of Ireland of the phonemes /θ/ and /ð/ as dental plosives [t] and [g] thus making it difficult to distinguish between pairs such as tree and three, fate and faith, breed and breathe, dare and there. Amador-Moreno (\textit{ibid}) also describes other vernacular features of Irish English such as the substitution of /ʃ/ for /s/ so that stay /steɪ/ is pronounced as [ʃteɪ], the lack of distinction between the /æt/ diphthong (as in mate) and long vowel /i:/ (as in meat) so that meat is pronounced as mate, and epenthesis, the process of inserting the schwa sound between consonants in particular between r+m and l+m (e.g. [fələm] film) \(\textit{ibid}\). Hickey (2013) also refers to local Dublin pronunciation which has features (such as low rhoticity as referred to above) which distinguish it from other vernacular Irish English forms.
With regard to grammatical features, while Filppula (2012, p. 86) claims that ‘it would be far-fetched to speak of a separate Irish English grammar’, nevertheless, in his comprehensive study of the grammar of Irish English (Filppula 1999), he examines what he considers to be the key distinguishing features in this variety. In his analysis of the noun phrase, he highlights features such as non-standard definite article use (1999 p, 56) which he finds, tend to be associated with particular categories of words and expressions, for example physical sensations or states (the tiredness, the hunger) and terms for family members (the mother). Filppula (1999 pp.77-78) also refers to the non-standard use of reflexive pronouns in Irish English and how they can occur in subject or object position or as prepositional complement in adverbial prepositional phrases, for example, ‘...he’d be the devil, if himself wouldn’t make him laugh’; ‘...they’d burn yourself’ (Filppula 1999, pp.77, 78). In addition, Filppula (1999, pp. 218-241) discusses Irish English usage of prepositions, focusing on the non-standard use of the prepositions in, with, of, on, for example, ‘...they’d be = have quite a drop of drink on them’. In his treatment of tense and aspect in Irish English, Filppula (1999, p. 90) lists six different categories of perfects associated with this variety. Of these, he considers the after perfect as one of the best-known features of Irish English, for example, ‘You’re after ruinin’ me.’. Amador-Moreno (2010, p.44), in discussing future forms in Irish English, also points to the use of will rather than shall as an important marker of Irish English, a feature which Filppula (1999, p.54) also acknowledges as characteristic of this variety, for example, ‘Will I sing you a song?’- rather than ‘Shall I?’ (Joyce 1910-1991 cited in Amador-Moreno 2010, p.44). Further key features treated by Filppula (1999) include Irish English questions, responses and negation, focusing devices and additional features of the verb phrase and complex sentence. (see also Harris 1993).

Turning to lexical features in Irish English, research has been carried out in relation to
words of Irish and Scottish origin, retentions from old English dialects and malapropisms which have taken on their own meaning in Irish English. Amador-Moreno notes observation by Bliss (1984), Filppula (1991) and Hickey (1997), that by comparison with the number of standard words used in Irish English, the number of Irish words is small. However, she points out that even in areas where Irish is not habitually spoken, Irish words or words derived from Irish are still in everyday use, for example, the Irish word, *flaithiúlach*, meaning *generous*. Indeed, although unable to access documentary evidence, the researcher has a personal recollection of this word having been used in an Irish-made advert for Ford cars in the 1970s. *See your Ford dealer - he’s feeling flaithiúlach.* Irish words are also widely used in government and politics, for example in the names of political parties, political offices, boards, councils etc, for example, *An Bord Bia* (the Irish Food Board) (Amador-Moreno 2010, pp.56-73).

The use of Irish words or Irish ‘tokenism’ has been cited as serving ‘emotional purposes’ in creating and maintaining an ‘otherness’ or distinct identity for Irish people and in this way fostering confidence in their Irishness. This is exemplified in the use of Irish first names for children or names of Irish origin for houses and so on (Tristram 2007, p.312).

Amador-Moreno (2010, pp. 63, 68) also refers to retentions of old English forms and meanings in Irish English as well as words in English whose meaning changes in the Irish English context. *Your man*, and *Your one*, for example, are used as deictics to refer to a particular male and female respectively. A study by O’Keeffe and Adolphs (2008) concludes that spoken Irish English has more religious references and swear words than that of British English and religious references are also found to be a feature
of contemporary Irish English by Farr (2008).

Kallen (2006, pp.1-2), in looking at the historical background of discourse marking in Irish English, identifies a number of words and phrases functioning as such markers, which are used in literature as indexing that a character is Irish (see also Amador-Moreno 2005). Some are derived from the Irish language, for example, arra, musha, mar dhea (pronounced moryah), while others are based on calques or translations from Irish, for example, at all at all; this latter phrase derives from the Irish phrase ar chor ar bith and, according to Todd (1999), is an example of rhythmic retention resulting from language shift. Other pragmatic markers associated with indexing Irishness are derived from English and indeed can be said to be similar to other varieties of English; however, notwithstanding this, they are seen as representative of Irish English. The marker sure in utterance-initial position is one such example (Kallen 2006, p.2). This marker is also referred to in this context by Amador-Moreno (2010) and indeed Kelly Holmes (2005) also cites the marker sure as indicating Irish identity. The marker like in clause-final position is identified as another marker of Irish English (Clancy 2000 p.56; Amador-Moreno 2010, p. 119; Schweinberger 2012). Kallen (2006, p.12) also finds that this marker occurs frequently in ICE-Ireland.11

2.2.4 Salient phonological markers for the differentiation of Irish English and SSBE

While the lexical and grammatical features outlined above all form strong markers of Irishness, at the level of phonology, a number of features have been identified as key in

---

11 The ICE (International Corpus of English) project for Ireland was proposed by Sidney Greenbaum in 1988. The rationale for the ICE project as a whole is the facilitation of comparative studies of the varieties of English where it is either a majority first language or an official additional language, through computer corpora of samples of written and spoken English from each of the participating countries. The authors and speakers of the texts are aged 18 or over and have, at the minimum, completed second-level education through the medium of the English language. The corpus includes both formal and relatively informal spoken and written text categories (Kallen 2006. pp. 3-4).
distinguishing Irish English speakers from those of SSBE. One such feature, retention of syllable-final /r/ (where /r/ is pronounced in syllable-final position, as in river, fur, and where followed by a consonant, as in dark, yard) (Amador-Moreno 2010, p. 77) has been mentioned above as part of a range of shared features in vernacular Irish English varieties. Hickey (2004a, p.41) refers to this as a key phonological feature of Irish English (based on a holistic view of Irish English rather than a focus on particular vernacular varieties, for example, ‘lower class Dublin English which is non-rhotic or only weakly rhotic, as discussed (Hickey 2005, p.28). He further suggests that the non-existence of particular features can negatively define Irish English, giving the example of ‘r-lessness’ as signalling ‘that a speaker is not Irish’. Amador-Moreno (2010), in her practical introduction to Irish English, outlines some of its general phonological features and echoes Hickey’s observation that the rhoticity of Irish English is one of its most distinguishing features.

Hickey (2005, p.33) also points to retention of the distinction between /ʍ/ and /w/ as highlighting how speakers from the Irish Republic distinguish themselves from speakers of Received Pronunciation (RP) (termed SSBE in this study) in what he gives us to understand as a conscious dissociation from this prestige variety. By contrast, an additional feature, deletion of yod after /n/ as in /nju:/ realized as [nu:] is also noted but is considered to be associated with very low speaker awareness (Hickey 2005, p.81).

The next section will look briefly at what might constitute prestige varieties in the Irish context. This will be used to launch the discussion on nationalist and standard language ideologies in relation to variety choice in Ireland.

2.2.5 Prestige varieties in Ireland

As discussed in section 2.2.3 above, Filppula (1999, p.12) points out that a number of
vernacular Irish English features, for example rhotic pronunciation, are shared by speakers of different social and educational backgrounds in Ireland. However, Hickey (2011, p.5) observes how some vernacular features are absent from more supraregional varieties due to ‘standardisation’ and the adoption by speakers of ‘less local’ pronunciation. Given the association of standard varieties with prestige (Milroy 2000), prestige options in the Irish context can be understood as either standard British English (in terms of accent and dialect) or what might constitute or equate with a (quasi) ‘standard’ variety of Irish English. Bell (1991a, p.145) observes how a colonial history can cause perceptions of the standard variety as superior to the local variety and cites the example of the case of prestige New Zealand radio and TV in the 1980s, in which announcers spoke with a close-to RP accent.

In the Irish context, however, it is necessary to consider the question of what constitutes an ‘acceptable’ prestige variety. The word ‘acceptable’ is important here in that a variety may have prestige but may not be deemed suitable in the particular context. Bourdieu’s notion of ‘habitus’ (Bourdieu 1991, p.12) is relevant here. The ‘habitus’ refers to a set of dispositions which generate specific actions and reactions, and lead to ‘regular’ practices, views and attitudes about what is or is not appropriate in a particular situation. Indeed, Hickey (2005, p.33) suggests that we need to question the status of standard forms of British English in Ireland. He discusses how, on the one hand, Irish people do not want to be seen as having an unacceptable accent but, on the other hand, in his words, ‘It would not befit any nationalist-minded Irish person to imitate an English accent’ which is regarded as ‘snobbish’, ‘pretentious’ and worthy of derision (Hickey 2005, p.34). Similarly, according to Mac Mathúna (2004)
colonising nation and it is not the standard to which the majority of indigenous educated people aspire.  
(Mac Mathúna 2004, p.117)

In addition, Hughes et al (2012, p.3) claim that with regard to accent, RP or the newer term, Standard Southern British English (SSBE) has the greatest ‘currency’ and prestige in England, but ‘is evaluated somewhat differently in the other countries of the UK and in Ireland’ (ibid). These comments suggest that while SSBE is available for exploitation in the context of radio advertising in Ireland, the notion of a ‘standard’ variety of Irish English may be more appropriate as a prestige variety in the Irish context; this leads us to a consideration of the language ideologies associated with such choice.

2.3 The ideologies of language

The ideological dimension of variety choice in the Irish context is implicit in the above comments of both Hickey (2005) and Mac Mathúna (2004). Mac Mathúna’s use of the terms ‘desired norm’ and ‘standard’, for example, and Hickey’s reference to an ‘unacceptable’ accent are based on standard language ideology. By the same token, the reference by Hickey to the ‘nationalist-minded Irish person’ and Mac Mathúna to ‘liberated country’ and ‘the colonising nation’ centre around nationalist ideology. The effectiveness of Irish English in replacing the Irish language as a symbol of Irishness and therefore as a creator of solidarity in the advertising situation is necessarily impacted by nationalist ideologies of language. In addition, while the strength of such ideologies may also put limits on the use of SSBE in radio advertising in the Irish context, standard ideologies may act to counter the effect of nationalist ideologies through the creation of the requirement for an ‘acceptable’ variety of English in the Irish context, in turn placing constraints on the use of vernacular forms of Irish English. ‘Standard’ or prestige forms of Irish English may be an effective tool in bridging the
gap between these ideologies and the exploitation of such forms may represent a resolution of the conflict between these ideologies. These ideologies may also be impacted by more recent developments in the form of the democratization and conversationalization of discourse (Fairclough 1992; 1994) as well as by new conceptions of authenticity as an ideological construct (Coupland 2003). In the following section, we will examine the concept of language ideology, first of all in terms of its definitions as a social construct and secondly, how it relates to media contexts; following this, the discussion will focus on particular ideologies of language and more recent ideological developments and how they relate to the Irish context.

2.3.1 Language ideology as a social construct

Research around the area of language ideologies has encompassed work ranging from legal education to national language policy to media discourse. Woolard (1998, p.3) in her introduction to Schieffelin, Woolard and Kroskrity’s volume on language ideologies, points out that ideologies of language do not only concern language but link it to such areas as aesthetics, morality and epistemology as well as notions of identity. In this way, they place emphasis not only on linguistic form and use, but also on the very notion of the person and the social group.

Woolard and Schieffelin in an earlier paper (1994, p.57), outline a number of definitions of language ideology: Silverstein (1979, p.193) refers to language ideologies as ‘sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use’ while Heath (1977, p.53) describes them as ‘self-evident ideas and objectives a group holds concerning roles of language in the social experiences of members as they contribute to the expression of the group’. Irvine (1989, p.255) defines language ideology as ‘the cultural system of ideas about social and
linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests’.

Rumsey (1990, p.346) puts forward a broader definition of ‘shared bodies of commonsense notions about the nature of language in the world’.

Woolard and Schieffelin suggests that the differences in these definitions come about largely due to differences in scholars’ notions of ideology ranging from

seemingly neutral cultural conceptions of language to strategies for maintaining social power, from unconscious ideology read from speech practices by analysts to the most conscious native-speaker explanations of appropriate language behavior

(Woolard and Schieffelin 1994, p.58)

They point out, however, that these notions all have a common view of ideology as linked to the experience of a particular social position. Woolard (1998, p.3), in her treatment of language ideology as a field of inquiry, arrives at a definition of language ideology as ‘Representations, whether explicit or implicit, that construe the intersection of language and human beings in a social world’.

The notion of language ideologies as representations of language is also advocated by Cameron (2003, p.448). She claims that while some definitions of language ideology refer to beliefs about language, we need to distinguish between ‘beliefs or attitudes’ relating to language and the concept of ideologies as ‘representations’ of language. She defines language ideologies as ‘sets of representations through which language is imbued with cultural meaning for a certain community’ (Cameron 2003, p.447). In distinguishing representations from beliefs or attitudes, she observes that while the latter could be said to be constructed mentally and ‘belong’ to individuals, the former is, by contrast, a social construct, that is ‘ways of understanding the world that emerge from interaction with particular (public) representations of it’ (Cameron 2003, p.448). These
include not only the spoken and written texts and practices in which languages are represented but also in which languages are spoken and written about. From these representations, users of language learn how particular speech patterns are interpreted and understood in their culture. Media language is fundamental to such ‘public’ representations. Based on these representations, particular language attitudes may be shaped. However, Cameron argues that such representations also allow for challenges to these understandings and the possibility to form alternatives.

Woolard and Schieffelin (1994, p.58) in discussing the socially constructed nature of language ideologies, point out that this does not detract from their validity, given that even scientific knowledge has a basis in social life. However, the term ideology serves to remind us that the cultural conceptions we study are ‘partial, contestable and contested, and interest-laden’. This notion of how language ideologies relate to the interests of particular groups will be discussed more comprehensively below in relation to the media and also to particular ideologies which pertain to this study.

2.3.2 Language ideology and the media

In this study, how language ideologies operate in media contexts is of particular importance. Johnson and Ensslin (2007) in their discussion of language in the media argue that what people have to say about language, that is, metalanguage, (defined by Preston (2004a) as language that is used to talk about language), is the basis for much of what we can learn about the ideological foundations of linguistic activity. Therefore, issues around language ideology are necessarily issues around metalanguage. This is apparent in Silverstein’s (1979) definition of language ideologies, (as outlined in section 2.3.2 above), and the notion of beliefs about language which are articulated by users. Hoenigswald’s (1966) proposal for the study of folk-linguistics suggests that
.. we should be interested not only in (a) what goes on (language), but also in (b) how people react to what goes on (they are persuaded, they are put off etc.) and in (c) what people say goes on (talk concerning language).

(Hoenigswald 1966, p.20)

Woolard’s (1998, p.3) definition, as we have seen, focuses on representations of language. Johnson and Ensslin suggest that the way in which language is represented, both in the media and otherwise, in addition to providing a discursive frame for language use, is the basis for our understanding of what language is. Johnson and Ensslin (2007, p.13) suggest that the media are ‘social systems interacting with other social systems, which make up their observable, salient environment.’ Because of this, the media ‘mirror’ and by implication ‘promote’ ideological frameworks. As public agencies of observation, interpretation, performance, representation and dissemination, they combine ‘conative, emotive and conceptual meanings’ in order to achieve the maximum effect on the target audience. The personal, institutional and corporate ideologies of media producers and of those who are authorised to present themselves and their agendas through the media are reflected through media performances. Jaworski (2007, p.271) points out that it is this power to influence language practices and values, brought about through the ubiquity and elite status of the media, that sets media communication apart from other forms of communication as a focus for research.

Johnson and Ensslin (2007, p.14) cite Pennycook (2004, p.7), pointing out that language is ‘an emergent property of social interaction’ which reflects the ideologies of the social agents who engage with it on a discursive and performative basis. They suggest that because it allows for the performance of local issues globally, the media provides the most powerful stage for such constructions of language. Conboy (2003, p.47) points to the increased use of vernacular language as linked to what he terms the ‘pseudo-democratization’ of the voice of the tabloid press. This exploitation of colloquial and
vernacular language in the popular press and its dialogic nature serves to construct what Conboy refers to as a ‘community of readership’. While the voice of this type of press is designed to mirror what is seen as the voice of popular opinion in its informality, irreverence and flippancy, Conboy argues that it also serves the interests of more powerful groups who may have a self-serving interest in what is seen as the agenda of more marginalized groups. It is particularly powerful in that it claims to be authentic – the voice of the people. This resonates with Fairclough’s (1989) notion of the ‘synthetic personalization’ of public discourse, which refers to the simulation of private face to face discourse in public mass audience discourse, that is, print, radio and television. With regard to radio advertising in Ireland, this suggests that the advertisers must consider the variety which best achieves this ‘synthetic personalization’ and in furthering the overall agenda of the ad (see also O’Keeffe (2006, pp.97-124) for a discussion on markers of ‘pseudo-intimacy’ in media discourse).

The relationship between language and symbolic power is highlighted by the claim that the properties of particular markets in which linguistic utterances take place afford such expressions a ‘value’ which is determined by the particular linguistic market (Bourdieu 1991). The knowledge of and ability to produce expressions which are assigned a high value on a particular market is seen as part of the ‘practical competence’ of speakers. This ability, termed ‘linguistic capital’ is not evenly distributed throughout society and is related to the distribution of economic, cultural and other types of capital (Bourdieu 1991, p.18) which indicate the position of individuals within society.

Spitulnik (1998) examines the role of powerful institutions in the production and reproduction of language ideologies through her case study on broadcasting in Zambia. She refers to the ‘balancing act’ of mediating unity and diversity through the allocation
of airtime to different languages She takes up Bourdieu’s (1991) concept of linguistic ‘value’ and introduces the concepts of language valuation and evaluation which she sees as ‘processes through which different social values and referents come to be associated with languages, forms of speaking, and styles of speaking (Spitulnik, 1998, p.164). The concept of language valuation and evaluation allows for a broader conception of the interpretive and value-laden nature of human reality and how it is socially constructed. In her case study, Spitulnik argues that language ideologies are both produced and reproduced through different processes of language valuation and evaluation; she demonstrates how divisions of airtime mark social divisions and how differences in program content construct and index relational values between languages and speakers. Spitulnik concludes that different institutions by their nature have different capabilities in producing language ideologies; with regard to broadcasting, the structure of the medium and of the institution, (allocation of resources such as airtime, wavelength and program types), are crucial to the construction of language value. She points out that radio, as well as having a role in the establishment of language ideologies, is also a result of such ideologies. Echoing the claims of Woolard and Schieffelin (1994) and Cameron (2003), referred to above in section 2.3.1, she argues that these ideologies, far from being hegemonic, are contested and manipulated and lack consensus. Despite this, however, radio remains a significant influence in reproducing social inequalities.

In the introduction to this discussion, we have referred to a role for particular ideologies of language in variety choice in radio advertising in Ireland in section. In the following sections, we will discuss nationalist and standard ideologies of language, both on a general basis and in the Irish context. The notion of a ‘standard’ Irish English is examined and in this context, the Irish English accent categories of ‘non-local’ as opposed to ‘local’ Irish English are proposed in relation to ‘standard’ or prestige
varieties and local varieties respectively. Particular accent sub-varieties of Irish English which are included in these categories are identified and examined. Recent ideological shifts, encompassing the concept of the democratization and conversationalization of discourse (Fairclough 1992; 1994) and the ‘crisis’ in relation to the construction of authenticity leading to a rethinking of this concept (Coupland 2003), are then discussed in relation to media contexts. The ideological construction of authenticity is finally discussed in relation to the ‘non-local’ Irish English accent sub-variety of advanced Dublin English which is now considered to be the mainstream Irish English pronunciation form (Hickey 2013).

2.3.3 Nationalist language ideology

With regard to the relationship between Irish English and nationalist language ideology, Lee’s comments on non-standard varieties are interesting. He claims that ‘The use of non-standard forms is in itself an ideological statement, a crucial marker of local affiliation and local identity.’ (Lee 1992, p.182). However, Hickey (2005, p.4) suggests that ‘the clear division between Irish and English in Ireland has meant that no attempt was ever made to regard Irish English as an embodiment of Irishness’. Hickey refers to the ‘complex, ambivalent attitude of Irish people to their former native language Irish and the attendant unwillingness to explicitly acknowledge English as the native language of virtually the entire Irish-born population’ (Hickey 2011, p.14). This view suggests the notion of national language as important to Irish identity.

More generally, with regard to the relationship between national identity and a distinct national language, Blommaert and Verschueren (1998, p.92) suggest that, given the dominance of the nationalist ideology of language throughout the world today, lack of a distinct language undermines claims to national identity. Joseph (2004, p.98), for
example, points to the lack of a national language as being one of the first and highest obstacles to be overcome in establishing national identity. In the Irish context, Pádraig Pearse, the Irish nationalist and political activist who was executed following the 1916 rebellion against British rule, spoke of the importance of retaining the Irish language with his claim, ‘Tír gan teanga, tir gan anam’ (*A country without a language is a country without a soul*). However, this dependency of national identity on language is generally viewed as having been constructed historically and ideologically rather than as a natural fact (Woolard998, p.16). Before considering the Irish situation specifically, we will look at the historical context for this ideology.

Definitions of schools of nationalist theory (A.D. Smith 1995) differ in regard to how they view the role of language in nation building (Wright 2000, pp.11,14). Ethno-linguistic nationalism sees the nation as preordained and as part of the ‘natural order’, making language ‘a mythical and mystical unifier’; it espouses the idea of national consciousness as necessarily linked to language (as per the Sapir Whorf hypothesis), that is the notion that how a group views the world is determined by the language it uses and only those who share this ‘linguistic world view’ can be part of the nation. Philosophies of universalism and republicanism, connected with the Enlightenment and the French and American Revolutions, posed a challenge to ethno-linguistic nationalism, as they showed how nations can be built, even with linguistically diverse populations (Wright 2000, p.17).

The second category, according to Smith, are the perennialists, those who advocate the theory that, notwithstanding its primordial nature, one may choose one’s own nation and build on traditions, changing them where necessary. In other words, the nation is not predestined and the linguistic world view is something which can be acquired.
A third category, modernism, rejects the role of tradition in the building of nations and sees nation building and linguistic unification as a necessary outcome of development and progress, linked to industrialisation, urbanisation, democracy and education. Modernist theory sees global social development and in particular the movement from agrarian to industrial society and from absolutism to democracy as the catalyst for the establishment of the nation state. The provision by state education systems for the teaching of standardised language gave rise to literacy in the official state language and therefore what Wright refers to as a ‘community of communication’. In this community, a reduction of differences between dialect groups became apparent as the standard language took hold. As communication in the standard state language was essential for employment, people were motivated to live and work within their own ‘community of communication’ (Wright 2000, p. 18-23).

The final theoretical category is that of post-modernism which views nationalism as being culturally constructed in order to foster an imagined identity. Postmodernist thinking does not focus on language difference, but views language as both the ‘tool and the product of the creative process which constructs the nation’. Late and post modernist nationalism espouses the concept of the nation as ‘a community imagined by its constituent members’ (Wright 2000, p.23) and ‘is constructed and accessed through the cultural artefacts, the symbols and the representations it produces’. Through the cultural representations of texts through the media of film, novel, theatre, print media television and radio (Wright 2000, p.24), the community is created and is thus a process which is necessarily linked with the language of these texts. Wright observes how the Reformation, the Enlightenment and the French Revolution gave rise to new communities based on geographical areas with a particular standardised language. Printing in vernacular languages promoted their standardisation and the growth of
literacy, with printers opting for the most commonly intelligible forms in an effort to tackle the problem of dialect variation (Davis 2010, pp. 26-27). Print capitalism needed a significant language community in order to survive and its production of political treatises, novels, newspapers and so on helped promote national group identity and allowed for socialisation and solidarity among members of the same community of communication. This means that for those outside the community of communication, the print media allows for the comprehension of the society to which they are external. When groups of different cultures come into contact, they can choose to what extent they wish to appropriate aspects of each other’s culture. Rejecting ‘foreign’ influence and promoting traditional customs reinforces group distinction and solidarity. Groups vary in the degree to which they are open to influence, and cultural practices which are not based on language are more likely to be adopted by outgroups (Wright 2000, pp. 23-5).

In considering nationalism and the role of language, the concepts of *Kulturnation* and *Staatsnation* are also useful in the context of this discussion. The notion of *Kulturnation*, which derived from the ideas, nature and function of culture which developed around 1800, was defined in 1907 by Meinecke as a unified human community based on shared culture rather than political statehood. According to Goethezeit thinkers, since culture and cultural education and understanding are a precondition for political progress and thus must precede politics, *Kulturnation* would have been the original idea and ideal concept of a human community, as culture supersedes the political conception of the nation state (Oergel 2006, p.288) Thus it reflects the original nature as well as the goal or ideal destination of humanity; language, religion, traditions or customs are constructed as the essential ‘stuff” of the nation.
The concept of Kulturnation has been criticized, however, in that identifying a nation by its language is dependent on the false premise that language is an independent variable and also the claim that a population’s linguistic unity can sometimes be simply the result of random intervention (Gellner 1994). In addition, state borders and linguistic borders do not always coincide. Furthermore, communities exist which are not yet nations, despite the fact that all the so called ‘objective criteria’ of language, culture and territory apply to them. Conversely, nations exist to which all these criteria do not apply. According to the concept of Staatsnation, on the other hand, national identification is based on the idea of a constitutional patriotism rather than on the basis of culture and ethnicity. The unity of the nation is based on a common state and in the rights and obligations of the citizens of that state (Wodak, de Cillia, Liebhart and Reisigl 1999, p.19). Similarly, Wright (2000, p.18) refers to civic nationalism which sees citizenship as a right for all, whether born within the boundaries of the state or through naturalisation. In contrast to theories such as ethno-linguistic nationalism, these theories foster inclusiveness in their notion of the concept of nation.

However, in contrast to this inclusiveness, Irvine and Gal (2009, p.404) refer to processes of identity formation which depend on defining the self in relation to an imagined ‘Other’, a concept familiar in the field of anthropology by which the ‘Other’ is essentialised and homogenised. The process of essentialising involves images relating to the simplification of linguistic behaviour which is seen as originating from the essence of the person as opposed to historical factors. These representations not only have the capacity to interpret linguistic difference but also to influence or even create linguistic difference where the display of sociological contrast in essential attributes is required. Horner (2007 p.135) points out that speakers of dialects and linguistic minorities may be ‘othered’ through the promotion of nationalist language ideologies and the notion of one
nation, one language. However, while the concept of ‘othering’ is often applied in relation to speakers of non-standard varieties, it is conceivable that speakers of standard languages may also be subjected to ‘othering’ in contexts where vernaculars are valued as indexing national identity.

2.3.4 Nationalist language ideology and the Irish context

Turning now, more specifically, to the Irish context, questions of the link between patriotism and possession and knowledge of a national language have been prominent in cultural and political debates in Ireland for over a century. Issues of language, spawned from a nineteenth century model of nationalism, were central in Ireland during the Irish Literary Revival, a movement associated with a revival of Ireland’s literature, language and culture which was to the fore in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (see section 2.2.1, above). These language issues, indeed, have remained prominent throughout the twentieth and into the twenty-first century. Eighteenth century models of nationalism, which were inspired by Enlightenment discourses, had been less rigid with respect to the necessity for possession of a national language for nationhood. However, the nineteenth century saw a change in the paradigm and the pervasiveness of what has been referred to above as ethnolinguistic nationalism, with far more emphasis on the linking of nationhood with a national language (Tymoczko and Ireland 2003a, pp.4-5).

According to Wright (2000, p.16), this ‘mystic’ association of language and people blended well with Romanticism and the mood of this era. In some cases, Wright argues, the notion of nation as defined by language, culture, history and religion appealed to the ‘proto-elites’ as a means to independence from the empire, political freedom and economic improvement. This ethno-linguistic nationalism worked well and was easy to promote with the people on an emotional level. The promotion of national language was linked to the promotion of nationalist imagery.
In the Irish context, the ‘mystic’ or spiritual association of language and people was epitomized in Pearse’s claim that a country without a language is a country without a soul, as referred to in section 2.3.3 above. This coincided, ironically, with a dramatic shift to the use of the English language in Ireland resulting from several factors: the political union of Ireland and England in 1801, the imposition of the English language as the medium of instruction in national schools and the efforts of Catholics for emancipation under the patriot, Daniel O’Connell, who, although a fluent Irish speaker himself, encouraged the abandonment of Irish as English was perceived as necessary for social advancement (Tymoczko and Ireland 2003a, p.5). Additionally, the Great Famine of the 1840s resulted in the decimation of rural districts due to the death and emigration of over two million people, the majority of whom were rural Irish speakers (Thomason and Kaufman 1988).

In looking at language in nation state formation, Wright (2000, p.33) refers to the process of ‘assimilation’, by which the majority group assimilates the minority group through attempting to achieve linguistic, religious and cultural homogeneity; indeed this could be applied to the Irish context, described above. This notion implies that there is little choice for the assimilated group with regard to language and culture. However, we have seen in the previous section how modernist theories see linguistic unification as resulting from a need for development and progress. The promotion of the English language for social advancement by the nationalist leader, Daniel O’Connell, as referred to above, lends support to this theory. However, with regard to the language shift in Ireland, the historian, Joe Lee takes the view that

The very assumption that not only acquiring the language of the conqueror but abandoning one’s own was a prerequisite for material development was itself a culturally conditioned one, based on an inferiority complex...The shift from Irish to English was no purely
neutral enterprise, with the cost-benefit ratio calmly and clinically calculated\textsuperscript{12}. It included a large element of psychological warfare. The conscious and explicit denigration of one language as inferior, and the conscious and explicit exaltation of another language as superior, were central to the psychology of the language shift...In however complex and convoluted a way, it is quite possible that the manner in which the [Irish] language was lost has damaged Irish potential for self-respect, with all the psychological consequences for behaviour patterns that flow from that, even in the purely material sphere.

\cite{Lee 1989, pp. 669-70, 673-74}

Lee’s viewpoint accentuates the notion, promoted by nationalist ideologies, of the loss of a distinct language as having a negative effect on the national psyche. However, Blommaert and Verschueren (1998 p.208) contend that social mobility can play a significant role in language choice, and note a discrepancy between this fact and popular nationalist ideologies which establish language as a fundamental aspect of ethnicity or group identity. In emphasising the importance of language in nationalism, Wright (2000 pp. 76-77) points out that its importance stems not only from its role as a symbol of group identity, but as a way of establishing a community of communication, as referred to in section 2.3.3 above. She uses the example of the Irish language in Ireland to illustrate how, in its iconic role as a symbol of differentiation, a language need not be mastered by the citizens of the country; however, as a ‘tool of communication’, mastery of the language is critical to participation in the civic life of the particular state. Therefore the building of nation states necessitates that ‘people are not trapped within their language’ \textit{(ibid)}.

In light of modernist thinking, while the Irish language may serve an iconic purpose as a marker of identity, nevertheless, for the vast majority of the Irish population, it fails to operate as a tool of communication and to allow for the community of communication, which Wright (2000 p.77) claims is a crucial element in all nationalist projects. Irish

\textsuperscript{12}cf. Concept of linguistic value (Bourdieu 1991) and concept of language valuation and evaluation (Spitulnik 1998)
English, on the other hand, serves as a practical instrument of communication, not only for the island of Ireland but also, given the role the role of English in globalisation (Wright 2000, p. 102), in a European and global environment. Indeed, with reference to the international context, Piller (2001, p. 156) points out that the linguistic identities of global consumers have become ‘English-dominant’. Therefore, Irish English fulfils one crucial criterion as a ‘national language’. However, the extent to which this variety can replace the Irish language as a marker of group identity and as a ‘carrier of the authenticity of the group’ (Wright 2000, p. 77) will now be explored.

In relation to the language shift from Irish to English, Tymoczko and Ireland, rather than focusing on the notion of a national inferiority complex, put forward a more optimistic analysis. They point out that the Irish Literary Revival movement promoted creativity and encouraged production of works based on Irish culture, as distinct from English culture, partly due to the political need for an individual Irish identity. They claim that the practice of cultural translation, that is, ‘the movement into English-language culture of many aspects of Irish-language literature, culture and history, and the integration of the island’s multilingual heritage into a joint cultural field’ was central to this revival in the early twentieth century (2003a, p.6). This is illustrated in the valorisation of Hiberno-English by playwright J.M. Synge and the attempt to bring to life again the rhythm, music and richness of the Irish language. It resulted in what Kinsella (1995) termed a ‘dual tradition’, that is, a bicultural literary tradition composed of elements from both the Irish and English language.

This bicultural tradition could be seen as fostering the ‘imagined’ community, referred to in relation to postmodernism. Synge’s work allows for ‘the language of the coloniser to be colonised in its turn by the language of the colonised’ (Cronin 2011, p.55).
According to postcolonial theorists, the postcolonial condition brings with it, ‘power to appropriate the colonizer’s culture and invest elements of it with new meanings as well as power to subvert colonial cultural authority and cultural forms’ (Tymoczko and Ireland 2003a, p.8). As we have seen, post-modernist theory proposes that when there is contact between groups of different cultures, they have the option to choose the extent to which they will appropriate aspects of each other’s culture, and indeed group individuality and solidarity can be enhanced through a rejection of ‘foreign’ influence and through fostering traditions which are not necessarily based on language.

The below extract from an Irish newspaper article captures the essence of this idea.

We don’t want an imposed language at the price of being stopped in O’Connell Street by jackbooted gaelgoiri\(^{13}\) and asked to spout Irish at the point of a gun\(^ {14}\). We know, deep down, that the real language of this country is the talk of the street. English as she is spoken with an Irish inflection. Which is to say one of the richest languages in the world, in its capacity to express colourfully, the myriad sensations of the human spirit.

(O’Connor, 1985)

This notion is not unique to the Irish context and indeed, is echoed by the African writer Chinua Achebe, who, in relation to writing in the English language, stated: ‘I feel the English language will be able to carry the weight of my Africa experience,’ He pointed out, however, that it would by necessity be a different English ‘still in full communion with its ancestral home, but altered to suit its new African surroundings’ (Achebe 1975/1993, p.434).

This notion could also be interpreted in terms of A.D. Smith’s perennialist category of

\(^{13}\)People who speak and advocate the Irish language

\(^{14}\) The term ‘jackbooted gaelgoiri’ could be interpreted as referring to those who advocate extreme forms of nationalism in the Irish context. Also, the fact that Irish is a compulsory subject of study in all schools within the Republic which receive public money is a subject of controversy in Ireland
nationalist theory as discussed in the previous section, that is, that nation can be chosen by a people and traditions built on and changed as appropriate. Drawing on Homi Bhabha’s (1985) notion of the power of cultural hybridity, Tymockzo and Ireland suggest that the language movement in Ireland and the practice of cultural translation which allowed for the integration of Irish language and English language culture, enabled Irish literature and culture to resist marginalisation within English-language culture. They put forward a constructivist approach to language and representation, claiming that the language movement allowed for new representations of Irishness as ‘noble and heroic’ as opposed to the negative stereotyped models which persisted through the nineteenth century. In doing this, the movement gave rise to new identities for both the Irish and the English (2003a, pp.9-10). This resonates with Woolard and Schieffelin’s claim (1994, p.58) that cultural conceptions are ‘contestable’, as discussed in section 2.3.1. The notion that representations (of language) allow for challenges to established understandings and the formation of alternatives, as proposed by Cameron (2003), is also applicable here in relation to these representations of Irishness.

What has been referred to as a ‘cultural confidence’ observed at the end of the twentieth century in Ireland is attributed in part to the language revival (Tymoczko and Ireland 2003a, p.14). This movement re-examined the issues of language and power and used language difference (followed by aspects expressed in other cultural terms such as music, politics, business, etc.) to differentiate Irish culture from that of the cultures of other English speaking countries. As already discussed, the concept of the nation as ‘a community imagined by its constituent members’ is integral to late and post modernist nationalism (Wright 2000, p.23). The community is created through the cultural representations of film, novel, theatre, print media, television and radio and so is by necessity linked with the language of these texts. This notion of the imagined
community could be said to apply to the Irish context in terms of such cultural representations in the media, as described. We could argue, therefore, that these cultural representations are linked by Irish English, and that it effectively replaces the Irish language for this purpose. This is corroborated by Amador-Moreno (2010. pp.104-5) who cites contemporary Irish writers such as Joseph O’Connor and Roddy Doyle, who exploit the distinguishing features of Irish English in their writing. Tymoczko and Ireland argue that in opting for bilingualism and biculturalism, the Irish in the Republic have brought about a new type of nationalism ‘in which nations can be imagined without linguistic uniformity’ as per Anderson (1991, pp.13-19). This, they point out, is facilitated by modern media use which can ‘conjure up the imagined community simultaneously across different languages’ (Tymoczko and Ireland 2003a, p.15).

White (2006, p.221) supports this notion and puts forward the argument that it is standard Irish English rather than ‘standard British English, general American English or even English as an International Language’ which is the main vehicle for communicating Irish identity globally. She sees the reason for this as relating firstly to Ireland’s colonial history and secondly to the effects of globalisation. White uses Kachru’s (1985) model of the historical spread of English which describes the spread of English in terms of the concentric circles of ‘Inner’, ‘Outer’ and ‘Expanding’ circles, relating broadly to L1, L2 and EFL speakers respectively; White (ibid) points out that Kachru places Irish English in the ‘Inner Circle’ which includes countries to which English spread between the twelfth and eighteenth centuries and which use standard British or general American as their standard. White, however, argues that Irish English should, in fact, be placed in the ‘Outer Circle’ which encompasses those countries which were colonised by England and which had an existing language prior to colonisation. These countries are now establishing their own standard varieties which
‘do not carry the colonial taint of standard British English’ (White 2006, p.222). With regard to the second reason, the effects of globalisation, White highlights the necessity of a local identity in the face of globalisation. As she puts it:

One way in which we manage to reconcile our citizenship of the global village and these more local allegiances is through our use of language, and in the case of Ireland, a standard variety of Irish English fits the bill, rather than standard British English with its colonial overtones, or Irish, which may express some aspects of Irish identity, but does not, unlike standard Irish English, easily permit users to link their local identity with a global one.

(White 2006 p.223)

Furthermore, she refers to the results of a questionnaire in which only 14.5 percent of Irish respondents felt that the ability to speak Irish was very important in order to be considered ‘truly Irish’ (Davis 2003, cited in White 2006, p. 221). This effectively supports the notion of Irish English as serving the purpose of a national language, first of all, as we have argued, in Wright’s terms, as a practical instrument of communication in a European and international environment, and secondly as a marker of culture and identity. Despite Hickey’s contention that it was not seen as the embodiment of Irishness, it could be argued that in the absence of more widespread use of the Irish language, Irish English is now serving as a distinguishing marker of Irish identity.

Therefore, as in the case of film, drama, literature and so on, as referred to above, the exploitation of the distinctive features of Irish English are available to advertisers in the Irish context. The exploitation of such a strategy can be said to be informed by the ‘new’ type of nationalism, existing independently of linguistic uniformity, as discussed.

However, while the use of Irish English may serve the function of marking group identity and in maintaining a community of communication, nevertheless we need to question how Irish English, in the sense of being a ‘real’ language, can be undermined by standard language ideology and how such ideology can affect its perception as a
stigmatised ‘non-standard’ variety. While White (2006, p.223, cited above) suggests that Irish English rather than standard British English is more effective in reconciling local and global identities in the Irish context, nevertheless she refers to a ‘standard variety’ of Irish English as being most appropriate. In looking at the operation of standard language ideologies in relation to Irish English, we need to examine firstly how such ideologies may have affected how Irish English as against standard British English was seen and represented in the earlier decades in which the sub-corpora are situated and how such ideologies function in an increasingly cosmopolitan environment in Ireland and impact on the emergence of new varieties of Irish English and the exploitation of variety in the context of radio advertising. This discussion is useful in shedding light on motivations for the employment of not only SSBE but also on prestige or ‘standard’ Irish English in this context. The following section will look generally at the notion of standard language ideology and at how such ideology can operate in relation to the use of these varieties and sub-varieties.

### 2.3.5 Standard language ideology

In relation to standard ideologies of language, the prescriptive approach views one variety of language as being intrinsically more valuable than another. Advocates of this approach claim that the favoured variety, which is usually a version of the standard written language, ought to be used by all members of the speech community. As exemplified in the approach to the writing of grammars and dictionaries in the eighteenth century, the main European languages were studied prescriptively. Rules were imposed and particular usages prescribed in an attempt to preserve linguistic ‘standards’ (Crystal 1997). In 1712, Jonathan Swift proposed the idea of an academy to ‘fix’ the English language and protect it from change but although well received initially, the idea did not take hold (*ibid*).
The concept of standardisation is linked, not only to the written word, but specifically to the European context (Woolard and Schieffelin 1994, p.64). In line with Bourdieu’s (1991, pp. 46-9) notion of standard language as a ‘normalized’ product, Milroy (2001, p.530) speaks of ‘standard language cultures’, for example, English, Spanish and French where languages are believed by their speakers to have standardised forms. Horner (2007, p.134) sees standard language ideologies as originating in European nationalism and the ideology of ‘one nation, one language’. In this way, such ideologies effectively preclude the notion of standard world varieties of English including the notion of a ‘standard’ variety of Irish English.

The main characteristic of a standard ideology is seen in terms of the notion that there exists only one correct spoken form of the language which is modelled on one correct written form (Milroy 2001). Variation from this form would be regarded as an undesirable deviation. Woolard and Schieffelin (1994, p.64) discuss how ideological analysis examines the rationalisation of principles of linguistic correctness and incorrectness and how these principles are related to principles of the intrinsic representational power, beauty, and expressiveness of language as a valued mode of action. The rejection on moral grounds of non-standard forms is based on ideological associations of the standard with qualities, such as clarity or truthfulness, which are seen as having value within the culture. Purist doctrines of linguistic correctness exclude non-native sources of linguistic innovation, but usually on a selective basis, focusing on languages seen as threats.

Standard language ideology also pronounces some usages as wrong on the basis of common sense. In other words, it is part of the culture of the speaker to know it is wrong. These common sense attitudes are ideologically loaded despite the fact that
those holding them do not see them in this way but rather as linguistic judgments on ‘incorrect’ language use which are sanctioned by authorities on language (Milroy 2001, pp.535-536). Therefore, the use of non-standard Irish English grammatical features may be viewed as ‘wrong’ based on these ‘common sense’ attitudes.

Milroy (2001, p.547) refers to the ‘legitimacy’ of standard forms of language, thus rendering other forms as illegitimate in the popular mind and points out that a key factor in assigning ‘legitimacy’ to a dialect is its historicisation, that is, whether a history can be established for the particular dialect. In the Irish context, the fact that substantial work has been carried out in documenting the history of Irish English raises the question as to whether it contributes to its ‘legitimacy’.

The importance of the notion of what is or is not a ‘real’ language in decisions about the civility and even humanity of a people has been highlighted (Woolard 1998, p.17). Such elements as written form, lexical elaboration, word formation rules and, in line with Milroy (2001), historical roots may be used in defining a ‘real’ language. Standards of literate forms and the existence of a grammar are also important in such diagnoses (Woolard and Schieffelin 1994, p.63). In the Irish context, despite Filppula’s (1999) extensive and comprehensive treatment of Irish English grammar, Filppula himself (2012, p. 86) contends that ‘it would be far-fetched to speak of a separate Irish English grammar’.

In analysing ‘true’ national language and standard forms we need to examine which linguistic features and semiotic processes are used for interpretation. Woolard (1998, p.13) suggests the use of Errington’s (1985, pp.294-295) concept of ‘pragmatic salience’, that is ‘native speakers’ awareness of the social significance of different levelled linguistic alternants’. in this analysis. More ‘pragmatically salient’ classes of
variables tend to be rationalised and used strategically by speakers as they are interpreted as being significant in mediating social relations. Woolard (1998, p.19) cites the example of a speaker of Received Pronunciation being categorised, not only as socially privileged, but also as someone of superior intellectual and personal worth.

The notion of ‘language subordination’ is proposed by Lippi-Green (1997) in her discussion of standard language ideology. She sees standard language ideology as

> a bias toward an abstracted, idealized, homogenous spoken language which is imposed and maintained by dominant bloc institutions and which names as its model the written language, but which is drawn primarily from the spoken language of the upper middle class

(Lippi–Green 1997, p.64)

‘Language subordination’ is described as the process by which powerful institutions advocate the notion of a homogeneous, standard language. In the North American context, such a variety is, for the most part, that associated with ‘white, upper middle class, and Midwestern speakers’ Resonating with Woolard’s (1998, p.17) theories, discussed above, on the importance of the notion of what is or is not a ‘real’ language in questions about the civility and humanity of a people, Lippi-Green poses the question as to how these dominant groups manage to persuade certain groups that ‘they do not fully or adequately possess an appropriate human language’ (Lippi-Green 1997, p. 65). In line with Milroy (2001, pp. 535-536) as cited above, she observes that standard language ideology provides ‘a web of common sense arguments in which the speaker of non-mainstream language can get tangled at every turn’. Speakers of stigmatised non-standard varieties who consent to the standard ideology, in effect, participate in the promotion of such an ideology which works against their interests and identities.

The model for language subordination is based on an analysis of actions and reactions of dominant bloc institutions when faced with a perceived threat to the authority of the
homogenous language of the nation-state. The institutions which are implicit in the ‘web of standardization’ include the educational system, entertainment industry, corporate sector, judicial system and the broadcast and print media. According to the language subordination model, individuals and institutions who claim to have superior language ‘mystify’ the language in the sense of claiming that it is too complex to understand without expert direction; they claim authority with respect to language and generate misinformation with regard to ‘inaccurate’ usage; they trivialise non-mainstream languages as ‘cute’, ‘homey’ and ‘funny’; those who conform to the ‘superior’ model are depicted as positive examples of what can be achieved through conformance to the model; promises and threats are made on the basis of conformance or non-conformance respectively and non-conformers are denigrated or marginalised (Lippi-Green 1997, p.68).

As language is the primary tool of the information industry, the process of language standardisation is supported both implicitly and explicitly by the industry for practical reasons. In line with Woolard and Schieffelin (1994, p.64), as discussed above, Lippi-Green concludes that the process of language subordination is not directed at all language varieties but is a selective one. However, while Woolard and Schieffelin see pejorative attitudes to non-standard varieties as targeting those varieties seen as threats to the standard, Lippi-Green claims that the language subordination process is directed at varieties representing differences in race, ethnicity or homeland or other social factors which have been found to be inferior in some way (Lippi-Green 1997, p.151). Hill (1995, p.198) refers to what she terms ‘Junk Spanish’ as the way in which Anglos in the US represent the identity of Mexican-Americans through a light and jocular style of talk, through the incorporation of Spanish loan words into English. This facilitates the reproduction of racism in the public sphere even where it is excluded in theory as these...
types of discourse are situated on the ‘leaky boundary’ between public and private talk.

Extending her discussion of standard ideology to focus on accent, Lippi-Green discusses the power of what she terms the ‘myth’ of non-accent, a concept which is very relevant to the Irish media context and the notion of what Kelly-Holmes (2005a, p.120) refers to as the ‘neutral’ Irish media voice, which is discussed below (section 2.3.7) in relation to sub-varieties of Irish English. Lippi-Green argues that myths are powerful in motivating otherwise illogical or unreasonable social behaviours and actions. She cites Milroy and Milroy (1991, pp 22-23) who see standard language as ‘an idea in the mind rather than a reality - a set of abstract norms to which actual usage may conform to a greater or lesser extent’. Lippi-Green develops this idea to suggest that non-accent, rather than being a particular variety of (US) English, is ‘a collectively held ideal, which brings with it a series of social and regional associations’ (Lippi-Green 1997, p.41).

Accent has been defined as ‘loose bundles of prosodic and segmental features distributed over geographic and/or social space’ (Lippi-Green 1997, p.42). Distinguishing between first language (L1) and second language (L2) accents, Lippi-Green equates L1 accent to the native variety spoken; every native speaker of a particular language has an L1 accent with the phonology of their region or one which is representative of a blending of one or more areas, regardless of how unmarked it seems to be. An L2 accent refers to the breakthrough of native language phonology into the target language and the phonologies of these languages influence the speakers’ pronunciation of the target language.

Given that accent equates to variable language and that language must be variable and must change, Lippi-Green consolidates the notion of a homogenous, standardized uniform language as an ideal and abstraction as proposed by Milroy and Milroy (1991)
rather than a reality. This abstraction, she claims, however, is a useful one, carefully
constructed in order to control and limit spoken language variation by certain
individuals and institutions empowered to do so. She cites Matsuda’s reference to the
hidden norms of legal institutions where, in relationships of domination and
subordination, the dominant is taken as the norm. With regard to accent, the powerful
speak ‘normal, unaccented English’ and any deviation from this constructed norm is
called an accent (Matsuda 1991, p.1361).

In looking at the notion of standardisation, Spolsky’s (1998, p.24) definition of a
‘speech community’ as understood in the field of sociolinguistics is useful; he sees it as
‘a complex interlocking network of communication whose members share knowledge
about and attitudes towards the language use patterns of others as well as themselves’
(Spolsky 1998, p.25). The speech community, in this sense, is defined by its sharing
both a ‘repertoire’ of languages or varieties and the norms for the use of these varieties.
Regardless of whether the members of a particular speech community know or use a
variety, they will be able to recognise the conditions believed by other members of the
community to be appropriate for their use. Strongly vernacular forms, for example, may
be deemed inappropriate by speech community members for use in more formal
contexts. This concurs with Milroy’s (2001) notion, cited above, of ‘common sense’
attitudes towards language use. It also resonates with Bourdieu’s (1991) notion of
‘habitus’ discussed above, which equips individuals with a sense of what is and is not
appropriate in given situations.

It has been argued that metalinguistic discourses which are ‘pro-English’ construct
languages other than English as effectively subordinate. Bleichenbacher refers to Lippi-
Green’s (1997, p.67) language subordination model in relation to these discourses and
observes how they strengthen the position of English on the linguistic market (Bourdieu 1991) to the detriment of other languages and varieties. Bleichenbacher points out that Bourdieu’s concept of ‘the institutional circle of collective misrecognition’ (Bourdieu 1991, p.153), suggests that speakers of other languages accept and support this discrimination to some extent (Bleichenbacher 2008, p.18). Indeed, this is corroborated by Lippi-Green’s (1997, p. 66) observation of how those speakers of devalued varieties who comply with the standard language ideology are instrumental in its promotion. In the Irish context, this has resonance with Lee’s assessment of the shift from Irish to English in the nineteenth century, referred to in the previous section, in which he sees the abandoning of the Irish language in favour of English as being based on a national inferiority complex (Lee 1990, pp 669-670). In this way, the acquisition of the English language by the Irish could be seen as evidence of their participation in ‘the institutional circle of collective misrecognition’. Furthermore, the employment of standard British English as opposed to Irish English forms could also be interpreted in this way.

In terms of the above discussion, the notion of a ‘standard’ Irish English may appear as a contradiction in terms. The pervasiveness of standard language ideologies such as the idea of ‘linguistic correctness’ (Woolard and Schieffelin 1994) and of the existence of only one ‘correct’ spoken form (Milroy 2001) together with the requirement of a distinct grammar (Woolard and Schieffelin 1994) would appear to preclude a ‘standard’ variety of Irish English. However, as Woolard and Schieffelin (1994, p.64) point out, the concept of standardisation has developed so that it is now seen as an ideological process rather than as linguistic fact. The early twentieth century saw the emergence of professional linguistics and of critical studies of Western philosophy of language, the rejection of prescriptivism and the emergence of positivist linguistic methodologies. The next section will look at standard ideologies of language as they apply in the Irish
context and at how such developments may impact on the feasibility of a ‘standard’ Irish English.

2.3.6 Standard language ideologies and the Irish context

With regard to the Irish context, the notion of a standard of English usage only became apparent in the sixteenth century. In commenting on the English of the sixteenth and seventeenth century planters, Filppula cites Hogan’s (1927/1970, p.53) view that despite their mixed origin and in contrast to prevailing schools of thought, ‘on the whole their speech approximated to contemporary Standard English’. He also refers to Thomas Dineely who claims in his book *Tour in Ireland* (1681) that speakers of English in Ireland spoke English ‘generally better and more London-like than in most places of England’ (Filppula 1999, p.19).

The setting up of National Schools in 1831 is generally viewed as instrumental in establishing standard English as the ‘target variety’ for Irish learners of English. However, Bliss (1977, p.16) observes that ‘the Irishman learning English had no opportunity of learning it from speakers of standard English’. Throughout these periods, several attempts at prescriptivism are in evidence. In his work *Rhetorical Grammar of the English Language* (1781), Thomas Sheridan, sets out a number of rules for Irish learners to help in achieving correct pronunciation of English words. Hogan (1927/1970, p.59), in commenting on this work, points out that its importance lies in the fact that it is the first grammar to comment explicitly on ‘Anglo-Irish’ dialect (Filppula 1999, p.20).

While the Irish Revival (as referred to in sections 2.2.1 and 2.3.4) at the turn of the twentieth century was based on the nineteenth-century framework of one language, one nation, Tymoczko and Ireland (2003a, p.7) suggest that the ideological importance of
the revival cannot however be fully understood without referring to new discourses and frameworks which allow for new ways of interpreting the language movement and the practice of cultural translation. These discourses, which came to the fore in twentieth century thinking, are based on a rejection of prescriptivism and positivism and an emphasis on the importance of frameworks and perspectives in examining the relationship between language and power. These perspectives show how language is interpreted through ideological frameworks and can in turn be used to shift these ideological structures. This allows for the practice of cultural translation as outlined above and the acceptance of a ‘dual tradition’, in other words a literary tradition composed of elements from both the Irish and English language. Again, this resonates with the claims of Woolard and Schieffelin (1994), Spitulnik (1998) and Cameron (2003), discussed in sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.4, that ideological structures are contestable and can be shifted.

However, notwithstanding this positive representation of cultural translation, Cronin (2011), although he acknowledges the unique use of Irish English associated with such translations, also refers to initial negative views of Irish English. He makes the following observations on how the Irish use of English at the end of the nineteenth century was viewed by native speakers of English.

...differences in language and expression became equated not only with the comic but with the inept. If Irish people after the conquest of the country were to become English speakers, then the same standards would be applied to them as to other English speakers. If they expressed themselves in strange or unusual ways or used different modes of intentionality, then they were classed with children and the insane as quaint but dim.

(Cronin 2011, p.56)

This reflects Lippi-Green’s (1997) claims, as discussed in the previous section, of how the use of a group’s native language by non-native speakers is generally seen as
‘irresistibly funny’ to the native speakers. This description suggests that the view of Irish English at the end of the nineteenth century was very much coloured by standard language ideologies as described above, and indeed a victim of Lippi-Green’s language subordination process. Also, White (2006, p.222) cites Croghan (1986) who observes that from the nineteenth century, the Irish adopted, in addition to the English language itself, ‘the political culture of language from England which included the myth that Hiberno-English was deviant’.

Cronin (ibid) goes on to discuss how the problems faced by Irish people in learning the new language were presented as either ‘sinister or endearing’, depending on how relations between Ireland and Britain stood at a particular time. However, he complies with Tymoczko and Ireland’s (2003b) view that the Irish revival brought about a translation process which, although it had in the past resulted in comic depictions of Irishness in the form of the ‘Stage Irishman,’ was now as Cronin puts it ‘consciously cultivated as a marker of specificity rather than shunned as a brand of inferiority’ and allowed for a new means of cultural expression in Ireland (Cronin 2011, p.55). As discussed, Tymoczko and Ireland (2003a) attribute the ‘cultural confidence’ apparent in Ireland at the end of the twentieth century, in part to this means of cultural expression. Cronin refers to Tymoczko and Ireland’s observation of the coming together of the cultural traditions of the English and the Irish language and how they have become ‘blended and hybridised’ (Tymoczko and Ireland, 2003b, p.20). Cronin comments that this serves to make Ireland ‘part of a global condition’ in which migration is leading to a closer contact between diverse languages and cultures.

In a similar vein, Kirk (2011, p.32) argues that ‘that shared aspect of English which makes global communication possible’ is a suitable interpretation of what can be
referred to as a ‘standard English’ in general terms. This, he claims, allows for the notion of ‘standard’ to be interpreted in two ways; as ‘an idealised set of shared features, and also to different sets of national features, reflecting different demographic and political histories and language influences’.

This allows for varieties of English outside of standard British English to have validity in their own right. As discussed in section 2.3.4, in relation to nationalist ideologies of language, if Ireland is viewed as being situated in Kachru’s (1985) ‘Outer Circle’ (as opposed to the ‘Inner Circle’ in which countries look to one of the traditional standard Englishes for notions of correctness), then standard British English should no longer be regarded as the yardstick for language use in Ireland (White 2006, p.222).

This discussion suggests that while standard language ideologies in relation to the English language in Ireland in the past have led to Irish English being seen as an ‘inferior’ variety, the practice of cultural translation, allowing for Irish and English language culture to be integrated, as discussed above, has helped to counter this over time, giving rise to a certain valorisation of Irish English and the moderation of potential stigma attached to its use. As Lee (1992, p.182) observes, the use of non-standard forms constitutes a ‘refutation of the imperial ideology that non-standard speech is corrupt and impoverished’ (Lee 1992, p.182). Furthermore, new, more flexible and inclusive approaches to what constitutes ‘standard’ (Kirk 2011) underpin this effect.

Notwithstanding these developments with regard to standard language ideology, the appropriacy of vernacular forms of Irish English for use in more formal contexts or as an authoritative voice may still be questionable in terms of the ‘habitus’ (Bourdieu 1991) which directs linguistic practices; in these contexts, more colloquial Irish English may not be immune from the regulation of standard language ideologies. Coupland
(2007, p.90) remarks that the concept of habitus implies the difficulty for speakers of removing themselves from ‘the ideological associations of [their] own ingrained ways of speaking’ as these are derived from the process of being socialised into ways of speaking which are acceptable for their particular social groups. This suggests the notion of a standard Irish English as a useful one in reconciling conflict between nationalist and standard language ideologies. This following section will discuss the concept of standard Irish English and its constitution together with the ideological implications of such a form.

2.3.7 ‘Standard’ or ‘non-local’ Irish English

The conception of standard is often equated with ‘the highest prestige variety’ rather than with the variety with the highest degree of uniformity (Milroy 2001, pp.532-533). Similarly, Jenkins (2003, p.29) observes how ‘Being a prestige variety, a standard language is spoken by a minority of people within a society, typically those occupying positions of power’. Milroy argues that rather than being a property of language itself, prestige in a variety is an acquired characteristic based on the prestige of its speakers. This prestige is indexical (the concept of indexicality is discussed in chapter 3, section 3.3) and is related to the social life of the speakers of the variety. A further criterion in discussions about standardisation is that of formality or carefulness. Milroy suggests that along with prestige, this criterion is also evaluative and has little to do with the standardisation process but is rather a consequence of the standard ideology.

With regard to a standard Irish English and its ideological implications, Hickey (2005, p.3) contends that the Irish are reluctant to accept a particular variety of English as standard on a formal basis, owing to nationalist ideologies and the notion of a language as the property of a nation. White (2006, p.220), however, sees the notion of a standard
Irish English as a more positive phenomenon. She points to the importance of the recognition of a standard variety of Irish English as ‘it has a prestige which regional dialects lack, and is a variety which is used by educated speakers across the Republic.’

In discussing what might constitute a standard variety of Irish English, Filppula (1999, p.20) cites the contention of Quirk et al (1985) that Irish English can be considered as the national standard as it is ‘consciously and explicitly regarded as independent of British English by educational and broadcasting services’. Filppula (1999, p. 21), however, is sceptical as to whether it is in fact ‘consciously and explicitly’ seen as a prestige variety and therefore as a standard, citing authors who deny the existence of an Irish standard of English (Hayden and Hartog 1909; Bliss 1979; Lass 1987) but rather acknowledge a ‘general’ or ‘common’ Irish English vernacular as a ‘reality’ (Hogan 1927, 1970 cited in Filppula 1999) rather than a standard. With regard to the existence of a distinct standard for Irish English, Harris (1991, p.39) sees Irish English as a continuum of varieties, from most to least standard-like.

Kirk and Kallen (2004, p. 88) look at the concepts of ‘standardisation’ and ‘Celticity’, based on a study of the British and Irish elements of the International Corpus of English (ICE) (see section 2.2.3), the texts of which come from speakers and authors of over 18 years from the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland, who have completed secondary education. The term ‘Celticity’, in this context, refers to the features of lexis, grammar and discourse, which appear in the ICE-corpora, and for which there is evidence of influence from the Irish language. Kirk and Kallen point to the ‘dual nature of Irish Standard English’, which shows ‘both the effects of the standardisation process common to all standard Englishes and the effects of Celticisation arising from a variety of circumstances’. They observe that, despite evidence of ‘Celticisation’, the spoken and
written texts of ICE-Ireland are ‘essentially standard’ and show few features of what we associate with traditional dialects. They conclude, however, that despite pressures for standardisation which emanate from factors such as education, written forms or standard language ideologies, ‘standardisation is never quite fully achieved’ and Irish English continues to show elements of variation in standard contexts (2004, p. 109).

In a later paper, Kirk (2011) looks again at the manifestation of standard English in Ireland through ICE-Ireland, pointing out that standard English need not be based on prescriptivism but rather on ‘observation of actual linguistic behaviour’ (2011, p.32). He concludes that:

> in the absence of a specifically codified Irish standard English on either side of the political border, linguistic features associated with traditional dialects and vernacular Irish English are to be found in standard English in Ireland. However, these features are muted relative to the material found in a dialect or sociolinguistic study: muted both quantitatively in low frequencies of occurrence, and qualitatively in the sense that those features which have crossed into the standard language constitute a strong marker of Irishness in a standard English corpus.

(Kirk 2011, p. 35)

White (2006, p. 224) refers to her corpus of young educated standard language users in the Republic, which was compiled under the same conditions and with the same aims as the ICE corpus. She found differences to exist between Irish English and standard British English in the syntax and lexis of both formal spoken situations and informal conversations. While some features associated with dialectal varieties (particularly as found by Filppula (1999) had low occurrence or did not occur at all, nevertheless there were examples of features such as specific uses of the present perfect, reported questions, and use of pragmatic markers, which are associated with Irish English and not with standard British English (White 2006, pp.225-6).

Mac Mathúna, (2004, p.115) in commenting on Kirk and Kallen’s work, questions
whether educated Irish English is a standard or a mainstream variety of English or indeed both, and points to the existence of

a range of Irish English regional and local dialects, some of which are quite traditional, including some urban ones, and others which are less conservative and traditional. The middle-class speakers of each of these various dialects have a kind of standard speech which they can avail of as appropriate and felicitous and it may be postulated that the varieties in question share a sufficient number of distinctive markers to constitute a kind of mainstream variety

(Mac Mathúna 2004, p.116)

Mac Mathúna italicises the words a kind of to highlight the imprecise nature of knowledge in this area but also to draw attention to the relationship between standard and non-standard varieties and the possibility of a continuum rather than the existence of a clear distinction between regional and local dialects of Irish English and middle-class varieties.

Based on Kirk and Kallen’s study, Mac Mathúna (2004, p.126) concludes that the written standard Irish English equates generally with Standard British English. With regard to a spoken standard, he notes the ‘lack of regionalisms’ in the data and argues for the need for a more comprehensive social profile of the respondents in the study. He also highlights that in looking at mainstream or standard variety, there is a need for more emphasis on accent, intonation and phonetics as they combine with other features such as grammar and lexis. Mac Mathúna (2004, p.117) points out that with regard to spoken mainstream Irish English, it has features which distinguish it from the standard RP. He concludes that

It may very well emerge that there are various Standard regional or local dialects, all quite similar in their core elements but differing in accent, intonation and phonetics and with varying percentages of distinctive grammatical features.

(Mac Mathúna 2004, p.126)
In looking at variation and the notion of standard English, Hughes et al make a clear distinction between the terms accent and dialect. The term *dialect*, they define as ‘varieties distinguished from each other by differences of grammar (morphology and syntax) and vocabulary (lexis); *accent*, they point out ‘refers just to variations in pronunciation’ (Hughes et al 2012, pp.3,13). As regards dialect, ‘Standard English’ is the dialect of ‘educated people throughout the British Isles’ (2012, p.13) (which, as understood by Hughes et al (2012, p.1), includes Ireland) but is not confined to a particular social group as is the standard accent, that of Standard Southern British English (SSBE) or RP (as described in chapter 1, section 1.2). Hughes et al point out that ‘most users of Standard English have regional accents’. As discussed, they see Standard English as subsuming Standard English English (England and Wales), Standard Scottish English and Standard Irish English (2012, p.13). They point out that in the latter two varieties, regional features can be found which are considered as ‘standard’ due to their regular occurrence even in formal writing, although variation between these standard dialects is generally quite low.

Hickey (2005, p. 208) points to what he terms non-local Dublin English and what can ‘loosely’\(^{15}\) be referred to as ‘educated’ Dublin English as having functioned as a ‘quasi-standard’ in the south of Ireland since the beginning of the twentieth century. Similarly, Filppula, in more recent discussions on standard Irish English, while reiterating his claims of the non-existence of a ‘commonly accepted, codified or observed national-level Irish English standard’ (2012 p.86), nevertheless points out that the so-called ‘Dublin 4 English’ has been identified as being associated with a ‘standard’ Irish English, Dublin 4 being the area in Dublin city where the national broadcaster RTÉ is...

\(^{15}\)Hickey (2005, p. 208) adds the *caveat* that too much weight should not be attached to the stipulation of formal education for speakers of this variety, the salient point being that it is not the local variety.
based. He claims that ‘Dublin 4 has a mainly professional and middle-class population, whose usage of English is in the Irish context regarded as the most prestigious variety serving as a model for educated Irish English usage in general’ (ibid).

However, while this ‘non-local Dublin English’ can be associated with educated and middle class usage to some extent, Hickey observes that what is more important in determining its use is the rejection of the ‘narrow, restrictive identification with popular Dublin’ (Hickey 2004, p.44). Hickey contrasts ‘non-local’ with ‘local’ Dublin English, associated with speakers who ‘show strongest identification with traditional conservative Dublin life of which the popular accent is very much a part’. Focusing mainly on phonological features, Hickey further subdivides the former group into a larger ‘mainstream’ section and a more specific, smaller group (which he initially terms fashionable or new Dublin English) which actively dissociates itself from the ‘low-prestige’ group (Hickey 2004a, p.44).

Returning to the question as to the constitution of a putative ‘standard’ Irish English, as discussed in the previous section, Kirk (2011, p.32) argues that ‘standard English’ can be seen in terms of a shared dimension which facilitates global communication, thus allowing for ‘standard’ to be interpreted not only as an idealised set of shared features, but also in terms of different sets of national features which show historical and linguistic influences. Given that there appears to be a consensus among researchers, (for example, Kirk and Kallen (2004), White (2006), (Kirk 2011), Hughes et al 2012) that the speech or writing of ‘educated’ speakers they refer to as ‘standard’ can contain, albeit in a muted way, lexical, grammatical, discourse and pragmatic features of Irish English, this equates with the latter interpretation of standard, as encompassing sets of national features at a muted level.
However, such features, while they may form part of the repertoire of the ‘standard’ Irish English speaker, are not easily differentiated from that of the vernacular speaker. Harris (1991) and Mac Mathuna (2004), as we have seen, refer to a continuum rather than a distinct division between standard and non-standard varieties in Irish English. This suggests a rather vague conception of ‘standard’ as applicable to Irish English. On the other hand, the importance of accent (MacMathuna 2004, p.119) has been highlighted. Hickey’s (2004a) observations, based mainly on phonological features, of ‘educated’ Dublin English in terms of ‘rejection and ‘dissociation’ from local forms afford us a stronger delineation of a ‘prestige’ variety. For the purposes of this study, therefore, in the absence of a clear delineation of the features of ‘standard’ Irish English, the term ‘non-local’ Irish English rather than ‘standard’ Irish English is more useful. This term can, however, be understood generally as a prestige or ‘educated’ variety and in terms of Hickey’s (2005, p.208) expression of a ‘quasi-standard’. It is interesting in this regard, to note Foulkes and Docherty’s (1999, p 16) observation that the dichotomy between standard and non-standard is being replaced by that of local as opposed to non-local forms.

This suggests that in the context of this study, in examining how standard language ideology operates at an intra-varietal level, it is more useful to look at phonological features as these are the factors which distinguish sub-varieties of Irish English. In relation to distinguishing between standard British English and Irish English (in its broad sense), however, dialectal features will be examined in addition to accent. However, for the purposes of the study, no distinction will be made at the dialectal level between features which might be included in a ‘standard’ variety of Irish English and those considered as ‘non-standard’. Therefore, the presence of dialectal (in terms of mainly lexical and grammatical but also pragmatic) features as well as phonological
features associated with Irish English, can be viewed as discriminating between these two broad varieties.

Thus, evidence for the effect of standard ideologies of language in radio advertising in Ireland can manifest itself in two forms. Firstly, more traditional standard language ideologies and the notion of one ‘correct’ form are visible in the choice of standard British English as opposed to Irish English in terms of accent as well as dialect. Secondly, the visibility of homogenous varieties as discussed by Lippi-Green (1997) through the rejection of ‘local’ forms of Irish English and the exploitation of ‘non-accented’, ‘non-local’ forms in terms of phonology, can indicate that such standard ideologies are still at play, albeit in a less conventional guise.

The following section will examine more closely these ‘non-local’ forms and identify categories of ‘non-local’ and ‘local’ Irish English which will be used for analysis.

2.3.8 ‘Non-local’ and ‘local’ Irish English

Based on the above discussion, therefore, for the purposes of this study, intra-varietal differentiation of local and non-local categories of Irish English is based on phonology rather than on frequency or type of dialectal features. Dialectal items which are ‘non-standard’ in relation to Standard English (Hughes, et al 2012, p. 13) and which are related to traditional or vernacular Irish English are quantified separately within the study and classed as Irish English dialectal variety.

At the intra-varietal level, therefore, we will look at particular sub-varieties and identify categories for the purposes of the study.

Looking again at so-called ‘mainstream’ Dublin English (Hickey 2004, p.44), as referred to in the previous section, as a quasi national standard, Hickey states that, as in
the case of any urban accent, particular popular features can be found in ‘educated’ non-local forms (Hickey 2005, p.28). He terms the locally influenced variety a ‘moderate Dublin accent’ including features such as fronting of the /au/ diphthong and lengthening of low back vowels (ibid). On a supraregional level, however, he points out, such exposure to popular local metropolitan features is absent.

For the purposes of this study I will use the category of supraregional southern Irish English (used by Hickey (2004, p.92) to describe the older, broad-based non-vernacular pronunciation form in the south of Ireland) in reference to this variety. This variety, which again could be described as ‘educated and urbane’, is derived from middle-class Dublin English of the mid-twentieth century but in it, these more local Dublin features are absent. This pronunciation form may have variable features depending on geographical location but nevertheless ‘a core of common features’ can be identified which are characteristic generally of the longer established middle-class speech of the south (as opposed to the newer ‘fashionable’ pronunciation form which is discussed below). These common features include rhotic pronunciation, dental stops for dental fricatives, fricativisation of /t,d/, Received Pronunciation (RP) diphthongs /eɪ/ /əʊ/ realized as monophthongs [e:] and [o:] respectively, retention of the distinction between /n/ and /w/, and lack of distinction between phonemically long and short low vowels before voiced consonants, for example palm and dance both with [a:] (Hickey 1999, p.267). As we have seen, some of these features are also found in vernacular varieties; more detailed differentiation of Irish English varieties is provided by Hickey (2004a, pp.57-59 and Hickey (2013) based on Wells’ (1982) lexical sets, and is employed in categorising varieties in the study.

As outlined, in addition to this longer established ‘mainstream’ Dublin English, Hickey
also refers in his earlier work to ‘new’ Dublin English, a further subdivision of non-local Dublin English which actively dissociates itself from the ‘low-prestige’ group. Hickey (1999, p.268; 2005, p.46) views Dublin as being a classic setting for language change due to an expansion in its population, brought about by internal growth and immigration as a result of the economic boom which began in the 1980s. He suggests that the associated increase in prosperity and elevated international position gave rise to a desire among young people for an ‘urban sophistication’ (Hickey 2004, p.45), represented in terms of language by a local dissociation, reactive in nature, from the vernacular form of their locality. The resulting form, which Hickey originally termed ‘new’ Dublin English, he now refers to as ‘advanced’ Dublin English. Notable features include those of the ‘Dublin vowel shift’ (Hickey 2004, p.47) involving a retraction of diphthongs with a low or back starting point and a raising of low back vowels. In addition, /r/ retroflexion and /l/ velarisation are associated with this pronunciation. Hickey (2005, p.72) points out that these emergent features of Dublin English had, by the middle of the first decade of the twenty first century, become prevalent throughout southern Ireland. On the basis of more recent research, he confirms earlier speculation that advanced Dublin has now become established as the new mainstream form of Irish English (Hickey 2013). Hickey’s latest research shows that, notwithstanding this, advanced Dublin English continues to develop and describes a number of current innovations in this pronunciation.

The functioning of non-local Dublin English as a quasi Irish standard makes sense of observations by Kelly-Holmes (2005, p.120) of the prevalence in the Irish advertising context of what is regarded as a ‘neutral’ Irish media voice as opposed to accents specific to particular counties. Indeed, Harrison (2002) points out a common criticism that ‘Irish radio advertising is dominated by middle class Dublin accents that are so
bland that they blend into each other after a while’ (cited in Kelly-Holmes 2005, p.121). This resonates with Bell (1984 p.172) who refers to the notion of the ‘house style’ of particular institutions which gives rise to a submergence of individual differences between speakers in the corporate style. Kelly-Holmes (2005, p.120) points out that this ‘neutral’ accent is in fact far from being without connotation and is interpreted as ‘an educated, urbane (Dublin) voice. This observation is discussed again in chapter 3, section 3.3.

We can thus differentiate between two very broad categories of southern Irish English. The term ‘non-local’ will be used here as an umbrella term for the accent sub-categories outlined above of moderate Dublin, supraregional southern and advanced Dublin English, which are viewed broadly by Hickey (2005) as ‘standard’ Irish English and align generally with what Kelly-Holmes (2005, p.120) refers to as the ‘educated, urbane’ voices which dominate Irish media. The term ‘local’ Irish English, on the other hand, will be employed in this context to refer to the category comprised of easily distinguishable local accents, including both local Dublin (also referred to as ‘popular’ by Hickey 2004, p.57) and other regional (rural and provincial) accents. As referred to above, Hickey (2004; 2013) provides detailed lists of phonological features on a regional basis. Dialectal items associated with Irish English are categorised separately as Irish English dialectal variety; this is based on the observation that dialectal items can be used in conjunction with non-local as well as local accent sub-varieties, as discussed above in relation to the notion of a standard Irish English,

It should be stressed that the above categories are, of course, generalizations and, as underpinned by Hickey (2005, p.28) and Lippi-Green (1997, p.59), in looking at actual data, the reality of accents which contain features from a number of these categories
must be recognized.

We have looked at nationalist and standard language ideologies and at how these ideologies can impact on variety choice both at an inter-varietal and intra-varietal level in the Irish context. We have discussed how nationalist ideologies can be reflected in the choice of Irish English (in that it acts as a substitute for a national language) as opposed to standard British English in advertising. Also we have seen how what some researchers refer to as ‘standard’ but what is understood as ‘non-local’ Irish English varieties for the purposes of this study, have been viewed as a more effective marker of Irish identity than, not only standard British English, but also vernacular Irish English (e.g. White 2006). We have remarked how standard ideologies can be reflected in the choice of standard British English as against Irish English and also in the choice of non-local over local sub-varieties at an intra-varietal level. The contention that the quasi-standard or non-local Irish English may more effectively represent Irish identity suggests that the use of such a variety may reflect a reconciliation of the two apparently conflicting ideologies in the Irish context, nationalist and standard. More recent developments with regard to language ideology, however, may come into play with regard to the employment of non-local Irish English in the context of advertising in Ireland. These are discussed below.

2.4 Recent language ideological shifts

The exploitation of non-local accent sub-varieties of Irish English at the intra-varietal level may be impacted by a number of relatively recent developments with regard to ideologies of language. These include the growth of an ideology of communication (Cameron 2003, p.460) which encompasses what Fairclough (1994) terms the ‘conversationalization’ of public discourse and consequent blurring of the boundaries
between public and private discourse, allowing for less formal forms of discourse and non-standard varieties in the public domain. Furthermore, this notion of the conversationalization of discourse can be said to subsume the concept of ‘authentic talk’ (Montgomery 2001, p.398) which can be an important factor in the way a listener engages with the speaker (a feature which is of course crucial in effective advertising). This is due to what Fairclough (1989, p.62) terms the ‘synthetic personalization of discourse’ which refers to a strategy which involves giving the impression of treating large groups of people as individuals through the use of techniques such as direct address. Montgomery observes that while broadcast talk is, by its nature, necessarily restricted in many ways in meeting certain ‘criteria’ for authentic talk (for example, in many cases not occurring in real time, being scripted and so on), nevertheless, it is increasingly designed to approximate to ‘fresh’ or ‘naturally occurring’ talk (Montgomery 2001, pp. 401-403). (It is interesting, in relation to this issue, to note the view of Bishop et al (2005, p.374) that the commodification of cultures and languages does not preclude their authenticity). As Lee (1992) tells us, advertisements are designed to reflect the discursive practices of the society in which they operate. In a similar vein, Kelly Holmes (2005a, p.107) points out that advertising in today’s world requires that the receivers of the ad are spoken to ‘in their own language’. She observes that this has resulted in an increase in the Bakhtinian notion of heteroglossia or multi-voicedness in advertising as exemplified through a greater range of accents and dialects when compared with a few decades ago.

While such developments would appear, on the face of it, to present a threat to the concept of standardisation and to promote more ‘authentic’ language use, Kelly-Holmes (2005, p.108) warns that despite its appearance as informal, spontaneous communication, ‘Advertising is still institutionally created and disseminated discourse.’
The suggestion of a simulation of more ‘authentic’ representations of discourse in advertising in the Irish context leads us to consider what constitutes an ‘authentic’ variety in this context. This necessitates the consideration of what ‘authentic talk’ actually is and the ideological dimension of authenticity. The following sections discuss the concept of the conversationalization and democratization of discourse and the notion of a ‘crisis’ in relation to the ideological construction of authenticity which has led to a rethinking of this concept. Following this, the most recently established non-local variety, that of advanced Dublin English, which according to Hickey (2013) has now become the new mainstream Irish English variety, will be examined in relation to such ideologies.

2.4.1 Conversationalization and democratization of public discourse

Through his (1994) concept of the conversationalization of public discourse, Fairclough observes a restructuring in contemporary society of the boundary between public and private discourse. This involves, not only a shift in the boundary between these discourses, but also between spoken and written discourse which results in a rise in the status of spoken discourse; this changes, to some extent, the direction in which modern discourse has been developing. This notion of the conversationalization of public discourse refers to a leaning towards the use in the public forum of less formal forms of discourse (including colloquial vocabulary, phonic, prosodic and paralinguistic features of colloquial language (including accent), modes of grammatical complexity representative of colloquial language, colloquial modes of topical development as described in conversational analysis, and colloquial genres) (Fairclough 1994, p. 260).

With regard to advertising, Fairclough (1994, p.260) refers to Leech (1966) who observes a ‘public-colloquial’ style of advertising and the simulation of a personal
relationship between the advertiser and the audience, as in Faireclough’s (1989 p.62) ‘synthetic personalization’, referred to above. Hoggart (1957) refers to this phenomenon as ‘fake intimacy’ and a ‘phoney sense of belonging’, all of which the term ‘conversationalization’ encompasses (Fairclough 1994, p.260). While conversationalization with regard to commodity advertising is not a new phenomenon, the fact that it is now led by the mass media means that it has a much broader and far reaching range in contemporary society.

Of particular relevance to the present study is the necessity, as highlighted by Faireclough, to determine the model for conversational practices, for example, from what social class, stratum and group the model for such conversational practices comes and whether they are in fact close to anyone’s real conversational language (Fairclough 1994, p.255). In the Irish broadcast advertising context, whether such practices relate broadly to ‘local’ or ‘non-local’ varieties of Irish English and in what contexts such varieties are employed, can be indicative of the ideological climate.

The ‘democratization’ of discourse (Fairclough 1992, p.201) is defined as ‘the removal of inequalities and asymmetries in the discursive and linguistic rights, obligations and prestige of groups of people’. Relevant to the Irish context and to this study is Faireclough’s observation that, notwithstanding the growth of this process in recent years, an imbalance still exists with speakers of some varieties having achieved more rights than others. With regard to public broadcasting, Fairclough points out that previously excluded non-standard and regional accents now have access, albeit limited, to this domain; for example working class accents tend to be limited to programme genres such as quizzes and soap operas. This resonates with Spitulnik’s (1998) findings, referred to in section 2.3.2, of how such imbalances construct and index relational
values between languages and speakers. In the context of broadcast advertising in Ireland, the extent to which non-local as opposed to local sub-varieties of Irish English (as described in section 2.3.8), are used as the authoritative voice may reflect such an imbalance. Fairclough (1992, p.202) questions whether this democratization process is heralding the end of the domination of standard English or whether domination is merely taking a new form. Democratization practices can be said to be contradictory in that, on the one hand, they can be said to lead to equality but on the other hand they maintain existing hegemonies through the appearance of democratization which makes such power relations difficult to challenge.

Coupland (2007, p. 96) refers to Mugglestone’s (2003, p.274) observation of a shift believed to have begun in the 1960s whereby respect for a ‘high’ dialect has diminished and ‘talking proper’ is understood as ‘talking posh’ and observes how the BBC broadcasting voice came to have negative associations and to be perceived as ‘plummy’. Coupland cites Mugglestone’s remarks on this situation in which RP is seen as indexing ‘elitism and exclusiveness’ rather than as ‘neutral and “accentless”’. A new validation of regionalism, the ‘rise of the regional’ in Mugglestone’s terms (Mugglestone 2003, p.273), has resulted in a ‘new and evolving language - ideological climate in which it is less necessary and less feasible to respect a British “standard” variety of English’, which has started to be seen as “old school”’. The notion of a ‘variation ideology’ is posited by Cameron (1995), cited in Coupland 2007, pp. 96-97) in which variation is seen in positive terms.

As we have seen in chapter 1, section 1.4, Coupland (2009a, p.37) claims that the notion of ‘posh’ challenges standard ideologies and ‘de-natures the Establishment voice, cutting though its links to authenticity...’. He observes the process by which new ‘orders
of indexicality’ (Silverstein 1976) are being substituted for older ones which have become outdated. In these new orders, ‘posh’ speakers are often ridiculed. This necessitates a re-assessment of received assumptions about orders of indexicality. Due to the diversity of the broadcast media with regard to format and genre, we are exposed to an increasing range of ‘dialect’ and ‘style’ dimensions of variation (Coupland 2009a, p.45). This, together with ideological changes, is leading to the establishment of a more multi-centred sociolinguistic culture. This, he explains, means that value-systems, both in general and in relation to modes of speaking, are becoming more complex and more contextualised. Coupland suggests that we must look for connections between such changes in the mediated world and the world of ‘everyday language’. He explains his use of quotation marks here by his need to indicate that the mass media are very much essential to most people’s ‘everyday’ experience, as for many people ‘everyday’ living is performed through mediated communication (Coupland 2009a, p.45).

The mass media and the broadcast media in particular, has impacted greatly on language evaluation and ideologies in the last fifty years (Coupland 2009a, p.40). Social stereotypes associated with dialects in Britain are both confirmed and challenged by representations on TV and radio. A hierarchy of ‘serious’ (for example, the use of conservative RP by news readers on BBC Radios 3 and 4) to ‘popular’ roles, (for example ‘non-standardness’ in the voices of TV and radio soapstars, stand-up comedians, vox pop street interviewees etc.) in broadcasting can be identified to illustrate this phenomenon. This corroborates Fairclough’s (1992) observation, referred to above, of the use of non-standard accents in less prestigious programme genres.

As we have seen, the conversationalization of discourse is seen as including the concept of ‘authentic talk’; due to the ‘synthetic personalisation of discourse’, ‘authentic talk’
can affect listener engagement with the speaker (Montgomery 2001, pp.398, 401). In the context of Irish English use in radio advertising, the notion of conversationalization and democratization of discourse and the validation of regionalism, as referred to above, suggests an increased use of Irish English, and particularly, on the face of it, in its ‘local’ or vernacular form. Local varieties have the potential to create solidarity through this ‘synthetic personalisation’, which can be accentuated through conversational features which are associated with such varieties (for example, vocatives, pragmatic markers and so on) and also through local and regional accent.

However, in light of Fairclough’s (2000) and Coupland’s (2009a) findings, as referred to above, regarding the use of accents in various broadcast media genres, while Irish English, in broad terms, may be deemed appropriate as opposed to SSBE, we could speculate that non-local Irish English forms or what can be termed ‘quasi-standard’ are used to a greater extent in formal contexts or in conjunction with discourses of power as associated with the authoritative voice of the ad, thus maintaining standard ideologies of language, but in modified forms.

The suggestion that conversationalization leads to a simulation of more ‘authentic’ representations of discourse in the Irish context leads us to consider whether non-local Irish English varieties are considered as ‘authentic’ and what constitutes an ‘authentic’ variety in the Irish context. As we have seen, Coupland (2009a, p.37) claims that the notion of standard language as ‘posh’ effectively severs its connection with ‘authenticity’. This raises the question as to whether non-local Irish English varieties (seen as quasi-standard) may be deemed ‘posh’ and therefore lacking in ‘authenticity’. This calls for a consideration of what ‘authentic talk’ actually is and the notion of a ‘crisis’ with regard to the concept of authenticity and its ideological implications. This
is the subject of the following section.

2.4.2 Authenticity in crisis

In the postmodern world, the realisation of authenticity as a performance and a cultural construct has led to a ‘crisis’ situation for the notion of authenticity as an assurance of reliable information and representation (Thornborrow and van Leeuwen 2001, p.388). These authors point to the necessity of finding ‘new forms of authenticity’ in order to provide criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of information and for examining the extent to which ‘events in the world’ relate to how they are represented in discourse.

We have seen in section 2.3.3 how the concept of ‘othering’ (Irvine and Gal 2009) can be used in relation to linguistic minorities, but also how it may apply to speakers of standard forms where the vernacular is valued. Jaworski (2007, pp.274-5), in his commentary on Johnson and Ensslin’s volume (2007) on language in the media, discusses how the notion of authenticity is ideologised in the media, and how this process leads to the ‘othering’ of and marginalisation of those linguistic practices which are deemed to be inauthentic. Jaworski cites several chapters in Johnson and Ensslin’s volume which point to the media focus on this type of ‘authentic’ language. This bias, he says, has its basis in the essentialist view of authenticity as being based on the assumptions that groups can be clearly defined and that group members are largely similar (Jaworski 2007, p.276).

Discussions of early concepts of authenticity show how the field of dialectology had its beginnings in Romanticism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century in European efforts to document the speech of the Volk or rural speakers as the ‘authentic’ form (Bucholtz 2003, p.399). As both a ‘nationalist and intellectual project’, Bucholtz observes, romanticism attempted to situate the foundations of the European nation as
residing in the spirit of the people and ‘valorized the rural population as the authentic source of traditional cultural knowledge and practice, including language’. Bucholtz argues that sociolinguists studying minority language groups tend to see movement away from the traditional language as a movement away from the ‘authentic past’ and the ‘view of ‘cultural change as cultural loss’ and warns of the dangers of such a view in terms of essentialism, (the view that characteristics and behaviour of socially defined groups can be determined and explained by cultural or biological attributes believed to be intrinsic to the group).

Coupland’s (2003, pp. 418-19; 2007, pp. 180-1) treatment of authenticity, in which he distinguishes between establishment and vernacular authenticities, is useful in bringing together the previous discussions on nationalist and standard ideologies and their relationship with the notion of authenticity. Coupland (ibid) identifies what he sees as traditional attributes of authenticity in terms of ontology (having a real rather than a derived existence), historicity (having longevity), systemic coherence (fitting into significant social or cultural systems), consensus (as to their authenticity) and value (having cultural value and acting as ‘anchoring points’).

Coupland (2003, p. 420; 2007, p. 181) argues that variationist sociolinguists tend to be opposed to establishment authenticities on an ideological basis, whilst on the other hand, giving precedence to vernacular authenticities. He applies the criteria outlined above to both establishment and vernacular authenticities, as summarised below.

With regard to establishment authenticities, the criterion of ontology indicates standard varieties as ‘real and proper’ language; historicity relates to proper, long-established standard usage and political action in its defence; systemic coherence is seen in terms of the preservation and refinement of the language through the standardisation process;
consensus relates to agreement by official order or dictum with orientations towards language cleansing; value denotes the iconic status of the language as ‘the fabric of the nation’. Therefore, we could expect language which meets the criteria for establishment authenticity to appeal to status (concerned with language ‘prestige’) rather than solidarity values (see Lambert et al 1960), as discussed in chapter 1 (section 1.4) in relation to the aims of the ad, as posited by Lee (1992).

With regard to vernacular authenticities, the traditional attributes of authenticity can also be applied. Ontology relates to how language ‘really is’ based on empirical studies; historicity is applicable in the sense of natural but also socially motivated change in community speech norms over time; systemic coherence relates to the orderliness which can be demonstrated in a speech community; consensus entails agreement with regard to group norms for language recycled in dense networks, producing a sense of community; value relates to speech style as a basis for solidarity and group membership; vernaculars as cultural objects (Coupland 2003, p. 420; 2007, p. 180-1). In contrast to establishment authenticities, these criteria can be associated with the dimension of solidarity (concerned with the socio-psychological need for national, ethnic group, social group or interpersonal solidarity).

Coupland takes the view that sociolinguists tend to oppose establishment authenticities and acknowledges that such authenticities are oppressive and authoritarian while the vernacular set are more participative, democratic and egalitarian. Nevertheless, he observes that both sets show the traditional attributes of authenticity. For example, ‘real’ language and the ‘authentic speaker’ are key to both sets of authenticities. Therefore, those who defend each set of authenticities feel they ‘have authenticity on their side’ (Coupland 2007, p.182). However, he warns, ‘to attribute authenticity to ways of
speaking is to fail to see the process of iconisation at work’ (ibid). Iconisation, in this context, refers to the process through which a linguistic feature comes to represent something social (Coupland 2007, p.112).

In attempting to examine how authenticity is interpreted in sociolinguistic research, Coupland (2003, p.421) goes on to outline a typology of sociolinguistic identities which are reproduced below:

Authentic language 1: attested and attestable language
Authentic language 2: naturally occurring language
Authentic language 3: language encoding fact and truth
Authentic language 4: fully owned, unmediated language
Authentic language 5: language indexing personal authenticity
Authentic language 6: language indexing authentic cultural membership

As Jaworski (2007, p.275) points out in his discussion of this typology, Coupland does not claim that these criteria are without their problems, but rather that it allows consideration of ‘traditional’ views of authenticity. In reviewing these categorisations, Coupland argues that Authentic language 1 and 2 (AL1 and 2) are weak criteria for authentic language in that they are dependent on assumptions of prototypicality and also are restricted to aspects of language use which can be demonstrated through observational and ‘naturalistic’ methodologies. Additionally, they are based on the premise that they allow access to speakers who are ‘more real’ than others (ibid).

With regard to Authentic language 3 (AL3), Coupland (2003, p.422) points out that it relates to the ‘moral’ issue of a speaker being true to him or herself, in such a way that as he puts it, ‘what you see is what you get’. Authentic language 4 (AL4) (2003, p.423)
relates to the assumption that speakers are responsible for both the semantic and pragmatic forms and meanings of their own utterances, although Coupland suggests that this may conflict with the Bakhtinian notion of heteroglossia and also concepts such as initiative style (Bell 1991a), among others. The notion of complete ‘ownership’ of speech is also moderated by linguistic reflexivity. Speech, Coupland says, is ‘internally dialogic’ and utterances are ‘negotiated’ with reference to the speaker him or herself, but also with reference to the hearer or potential hearer and to what is ‘sayable or interpretable’ in the particular context. This idea resonates with theories of linguistic accommodation which will be discussed in chapter 3.

*Authentic language 5 (AL5) (2003, p.424)* requires that authentic speakers ‘be themselves’, on moral ground as discussed in relation to *Authentic language 3*. Coupland gives the example of the context of speaking English in Wales with ‘the straightforward, rural south-west Walian, versus the streetwise and urbane speaker from the capital city, Cardiff, versus the posh and ‘English’ RP speaker’. Indeed, this illustrates effectively the notion of iconisation as referred to above. Particular phonological features can suggest a speaker as being more ‘truly Welsh’ than another and, generally speaking, some groups are indexed as more ‘trustworthy honest and straightforward’ than others. However, on the basis of establishment authenticities, speakers of prestige or ‘standard’ varieties can also claim personal authenticity, for example the ‘clarity’ and ‘transparency’ with which RP speakers are associated, as well as competence-related attributes (Coupland 2003, p.424).

*Authentic language 6 (AL6) (ibid)* relates to *Authentic language 5* but on a ‘community’ basis. In contrast to the criterion of ‘naturally occurring language’ of *Authentic language 2 (AL2)* in which the criterion of being a naturalistically observed community
deems it authentic, the notion of ‘cultural authenticity’ as potentially differentiating groups is paramount. Jaworski (2007, p.276), in commenting on this criterion, suggests that this is probably most in evidence where ethnic or linguistic minorities are undergoing a language shift in the direction of the dominant variety. This comes under criticism on the basis of its links with essentialism. Interestingly, Jaworski (ibid) also observes a media bias in attending to AL6.

Before turning our attention to more recent conceptions of authenticity, it is interesting to consider accent sub-varieties of Irish English in relation to Coupland’s typology. In the context of broadcast advertising, it is more important to focus on the perception of language as authentic rather than fixating on the true ‘essence’ of authenticity. Therefore, the critique of this typology is less relevant than its value in allowing us to consider traditional notions of authenticity, as Jaworski (2007, p. 275) has pointed out.

With regard to non-local Irish English accent sub-varieties (as described in section 2.3.8), at one level, authenticity in relation to AL3, AL5 and AL6 may be compromised through the dissociative nature (highlighted in media commentary, as we will see in section 2.4.4) of these non-local forms. On the other hand, evidence exists that these, rather than local forms are mainstream in the Irish context (Hickey 2013). Therefore, they can be seen as authentic with regard to AL1 and AL2 in that they are ‘attested’ and ‘attestable’. In addition, they are represented as ‘naturally occurring’ in that they dominate in representations of ‘everyday interaction’ (although they are of course staged representations of ‘naturally occurring’ language). In other words, they claim authenticity through such representations. In addition, speakers of non-local Irish English forms could claim authenticity based on these same authenticities (AL3, AL5 and AL6), which we have said may be compromised on the basis of their dissociation from local values (see section 2.3.8)), in that they are being true to their (target) identity.
as a modern sophisticated and urbane group (Hickey 2005), which is itself constructed to some extent and reinforced by the media. Piller (2001, p.163) discusses how contemporary identities of the ‘implied readers’ or ‘narratees’ of ads based on a German corpus, are constructed as having particular characteristics, such as ‘sophistication’ and ‘success orientation’. This effectively allows the target audience of such ads to identify with these characteristics and to view them as ‘authentic’ representations of their ‘target’ identity or the identity with which they wish to be associated.

Returning to Coupland’s typology, the use of varieties other than Irish English, for example SSBE, North American and so on may be problematic with regard to not being seen as ‘fully owned’. On the other hand, local sub-varieties may be seen as having authenticity in terms of AL3 and AL5 on the grounds of the speaker being true to his or her Irish identity and also in terms of the ‘cultural authenticity’ of AL6, thus appealing to solidarity related values. However, particularly hyperbolised representations of these vernacular forms may detract from this authenticity on the basis of AL2, in that it is stylised, exaggerated and not ‘naturally-occurring’ and also in terms of AL4 as not being ‘fully owned’. Coupland’s typology, therefore, allows us to look at authenticity in a less rigid way and to move outside the constraints of traditional notions of authenticity.

### 2.4.3 New authenticities

With regard to ‘traditional’ establishment and vernacular authenticities, Coupland (2003, p.425) points out that the ‘vertical’ competition between these two sets of authenticities has been destabilised in late modernity, rendering both sets less sustainable. These authenticities were based on different perceptions of social divisions which determined particular speech varieties. Coupland suggests that while the quest for authenticity continues, there is a need to reconsider these ‘primary’ authenticities, the
ideal and romanticised nature of which have rendered them less acceptable. In relation to Irish English, White’s (2006, p. 220) reference to ‘real language use in the present, as opposed to a myth of current language use based on reference to the past’ illustrates the ‘romanticised nature’ of vernacular authenticities, as referred to above. Therefore, this may have a bearing on media representations of authenticity which are important with regard to advertising.

Coupland (2001a, p.347) points out that sociolinguistic research has placed too much emphasis on ‘authentic speech’ while ignoring the importance of language use in constructing inauthenticity as well as authenticity. Based on an analysis of dialect stylisation in radio talk in Wales, he looks at stylisation, which he defines as ‘the knowing deployment of culturally familiar styles and identities that are marked as deviating from those predictably associated with the current speaking context’, as a way in which speakers effectively ‘deauthenticate’ themselves through the ‘betrayal’ of its artificial nature (2001a, p.345). The stylisation of dialect, he points out, is best understood as a way of ‘deploying normative community speech forms at one remove, without overtly subscribing to the norms of tradition and cultural continuity, but also without discrediting their cultural value’ (Coupland 2001a, p.372). He argues that the stylising of ingroup markers may be viewed as ‘a characteristically late-modern symbolic practice that can achieve a distanced validation of speakers' social identities’ (2001a, p.347).

Acknowledging insights from the work of Rampton (2006) and adapted from Coupland (2001a), Coupland (2007, p.154) outlines what he considers to be the defining criteria of stylisation, based on his in radio talk data (Coupland 2001a): Stylisation projects personas, identities and genres, which are not presumed to be a current part of the
speech event, but which are derived from familiar identity repertoires; it is metaphorical, based on stereotyped ideological values associated with groups, contexts and times outside the speech event, dislocating the speaker and utterances from the current context; stylisation is ‘reflexive, mannered and knowing’, attending and calling attention to its own modality and mediating understanding of its utterances at an ‘ideational, identificational and relational’ level; the process needs an ‘acculturated’ audience who can interpret the semiotic value of the projected persona, identity or genre as it is based on normative interpretations of style of particular speech communities; it activates, in and with listeners, processes of social comparison and re-evaluation, which centre on the real and metaphorical identities, strategies and goals of the speakers, but also allowing re-evaluation of the identities, orientations and values of the listeners; stylisation introduces a new social context, with new identities and values, interrupting the current contextual frame and thereby allows re-evaluation of existing situational norms by virtue of its ambiguity; it is ‘creative and performed’ and requires skill and learning; it often involves emphatic and hyperbolic representations of the styles and genres that it targets so as to highlight dissonant social meanings; stylisation can be analysed as ‘strategic inauthenticity’ and has ‘complex implications for personal and cultural authenticity’.

In looking at dialect stylisation in radio talk in Wales, Coupland refers to how ‘Modern, incipiently more independent Wales finds discomfort in the sociolinguistic associations BOTH of its own socially disadvantaged industrial past AND of hegemonic English culture’. Dialect stylisation, he claims, can resolve this paradox. It allows presenters to ‘repackage traditional ways of speaking, reflecting them back to the community with which they are associated’ and enables a ‘cultural reassessment’. In this way, through the ‘inauthentic’ representation, the speakers deauthenticate
themselves yet, in doing so, achieve a type of reauthentication. According to Coupland

Living a culture has to be a self-reflexive process, unless we want to claim that cultural authenticity is visible only to outgroup members or critical observers such as sociolinguists or anthropologists.

(Coupland 2001a, p. 371)

Rampton’s (2006, p.224-5) study of interaction in an urban high-school looks at exaggerated performances of ‘posh’ and ‘Cockney’ which he says can be categorised in terms of stylisation. Rampton observes how stylisation involves

a partial and momentary disengagement from the routine flow of unexceptional business, and the recipients are invited to use their broader understandings of society to figure out exactly what “image of another’s language” this is actually supposed to be.

(Ramton 2006, pp. 224-225)

Rampton goes on to say that the recipients are also asked to consider how the voice is relevant to the current ‘business-on-hand’ and to evaluate it through comparison with their own sense of the language, characters and situations being represented in the stylisation. This interpretation of stylisation highlights the potential of this process for the self-reflexivity referred to by Coupland (2001a) above.

In his discussion of this new way of constructing authenticity, Coupland refers to a movement away from indexical conceptions of social identity to the notion of social identification, which allows for meanings to be ‘locally negotiated in reflexive and strategic communicative practice’ (2003, p.427). In referring to his series of case studies on the orientation of mass media performers to Welsh ethnicity through phonological variation, for example, Coupland (2003, p.428) describes a process by which authenticity can be achieved by a speaker through highlighting his or her inauthenticities in a playful and self-deprecating way, while depending on the listener to use contextual information to construct their identity as authentic in this ‘more
relativised, second-order sense’. Coupland concludes that the new authentic speaker will be the one who can occupy the ‘gap’ between the indexical values of social identity and the outcomes of social identification through employing aspects of ingroup speech while indicating ‘less than full ownership’ (cf Authentic Language 4) and through ‘strategic self-deauthentication’, in this way using traditional linguistic resources but in new and creative ways.

This ‘self-deauthentication’ is illustrated by Kelly-Holmes and Atkinson (2007) in their study of how the ‘imperfect’ or ‘inauthentic’ use of Irish by an Irish celebrity figure in a comedy radio sketch, while the object of ridicule when viewed with regard to language purism in the context of a minority language revival situation, can also build authenticity as an index of Irishness. Similarly, an Irish television ad for beer shows a group of young Irish tourists in a bar in Brazil being asked to ‘do something Irish’ to demonstrate their culture. They respond by performing, in dramatic fashion, nonsensical ‘inauthentic’ sentences in ‘school’ Irish, which highly impresses their non-Irish audience. In the context of the ad, this simultaneously deauthenticates the speakers and reauthenticates them as ‘authentically’ Irish and in so doing ‘others’ those non-Irish who are not party to the joke.\(^\text{16}\)

This new view of authenticity suggests that the traditional authenticities as related to standard and vernacular varieties may not be exploited in the same way in the advertising context in more recent years, but rather that apparently conflicting ideologies of language will be exploited in new ways in order to represent Irish identity. This allows for new representations of what constitutes ‘authenticity’ in the media context and for a reconciliation of the sometimes conflicting authenticities of

\(^{16}\text{MetalMonkey75 (2011) } \text{http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ul5_b-327Dw}\)
Coupland’s typology. This notion is particularly interesting in light of recent developments in the linguistic environment of Ireland in terms of what Hickey (2004 p.46) views as the most important case of language change in contemporary Ireland, the shift to advanced Dublin English pronunciation (as referred to in section 2.3.8), which he sees as dissociative in nature. The way in which authenticity can be constructed so as to allow the reconciliation of conflicting evaluations and ideologies both in relation to this new form and vernacular forms is of interest to the study. Strategies such as the stylisation of local and non-local (the latter as represented by advanced Dublin English, given the media attention directed at this form, which will be discussed in the next section) can be taken as evidence of such new authenticities.

Therefore, based on its representation in the media, its dissociative nature and its establishment as the new mainstream Irish English variety, advanced Dublin English provides an interesting locus for a discussion of the ideological dimension of authenticity as it applies in the context of Irish English. The next section will focus on the sociolinguistic and ideological context of this pronunciation style.

2.4.4 Advanced Dublin English as ‘authentic’

As discussed in section 2.3.7, Filppula (2012) observes that what he refers to as ‘Dublin English’ is the closest approximation to a standard Irish English. Hickey (2005) also sees non-local or ‘educated’ Dublin English as serving as a ‘quasi-standard’ for Irish English, but also refers to ‘new’ Dublin English, a further subdivision of non-local Dublin English; this form is said to actively dissociate itself from the local or ‘low-prestige’ group and is epitomised by a shift in pronunciation. Hickey more recently (2013) refers to this accent as ‘advanced Dublin English’ and confirms earlier predictions of its functioning as the new supraregional variety.
In describing this shift in pronunciation in southern Irish English which took place in the 1980s and 1990s, Hickey (2004a, p.46), points out that this change is reactive in nature and attributes its beginnings to a relatively small number of speakers from an affluent area in Dublin city known as Dublin 4 (the postal district for this area). These speakers saw themselves as ‘trendy, modern, [and] sophisticated’ and did not identify with the traditional image of Irishness. Consequently, a new style of pronunciation, different from local Dublin forms evolved in the speech of this ‘Dublin 4 set’ (Hickey, 2005, p.47). This new form of pronunciation, often referred to as ‘D4’, and intended to maximise the differences from more traditional conservative forms, soon however, became the object of comment and ridicule, and was often satirised in the media. Another term ‘Dartspeak’ was coined in reference to the putative accent of southside suburban residents. This term was later changed to ‘Dortspeak’, a satirical term deriving from the retracted and rounded vowel pronunciation. Hickey describes how the accent ‘came to be disliked’ and cites a well-known Irish newspaper columnist, Kevin Myers, who writes that ‘The written word cannot begin to convey the awfulness of the Dortspeak, which seems to have taken over southside middle-class schools’ (Myers 2000, p.64, cited in Hickey 2005 p.48). The division between local and newer pronunciation has been the object of parody by Irish writers such as Paul Howard in his series on the character, Ross O’Carroll-Kelly, as referred to by Amador-Moreno (2010, p.81). Ireland’s national television broadcaster, RTÉ (Raidió Teilifís Éireann) has also featured programmes parodying this form of pronunciation in the form of the video diaries of ‘Dan and Becks’, an affluent couple from Dublin’s southside, in 2007. Amador-Moreno (2010, p.81), in her discussion on Dublin English, provides examples of how such pronunciation is often negatively perceived and can be the object of

---

17 DART is an acronym for Dublin Area Rapid Transport, a suburban railway serving commuters in the southern part of Dublin city
mockery. In time, according to Hickey (2005, p.48), Dortspeak became less fashionable and was avoided by younger speakers, a trend which was perhaps consolidated by such satirical comment.

The second half of the 1990s saw the beginning of a period of population growth and increased prosperity in Ireland, and particularly in Dublin, together with a growing cosmopolitanism, due to the economic boom (see chapter 4, section 4.3.1). As a result of this boom, in-migration to Dublin city increased, forming a set of ‘socially mobile, weak-tie speakers’ (Hickey 2004a p.46), seen as central to language change. A need arose within this group for a non-local but socially acceptable form of Dublin English. In what Hickey refers to as ‘a classic case of dissociation in an urban setting’, a new form of pronunciation developed, which disconnected itself from local speech forms. According to Hickey, while discarding unpopular elements of D4 and Dortspeak, this new pronunciation form, however, retained a number of features of its predecessors such as the raising of non-local back vowels and the retraction of /ai/ in differentiating itself from local speech forms. The retention of these features are regarded as key elements of the Dublin vowel shift. This new pronunciation was more broad-based and, according to Hickey (2005, p.49), to the extent that it had dropped the elements which were the subject of derision, ‘lost all the connotations of snobbishness and condescending poshness’ relating to the D4 set. As we have seen in section 2.3.7, Hickey claims that, given the status of Dublin in the Republic of Ireland, non-vernacular Dublin speech serves as an unofficial standard for the rest of the Republic. Therefore, non-vernacular Dublin English is seen by those speakers outside of Dublin, who wish to distance themselves from their regional variety, as an acceptable form of Irish English, thus meeting a demand for a non-local form. The spread of this new form to other parts of the Republic of Ireland is seen as a type of reactive divergence from the vernacular
form of their locality. This is attributed to a need for ‘urban sophistication’ (Hickey 2004a, p.45) associated with Dublin’s elevated international position and economic boom of the last decade of the twentieth and first decade of the twenty first centuries (see chapter 4, section 4.3.1). This speech style was particularly observable in the case of younger speakers, predominantly among females and later males as it spread quickly throughout the Irish Republic. Hickey (2013) points out that, having now established itself as mainstream, advanced Dublin English continues to develop, showing a number of new features in recent years.

The lexical sets used by Wells (1982) are employed in outlining the main features of what was originally referred to as ‘New Pronunciation’ (Hickey 2004a). Among these features, the retracted starting point for /ai/ in the PRIDE lexical set, (particularly noticeable before /r/ so that Ireland is pronounced [ɐɪɹlənd] rather than [ɐɪɹlənd]), although carried over from D4 and Dortspeak, as observed above, was a variable feature. This was due to its associations with RP or with the D4 accent described above, and not one which was favoured by all speakers. Indeed, this is now seen as a recessive feature of advanced Dublin English (Hickey 2013). The raising of low back vowels is, however, a more pervasive feature; raised realisations of the vowels in the CHOICE and THOUGHT lexical sets are further examples of the vowel shift. Traditionally, southern Irish English has a lower realisation of these vowels than standard English pronunciation (or SSBE) as in choice realised as [tʃoʊs], and thought as [tʊθ]. In this newer Irish English pronunciation form, these sounds are raised in extreme realisations to [ɔʐ] and [ɔː] respectively. Vowels in the START lexical set may also be slightly raised by non-local speakers combining with /r/- retroflexion, another notable advanced feature, to give realisations like [stæ(ɻ)t]. With regard to /r/- retroflexion, Hickey suggests that the spread of this feature stems from dissociation both form the traditional
realisation of /r/ as a velarised alveolar continuant in southern Irish English and also from the low rhoticity of traditional Dublin English.

Also, vowels in the THOUGHT, NORTH and FORCE lexical sets are slightly shortened in the newer pronunciation form. When co-occurring with /r/ the long vowels become short phonetically to produce a pronunciation ‘far removed from more traditional realisations’, for example fork realised as [foːk] as against more the more traditional southern Irish English realisation [fɒːk] (Hickey 2005, p.78). A further feature is MOUTH-fronting, which is associated traditionally with Dublin and east-coast varieties in general. The traditional realisation of this vowel as [au], which characterised pronunciation in rural areas of the southwest and west of Ireland, is now being replaced by a realisation with a front starting point ([æ] or [ɛ]).

Hickey also points to what is referred to as SOFT-lengthening which is a feature of traditional Dublin English. This refers to the lengthening of the vowel of the LOT lexical set when occurring before a voiceless fricative. Although this is not a feature of conservative mainstream Irish English, it is becoming increasingly widespread outside of Dublin due to its presence in Dublin English. Also, the vowel in the GOAT lexical set is realised in the newer form as a diphthong so that go is pronounced [goʊʊ] or the more extreme [ɡəʊ] as opposed to the rural southern Irish English form [ɡoː] (Hickey, 2005, p.75)

In addition to retroflex /r/ described above, the realisation of /l/ is affected in advanced Dublin English. The traditional alveolar [l] in all syllable positions is giving way to velarised [ɻ] for example [fiːɻd]. Again, Hickey sees this as a reactive change, designed to distance the speaker from the traditional Irish accent. T-flapping is also seen as another recognisable (albeit variable) feature of the advanced form. It occurs intervocally (as
in *letter* ([lɛɾə]) or in sandhi contexts, where a word ending in [t] is followed by one beginning with a vowel (as in *bought apples* [buɔt æpəlз]) (Hickey 2005. p. 78).

Among the most recent innovations in advanced Dublin English, Hickey (2013) observes the lowering of short front vowels, in particular those of the DRESS lexical set and the retraction of the TRAP vowel. A more extreme form of GOOSE fronting, a feature which has characteristically been associated with Dublin English, has also been recorded in advanced Dublin English, particularly among female speakers. These newer features of advanced Dublin English are presently confined to Dublin city, its suburbs and satellite towns, and as with the earlier features of this form, female speakers lead in these changes (see O’Sullivan 2013, p.372).

In his discussion of the Dublin vowel shift, Hickey questions whether it is in fact a shift or simply a steady movement towards more standardised southern British English, given the pervasiveness of the media and ease of movement between the two countries (Hickey 2005, p.57). This question is interesting in relation to the present study in terms of the influence of standard language ideologies on the emergence of this variety. Hickey however, discounts this argument, pointing to the fact that other features, characteristic of this standardised variety have not been adopted. These include /æ:/ in the BATH lexical set, a feature which is indeed used by Irish people to deride a ‘plummy’ or British accent. Furthermore, syllable–final /r/ is retained in advanced Dublin English. In addition, the diphthong of the CHOICE lexical set of SSBE has a higher realisation in the newer form so that *annoy* [ənɔɪ] is realised as [ənɔɪ]. However, it is arguable that this higher realisation could be viewed in terms of hyperconvergence or an overshooting of the mark with respect to convergence to the standard pronunciation. This will be discussed in chapter 7 (section, 7.6.2).
In discussing the spread of advanced Dublin English, Hickey sees the media as having a significant role (as attested to by Foulkes and Docherty (1999, p.15) cited in Hickey 2005, p.87). The presenters of the national broadcaster, RTÉ, show marked features of this pronunciation form, and it is also widely used on local radio stations, particularly by female presenters.

In relation to advanced Dublin English, Coupland’s (2007, p. 89) observations on style shifting in Western Anglophone countries are particularly relevant; while style shifting away from vernaculars in order to escape the stigma of their indexical associations may be seen as positive, nevertheless the ideological climate makes style-shifting ‘a highly charged and risky business, subject to social monitoring and threatening further sanctions when it “goes wrong”’.

This ‘social monitoring’ is apparent in the way in which advanced Dublin English has been the object of media comment in recent years, and is particularly interesting given the concern of this study with the ideological dimension of variety choice. As discussed in section 2.3.2, in relation to the study of folk-linguistics, Hoenigswald (1966, p.20) points out that it is necessary to take account of talk concerning language. Moore (2011) discusses such talk which takes the form of media commentary in relation to advanced Dublin English. Unlike Hickey, Moore (2011), does not discriminate between the pronunciation forms of D4 and advanced Dublin English and refers to Hickey’s terminology as interchangeable terms; “‘New,” “advanced,” or “fashionable Dublin English” (aka “D4” )’ (Moore 2011, p.45). Moore speaks of the ‘moral panic’ that he says has taken hold in Ireland with regard to this pronunciation (Moore 2011, p.57). Resonating with Coupland’s remarks of the notion of ‘posh’ de-naturing the establishment voice and rendering it inauthentic (see section 2.4.1), Moore (2011, p.42)
observes how the D4 accent is ‘explicitly denaturalized’ as an ideological construct in the Irish sociolinguistic context. According to this construct, the accent has no community of ‘nativespeakers’, only people who are pretending to be something they aren’t; not authentically linked to any particular place, it spreads across the countryside like an infectious disease; above all, it has no connection to a shared Irish past - it was only invented recently, during the economic boom years of the ‘Celtic Tiger’ economy. The ‘D4 accent’ is then itself an emblem, and a creature, of that recent and short-lived period of Irish affluence...all seem to agree that it is an imitation - that it is, in fact, ‘imitation’ as opposed to ‘real’or authentic. It is no one’s ‘native’ accent - it is always ‘put-on’ ...

(Moore 2011, p. 49)

Resonating with Thornborrow and van Leeuwen’s (2003) notion of a ‘crisis’ in relation to the construction of authenticity, as referred to in section 2.4.2, Moore cites numerous examples of contemporary media discussion of the new pronunciation form which, he says, has now become ‘the target of anxiety, rather than the [English] language as a whole.’ Interestingly, in light of our observations about nationalist language ideologies and Irish English, he compares it with nationalist discourse of late nineteenth century Ireland, which berated the spread of the English language in Ireland (Moore 2011, p. 57). This suggests that, in addition to the ideological construction of authenticity being visible in relation to advanced Dublin English, nationalist language ideologies may also be at work with regard to ‘anxiety’ in relation to this new Irish English form. Cronin (2011, p.56) points out how Ireland’s incorporation into the ‘turbomarket’ of the English language has led to a ‘more global, less distinct forms of English’ (ibid). This suggests that the distinctive features of Irish English which Cronin (2011, p.55) claims were ‘consciously cultivated as a marker of specificity’ are being eroded. Among other media reports, Moore refers to a quotation by Dolan (1994) claiming that the new accent ‘is being adopted as a badge of progressiveness, an explicit rejection of provincial “backwardness”’ (Moore 2011, p.50). It could be argued that, as with the
adoption of English in Ireland at the turn of the 20th century, Irish people felt the need for a more cosmopolitan variety in order to take advantage of the economic situation and advance socially and also to reflect a new image of Irishness. The media reports which criticise this pronunciation form can, as Moore (2011, p.57) points out, be compared with nationalist reaction with regard to the spread of the English language in the late nineteenth century and can thus be said to reflect nationalist language ideology.

While advanced Dublin English has been argued not to have been influenced by British English or US English (Hickey 2005), nevertheless there are parallels with both varieties which cannot be ignored and indeed we cannot rule out a potential influence of standard language ideologies on the emergence of this new form (for example a movement away from the ‘homey’ image, in Lippi-Green’s (1997) terms). In addition, the influence of standard language ideology is visible in views such as those articulated by White (2006, p. 220) of standard Irish English as more appropriate in representing Irishness than vernacular varieties due to its prestige and use by educated speakers.

Moore observes how this ‘avoidance-driven “accent” has itself become stigmatized - imbued with strong indexicality - and has become worthy of avoidance in its own right’ (Moore 2011, p.42). He cites a newspaper report by Bielenberg (2008) who claims that ‘Having originated in South County Dublin, Dort-speak has spread like an out-of-control Winter vomiting bug’. These reports contradict Hickey’s view that advanced Dublin English has been modified to the extent that its more stigmatised, ‘posh’ features have been discarded, at least as represented by the media. More importantly, they highlight the role of the media in the propagation of language ideologies.

Returning to the notion of authenticity in relation to advanced Dublin English, the ideological construction of this form as inauthentic is not limited to folk-linguistic
accounts of this variety, as found in media reports. As Moore observes, ‘As an ideological construct in an Irish sociolinguistic imaginary, then, “D4” is already explicitly denaturalized without authentic links to a shared place or past’ (Moore 2011, p. 42). As we have seen, this accent has been identified as a quasi-standard mainstream variety by Hickey (2013). Coupland points out that ‘standard’ ways of speaking have been constructed as ‘inauthentic’ by variationist sociolinguists and cites Labov’s treatment of ‘standard’ speech as ‘a deviation from real, natural, orderly vernaculars.’ (Coupland 2007, p.182). In addition, the assumption has been said to exist among sociolinguists that ‘style-shifting in general is a movement away from the true vernacular system’ and ‘where sociolinguistic authenticity starts to crumble’ (ibid). Moore’s discussion of the representation of the new pronunciation form in the ‘Irish sociolinguistic imaginary’ as ‘inauthentic’ bears out this theory.

In terms of the traditional qualities of authenticity, as identified by Coupland (2003, p. 418-9) and outlined in section 2.4.2, advanced Dublin English, as it is represented in the media reports, could be said to be lacking with regard to several of these attributes. On the basis of ontology, for example, its existence is seen as a ‘derived’ one, an ‘imitation’ (Moore 2011, p.49); with regard to historicity, it cannot be deemed to have longevity as yet; furthermore, it has already undergone changes so cannot be said to have durability. In terms of consensus, media reports, as illustrated by the above example, indicate a consensus only in relation to its inauthenticity. Furthermore, its cultural value and its potential as an ‘anchoring point’ (Coupland 2007, p.181) is questionable in light of such reports. Moore’s description of how this accent is represented in media reports also (2011, p.49) resonates with Coupland’s typology of authenticity in terms of AL3 and AL5, which relate to the ‘moral’ issue of a speaker being true to him or herself (‘pretending to be something they aren’t’);and also with regard to AL6 in that it lacks
links with a ‘shared Irish past’ and therefore lacks ‘cultural authenticity’ (Coupland 2003, p. 422).

However, if we look back at Coupland’s application of the criteria for traditional attributes of authenticity to vernacular authenticities, (section 2.4.2), advanced Dublin English would appear to have authenticity in this respect; with regard to ontology, it is how language really is (or at least is becoming); it also represents part of the process of ‘natural and inherent change in speech norms of a community over time leading as much to diversity as uniformity’ and thus meets the criterion of historicity; consensus exists in group norms (with regard to the group of ‘fashionable’ speakers) for language use; in addition the value of studying this pronunciation form is manifest through recent sociolinguistic studies (Hickey 2013; Amador -Moreno 2010; Moore 2011)

Therefore, while advanced Dublin English may be deemed ‘inauthentic’ on the basis of both folklinguistic accounts, for example in media reports, and in its construction by sociolinguists, nevertheless if we look at the criteria for vernacular authenticity, it does appear to have ‘authenticity’. Furthermore, if it is established as the mainstream variety, it can be seen as ‘real language use in the present, as opposed to a myth of current language use based on reference to the past’ as White (2006, p.20) puts it in her advocacy of a role for standard Irish English in expressing national identity (2006, p.220). Also, as discussed in section 2.4.2, speakers of non-local Irish English forms, such as advanced Dublin English, can arguably claim authenticity based on AL3, AL5 and AL6 in that they are being true to their identity in terms of a sophisticated, ‘socially mobile, weak-tie’ set (Hickey 2004a, p. 46). However, as discussed, the key issue here is not so much the essential authentic qualities of this form but rather how it is represented by the media and how this affects its exploitation in advertising in Ireland.
As Johnson and Ensslin (2007, p.13) point out, the way in which language is represented, both in the media and otherwise, is the basis for our understanding of what language is. There appears to be a conflict, however, particularly visible in relation to advanced Dublin English in the Irish context, between the ‘reality’ of this new pronunciation form and its ideological associations, particularly in relation to authenticity and its ability to represent Irishness. However, the advent of new representations of authenticity may allow for a resolution of this conflict.

2.5 Summary and conclusions

This chapter has focused on the sociolinguistic and language ideological context of Irish English as it relates to standard British English and also in relation to the sub-varieties of Irish English, through a discussion of how these varieties operate in Irish society and how they relate to particular ideologies of language.

The chapter has traced the history and development of Irish English, its links with the Irish language and its position in the post-colonial situation. In order to provide a framework for the examination of how Irish English may reflect distinct language ideologies, this variety was examined according to broad categories of vernacular and prestige sub-varieties. Vernacular Irish English was examined in terms of phonological, grammatical and lexical features. As phonological features are key to this study, salient phonological markers of Irish English which distinguish it from SSBE were identified. Following this, the notion of prestige varieties of English in the Irish context, standard British English and the notion of a ‘quasi-standard’ Irish English, was discussed. These varieties were considered in relation to their acceptability in the Irish context and this provided a launching point for a discussion of language ideology in general terms and its relationship to the media.
The notion of language ideologies as social constructs (Cameron 2003) and as representations of language (Woolard 1998) was examined, before a discussion of how such ideologies relate to media contexts and how the representation of language in the media contribute to our understanding of such language. The power of the media in its ability to reflect and promote ideologies, enhanced by its ubiquity and status was highlighted as well as the way in which the ‘synthetic personalization’ of public discourse (Fairclough 1989) can augment this power. The importance of the broadcast media to the construction of language ‘value’ (Bourdieu 1991; Spitulnik 1998) was also emphasised. This discussion prefaced an examination of particular language ideologies relevant to the study.

Nationalist ideology was examined in terms of its historical context and in terms of different views of the role of language in nation building according to distinct schools of nationalist theory, ethno-linguistic nationalism, the perennialists, modernism and post-modernism as well as the concepts of Kulturnation and Staatsnation. The notion of the potential of nationalist ideologies based on the idea of one nation, one language to ‘other’ speakers of minority varieties was touched on.

Nationalist ideology as it relates to the Irish context was then examined. Although ethno-linguistic nationalism, which linked language and nationhood, dominated in the nineteenth century, it was during this time that the English language started to gain ground in replacing the Irish language in Ireland. While in terms of ethnolinguistic nationalism, the demise of the Irish language presented a challenge to the concept of nation, according to modernist thinking, the Irish language, in that it is no longer the L1 in practical terms in Ireland, failed to allow for the community of communication which is crucial for nationalism (Wright 2000). Irish English, however, fulfils this role both
nationally and globally. The notion of the Irish Literary Revival in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as resulting in a bicultural tradition composed of elements from both the Irish and English language (Tymoczko and Ireland 2003a) was discussed and related to postmodernism in that it can be seen as fostering the ‘imagined’ community. This bicultural tradition was also viewed in terms of perennialist theory in that the nation can be chosen by a people and traditions built on and changed as appropriate, thereby allowing for a new type of nationalism which does not depend on linguistic uniformity. The idea of ‘standard’ Irish English as representing Irish identity nationally and globally was proposed, thus setting a context for the discussion of standard language ideology.

The foundations on which standard language ideologies are based were described. These include prescriptivism, ‘standard language cultures’ and the notion of one nation, one language which links standard to nationalist ideology. Standard language ideology was also discussed in terms of linguistic ‘correctness’ and ‘common-sense’ attitudes, and the notion of what constitutes ‘real’ or ‘true’ language or what gives a language ‘legitimacy’. Lippi-Green’s (1997) ‘language subordination’ process was described, as well as her concept of the ‘myth’ of non-accent, both of which she claims, are strategies employed by dominant bloc institutions to counteract what they see as a threat to the authority of the homogenous language of the nation-state.

Spolsky’s (1998) concept of ‘speech community’ (whose members share not only a ‘repertoire’ of languages or varieties, but also the norms for the use of these varieties) was introduced and this concept was related to the notion of ‘common-sense’ attitudes to language (Milroy 2001) and that of the ‘habitus’ (Bourdieu 1991). Bourdieu’s concept of ‘the institutional circle of collective misrecognition’ (1991), in which
speakers of minority language accept discrimination in relation to such varieties, was also discussed.

The discussion of standard language ideology then extended its focus to relate it to the Irish context. Reference was made to the shift to the English language in Ireland and the influence of the ‘political culture’ of language in England which rendered Irish English as ‘deviant’. However, the less prescriptive ‘dual tradition’ was also highlighted; this allowed for a merging of Irish and English language cultures making Ireland ‘part of a global condition’ in which migration is bringing together diverse languages and cultures. This set the context for the discussion of ‘standard’ Irish English.

The notion of ‘standard’ as linked with prestige and carefulness prefaced an examination of different conceptions of ‘standard’ Irish English. With regard to such conceptions, agreement was found to exist among researchers, (for example, Kirk and Kallen (2004); White (2006); Kirk (2011); Hughes et al (2012)) that the speech or writing of ‘educated’ speakers they refer to as ‘standard’ can include lexical, grammatical, discourse and pragmatic features of Irish English, although these features tend not to be strongly vernacular. However, such a notion of ‘standard’ does not facilitate differentiation from non-standard variety for the purposes of this study. The importance of accent (MacMathuna 2003) and Hickey’s (2004a) observations of the phonological features of ‘educated’ Dublin English in terms of ‘rejection’ and ‘dissociation’ from local forms was established as providing a stronger demarcation of prestige and vernacular forms. Therefore, the term ‘non-local’ Irish English rather than ‘standard’ Irish English was found to be more useful, in the context of this study, in referring to a prestige or ‘educated’ variety and what Hickey (2005, p.208) sees as a ‘quasi-standard’. This justified the analysis in relation to sub-varieties of Irish English.
as based mainly on phonological features, dialectal features are, however, examined in relation to the inter-varietal analysis of standard British and Irish English, but are quantified separately within the study and categorised as Irish English dialectal variety. The way in which standard ideologies can be reflected in the choice of standard British English as against Irish English and also in the choice of non-local over local Irish English accent sub-varieties at an intra-varietal level was emphasised.

Sub-varieties of Irish English were thus identified in broad terms; ‘non-local’ Irish English comprises the sub-categories of moderate Dublin, supraregional southern and advanced Dublin English, viewed broadly by Hickey (2005) as ‘standard’ Irish English while ‘local’ Irish English refers to the category comprised of easily distinguishable local accents and dialects, including both local Dublin and other regional (rural and provincial) accents and dialects (see Hickey 2013).

The discussion then moved on to identify and examine more recent ideologies of language which can influence the exploitation of variety. These include the concept of the democratization and conversationalization of discourse (Fairclough 1992; 1994) which relate to the use of less formal discourse in the public domain and the removal of imbalances in relation to linguistic rights and prestige. This relates to the denigration of ‘posh’ forms of speech and the ‘rise of the regional’ (Mugglestone 2003; Coupland 2007), although imbalances are still found to exist. Conversationalization was also linked to the ‘synthetic personalization’ of discourse (Fairclough 1989) which gives listeners a false sense of belonging and is employed in advertising. As the conversationalization of discourse subsumes the concept of ‘authentic talk’ (Montgomery 2001), the notion of authenticity as an ideological construct was introduced.
Early concepts of authenticity and the view of ‘cultural change as cultural loss’ (Bucholtz 2003) were reviewed. Coupland’s (2003) traditional attributes of authenticity and his application of these attributes to establishment and vernacular authenticities were described; this suggested that both categories can claim authenticity, despite the claim that variationist sociolinguists favour vernacular authenticity on an ideological basis. Coupland’s (2003) typology of sociolinguistic identities was used to consider these traditional authenticities and to relate them to sub-varieties of Irish English. The importance in advertising of the perception of language as having authenticity rather than a preoccupation with the essential attributes of authenticity was highlighted. The discussion proposed that the authenticity of non-local Irish English forms may be compromised due to their dissociative nature; however, their representation in the ads as ‘naturally occurring’ allows them to claim authenticity; in addition, non-local forms could be said to index personal and cultural authenticity in terms of representing a very real (albeit constructed with the help of the media and advertising) contemporary, sophisticated group of speakers. On the other hand, local Irish English accents may have authenticity in terms of being true to a more traditional form of Irish identity; however, exaggerated forms may lose out in terms of not appearing as ‘naturally occurring’.

The need to reconsider traditional authenticities was examined in terms of dialect stylisation which can resolve the conflict between traditional notions of authenticity (Coupland 2001a; 2003). Through ‘inauthentic’ representations, the speakers deauthenticate themselves but in this way achieve a type of reauthentication through self-reflexivity and a claim to ‘less than full ownership’ of the speech form. This means that traditional linguistic resources can be employed in new and creative ways.

The new mainstream Irish English variety, advanced Dublin English, was identified as
providing an interesting focus for a discussion of the ideological dimension of authenticity due to its representations in the media (Moore 2011) and its dissociative nature (Hickey 2004a). The origins, socioloinguistic context and salient features of this form, which is actively dissociative from local forms, were described. Contemporary media reports in which this form is denigrated as ‘inauthentic (Moore 2011) were outlined, reflecting not only the ideology of authenticity but also nationalist ideology in the discrediting of this form which actively dissociates from traditional local forms. The influences of standard language ideology were also referred to. The notion that this form is viewed as inauthentic not only in folklinguistic terms (through media reports) but also by sociolinguists, was discussed (Moore 2011). Advanced Dublin English was then examined in terms of traditional authenticities and Coupland’s typology (Coupland 2003). Finally, the chapter highlighted the conflict between the ‘reality’ of this new pronunciation form as mainstream and thus as having authenticity, and its ideological representation; it was proposed that this conflict might be resolved through new representations of authenticity, as discussed.

The following chapter revisits the factors (outlined in chapter 1, section 1.4) which the study employs in examining the ideological dimension of language choice in radio advertising in Ireland and positions these factors within the context of the relevant literature and theoretical frameworks.
Chapter 3. Frameworks and theories for examining the ideological dimension of language choice in radio advertising

3.1 Introduction

As we have seen in the previous chapters, the research looks at language ideological change in the Irish context through an examination of variety choice in radio advertising in Ireland in the thirty year period from 1977 to 2007. Chapter 2 has established the sociolinguistic and language ideological context of the main variety used in Ireland, that of Irish English, both at an inter-varietal level with regard to how it operates in relation to standard British English and also on an intra-varietal basis in relation to local and non-local accent sub-varieties of Irish English.

As outlined in chapter 1, section 1.4, the language ideological position of a particular society can be manifested through its radio advertising in a number of ways. It may be visible through longitudinal changes in the extent of use and function of variety and sub-variety within the ad (as suggested by its location within the Action or Comment component (Sussex 1989; Lee 1992); furthermore, it can manifest itself through the strategy of the juxtaposing of standard or prestige varieties and sub-varieties in the Comment component of the ad against non-standard or local in the Action, highlighting the status value of the former against the solidarity value of the latter (Lee 1992); in addition, the (changing) indexical values (Gal and Irvine 1995) of particular varieties and sub-varieties can be indicative of the ideological climate; finally, speech accommodation strategies (Giles 1973; Giles, Taylor and Bourhis 1973; Giles, Mulac, Bradac and Johnson 1987) and the related concepts of audience and referee design (Bell
1984), as they relate to the construction of the stereotype of the audience or receivers of the ad, can also be telling in this regard. This chapter situates these factors within the context of the relevant literature and theoretical frameworks. These factors can be categorised broadly according to the ways in which they examine variety choice in advertising. The factors of variety choice and location in terms of ad components together with the juxtaposition of prestige and local varieties and sub-varieties in the ad components are centred around the production of the ad, while accommodation strategies and audience and referee design and the notion of indexicality (in its associations with the characteristics of the implied ‘reader’ or receiver of the ad (Piller 2001)) are reception-oriented in that they are centred on the receivers of the ads.

The chapter is organised as follows. It begins by introducing and defining Bakhtin’s (1981) concept of heteroglossia or multivoicedness, as this concept underpins the theoretical framework of ‘Action and Comment’. It goes on to relate heteroglossia to advertising discourse with reference to relevant research such as Cook (2001) and Piller (2001). As mentioned, the first part of the chapter deals with production related aspects of variety choice which centre largely on the structure of the ad. The notions of advertising as monologic discourse and the concept of ‘voice of authority’ are introduced to preface the discussion of the key framework for this research, that of ‘Action and Comment’ (Sussex 1989, as used by Lee 1992) which relates to the composition of the ad. As Bakhtin found in relation to the novel, the advertisement brings together many discourses or ‘voices’; these ‘voices’ are not only of different accents, dialects and varieties but also of different genres (Cook 2001, p.186). This provides the context for the discussion of ‘Action and Comment’. The division of the ad in terms of the Action and Comment components is based on the genre of the discourse and the location of particular varieties in these components can be indicative of the
function of this variety and can in this way reflect particular language ideologies. The strategy of juxtaposing prestige and local varieties in the Comment and Action components of the ad respectively and the exploitation of contrasting varieties within the ads is discussed. This strategy is related to the concept of indexicality and indexical values and in this way introduces the second part of the chapter which focuses on reception centred aspects of variety choice.

The concept of ‘indexicality’, based on Peirce’s (1893-1913/1998) semiotic categories and relating to the social meaning of linguistic forms (Gal and Irvine 1995, p.972), is discussed and related to the notion of ‘linguistic fetish’ (Kelly-Holmes 2005) in that both are based on symbolic rather than ‘real’ connections or associations. The chapter also looks at how the juxtaposition of variety within the ad can highlight the indexical value of that variety. In addition, the notion of how the indexical value of a particular variety can vary across communities and nationalities is examined.

This concept of the indexical value of particular ways of speaking is related to Piller’s (2001) research on characteristics associated with the implied receiver of the ad. In this way it links with a further framework for analysing variety choice, speech accommodation theories and the related concepts of audience and referee design, a further means by which language ideology may be manifested. As referee design focuses on an absent reference group and thus on a stereotyped rather than an actual audience, it plays a role in the construction of the identity of the implied recipients of the ads through attributing particular characteristics to them. A particular focus on categories of referee design forms an important part of a broader-based examination of theories of accommodation and convergent and divergent linguistic behaviour.
3.2 Heteroglossia and the voices of the advert

The concept of heteroglossia or multivoicedness, as proposed by Mikhail Bakhtin (1981), has been employed in examining the use of language variety in advertising discourse (for example Lee 1992; Cook 2001; Piller 2001; Kelly-Holmes 2005a). Bakhtin defines heteroglossia as ‘The base condition governing the operation of meaning in any utterance…that which ensures the primacy of context over text.’ (Bakhtin 1981, p.428). According to Bakhtin (ibid), words have different meanings depending on the conditions, (for example social or historical), in which they are uttered. Bailey (2007, p.257) provides a useful analysis of the definition of heteroglossia: ‘Heteroglossia addresses (a) the simultaneous use of different kinds of forms or signs, and (b) the tensions and conflicts among those signs, based on the sociohistorical associations they carry with them’. With regard to the first part of the definition, Bailey (2007, p.258) points out that Bakhtin coined the term to refer to intra-language varieties rather than distinct languages, and indeed the original Russian term raznorechie is often translated as ‘the social diversity of speech types’ rather than heteroglossia. The second part of the definition refers to the political and sociohistorical associations as in the Peirician notion of indexicality or social connotations that can be attributed to linguistic forms (ibid). As Bakhtin puts it, ‘Each word tastes of the...contexts in which it has lived its socially charged life’ (Bakhtin 1981, p.293).

Heteroglossia has been used in analysing multilingualism in advertising (for example, Kelly-Holmes 2005a). The appearance of a lexical item from another language in an ad is not designed to serve a direct denotational function, but rather is telling the receiver of the ad about ‘the characteristics and symbols summoned up by those languages in the individual’s own sociolinguistic environment’ (Kelly-Holmes 2005, p.21). As Woolard
(2006, p.87) puts it, ‘The voice is the social intention with which a given echoic linguistic form-in-use or “word” is infused’. Heteroglossia can be associated, not only with different languages but with accent and dialectal varieties in a text (Kelly-Holmes 2005a, pp.20, 108); in this way, the concept is applicable to the present study and the ‘characteristics and symbols’ relate mainly to accent and dialectal variety and sub-variety as opposed to distinct languages.

While heteroglossia can be seen in terms of distinct languages and accent and dialectal varieties in a text, it is also viewed in terms of genre. Cook also employs Bakhtin’s heteroglossia in the context of advertising, describing Bakhtin's concept of voice and voices as the presence or presences which an act of communication evokes. Voices within a given text may be said to be not only the voices of different people but also the voices of different genres. These voices often ‘imply each other’ (Cook 2001, p.186). For example, a party political broadcast requires a politician, a university lecture implies a lecturer and so on. Bakhtin refers to three types of voice: monologic (with one voice); dialogic (with two voices); heteroglossic (with many voices at once). Cook points out that this division suggests a ‘value judgement’ (ibid). In contrast to the more democratic heteroglossic discourse, he sees monologic discourse as an attempt to silence all voices but one and characteristic of a closed, intolerant and authoritarian individual or society. Such monologic discourse could be associated with particular genres, for example, religious dogma. While Bakhtin examined dialogic and heteroglossic discourse at single utterance level, through reported speech and also at discourse level through the study of the parody of medieval carnival and the novel, Cook, however, sees his theories as applicable to the advertising genre.

As Cook argues, while the interplay of voices (of individuals as well as of other genres)
in ads may appear to be heteroglossic (and therefore democratic), it may in fact be
cloaking a monologic discourse where one hegemonic voice dominates all others (Cook
2001, p.188). He shows how television ads may compare with the structure of the novel
(2001, p.190). He compares such ads with examples of narrative techniques from
novelistic discourse; in the first example, the author begins by directly addressing the
reader, followed by a report of the fictional world and then allowing the characters to
speak for themselves. Cook points out that ads may begin and/or finish with a voice-
over, which directly addresses the receiver in making claims. The middle of the ad may
include a fictional situation with perhaps a conversation between the characters. In the
second example of a relatively more recent narrative technique in the novel, the
identities of the voices are more ambiguous and therefore the voice of the author is
unclear and can only be accessed through the voices of the characters. Interestingly,
research by Gisbergen, Ketelaar and Beentjes (2004) confirms an increase in ‘openness’
in advertisements in recent decades, which provide less guidance towards a particular
message, thus requiring the receiver of the advertisement to expend more effort in
interpreting the message. Cook (2001, p.193) concludes that while it is difficult to say
which narrative technique is most similar to that of the ad, due to the fact that there are
many exceptions to more typical formats, in general, in ads, there is

a reluctance to leave matters open, which results, even in the most
heteroglossic ads, in the assertion of a single monologic and
authoritative voice at the end.

(Cook 2001, p.193)

This, he says, leads to ‘a clearer separation of voices’. Cook attributes this to the fact
that a ‘final and closed’ judgement is needed by the receiver of the ad (ibid). In contrast
to the novel in which the voice of the author can be ambiguous, in ads the voice of the
advertiser cannot risk leaving room for ambiguity or interpretation.
Cook’s concept of heteroglossia encompasses the notion of voice as genre, while Kelly-Holmes’ view focuses on the display of different languages as well as accents and dialects (Kelly-Holmes 2005, p.108) in a text. The latter notion of ‘voice’, however, particularly as it relates to accent and dialectal variation within a language, can be said to have an inter-dependency with the former, that is, the concept of genre as ‘voice’. As Maybin puts it in her discussion of Bakhtin’s writings, ‘the kinds of things we say, the way we say them and the evaluations of experience that they carry will vary in the different speech genres we are engaged in over the course of a day’ (Maybin 2001, p.66). Cook’s observation of the Bakhtinian notion of voice as involving a value judgement and the association of the monologic voice as an authoritarian one is significant with regard to variety choice (in terms of accent or dialectal variety or sub-variety) in relation to the authoritative voice of the ad. The choice of accent or dialect to convey the ‘single monologic and authoritative voice’ (Cook 2001, p.193) of the slogan or voice-over of the ad will necessarily have associations with authority, and this choice will inevitably be informed by prevailing ideologies associated with language. This concept will be explored more fully below in relation to ‘voice of authority’ (Piller 2001) and ‘Action and Comment’ (Sussex 1989; Lee 1992).

As we have seen, the voices within a text may not only be those of different people but also those of different genres (Cook 2001, p. 186). Piller refers to Bakhtin’s theory that both speakers and hearers may be present in a text or discourse through a number of ‘voices’ and therefore utterances are never completely original but are connected with voices that have been heard before (Piller 2001, pp.158-159). Cook (2001, p.193) looks at the concept of intertextuality in ads and categorizes the concept as (1) intra-generic intertextuality where, for example, the voice of another ad is contained within a particular ad, assuming that the receivers have knowledge of it and (2) inter-generic
intertextuality, where the voice of another genre is contained in the ad, for example assuming knowledge of a film or story. In a similar vein, Kelly-Holmes (2005a, p.6) refers to Fairclough’s (1992) concepts of manifest and constitutive intertextuality. Manifest intertextuality refers to the form of a text. In the context of advertising, the fact that a particular ad looks like other ads for a similar product and like ads in a particular medium, for example a woman’s magazine, can be said to demonstrate manifest intertextuality. These intertextual links allow the receiver of the ad to build on existing knowledge of these other ads. Constitutive intertextuality refers to the concept of the presence of many other texts or, in Bakhtinian terms, voices, in a particular ad. These texts may relate to societal roles, religion, literature, film, T.V. and so on. The ad will choose its own context such as age, gender, linguistic factors and so on. From this, Kelly-Holmes points out, advertisers can address advertisees who are most representative of their target group on the basis that they share what is referred to by Sperber and Wilson (1986) as ‘common knowledge’. In the Irish advertising context, these ‘voices’ can operate in combination with the ‘voices’ of accent and dialect to achieve the aim of the ad. For example, contexts associated with Irish literature or film or indeed dialectal items associated with characters from Irish literature or film may be exploited in the ads to create solidarity with its audience. Such strategies can be said to reflect nationalist ideology in that, as Wright (2000, p.24) points out, the nation as an ‘imagined’ community can be created through such cultural representations (Wright 2000, pp. 23-24).

3.2.1 Voice of authority

The Bakhtinian notion of voice has been employed in discussing how multilingualism is used in relation to narrators and narratees (or implied recipients) of ads. With regard to the narrators of ads, Piller (2001, p.159) discusses Cook's (1992) reference to the
authoritative voice which occurs at the end of ads (resulting from the need for a 'final and closed' judgement, as discussed in the previous section), as ‘voice of authority’ and points out that it occurs as voice-overs in TV advertisements or as slogans at the bottom of print advertisements. According to Piller (2001, p.160), as slogans are said to be integral to brand identity or philosophy, the language used in the slogan becomes the language that expresses authority and expertise, the central or ‘master voice’ of the ad. This elucidates Cook’s reference to this monologic voice as associated with value judgement through its authoritarian nature. Interestingly, in her study of a corpus of German ads, she finds that it is at this point that language typically switches from German into English. Piller (2001, p.160) observes that given that the body copy and factual information in her corpus tends to be expressed in German, it would appear that the use of English serves a connotational rather than a denotational function. Therefore, the use of English will allow the recipients of the ads to associate their stereotypes of English, of English-speaking individuals and of cultures where English is spoken to the product. These are not necessarily native speakers or native-English speaking cultures, however, but rather a young, cosmopolitan, business associated segment of German society. We have referred briefly in chapter 2 (section 2.4.2) to Piller’s (2001 pp.163-173) identification of a number of characteristics of the narratee or implied reader of the ads in the corpus, examples of which are international orientation, success orientation and sophistication, among others. These findings are discussed further below in relation to indexicality (section 3.3) and also in relation to accommodation strategies and the construction of identity (section 3.4).

3.2.2 Action and Comment

The ‘voices’ of the ad can also be examined in terms of the structure of the ad. Lee (1992 p.173) compares the genre of advertising with that of the novel, claiming that
both are characterised by heteroglossia in that they bring together many different discourses and ways of speaking and incorporate many different genres. He refers to Sussex’s (1989) distinction between the ‘Action’ and ‘Comment’ components of an ad, based on the genre of the discourse. In line with Cook’s observation of a ‘fictional situation’ in the ad, the Action component is comprised generally of dialogic interaction in specific contexts. The Comment component (which names and provides general information on the product), on the other hand, can be equated to the voice-over of the ad as described by Cook and what Piller (2001) terms ‘voice of authority’ (as discussed in the previous section) and tends to be monologic and decontextualised. In the case of his study of a corpus of 108 ads (broadcast in a Swiss-German channel in 1989), Lee observes that the Comment voice ‘articulates with general discourses of power and authority, within which [High German] constitutes the normal or “unmarked” choice in diglossic societies’ (Lee 1992, p.172). This component, Lee tells us, functions as a ‘purveyor of privileged information’ which is a major function of the discourse of power (Lee 1992, pp.172-3). The Action component, on the other hand, is dominated by non-standard Swiss varieties and ‘articulates with discourses of everyday informal interaction’. The notion of the ad in terms of these components resonates with Cook’s view that ‘ads merge the features of public and private discourse, and the voices of authority and intimacy, exploiting the features which are common to these poles’ (2001, p. 220).

A study of Australian television ads by Sussex revealed that the Comment was dominated by ‘educated’ rather than ‘broad’ Australian voices (Sussex 1989, p.165). Lee (1992, p. 183) sees parallels between the tendency to use High German in the Swiss context and that of post-colonial societies to use standard British English. In both situations, the standard variety has prestige but is not ‘the language of the heart and the
emotions’ (*ibid*). This resonates with Bailey’s (2007, p.257) reference to heteroglossia, as referred to in section 3.2 above, as addressing the use of different kinds of forms as well as the tensions and conflicts among them which are derived from sociohistorical associations.

However, Lee points out that the use of non-standard Swiss German is not socially stigmatised in the ads in his corpus, as the Action components are dominated by ‘middle-class’ settings. Lee stresses also, that despite the fact that the standard or high variety dominates with respect to the Comment voice, localised Swiss German varieties are not excluded from this component of the ads. This, he says may be partly attributed to the fact that these varieties have recently become more a feature of domains previously dominated by standard varieties (as in Fairclough’s (1994) concept of the conversationalization of discourse, discussed in chapter 2, section 2.4.1). Lee also observes the use of local varieties in the Comment to be associated with a different range of discourses from those Comment components which are dominated by the more formal High German. In his corpus, for example, the Swiss German voice in the Comment is characterized by a broad discursive range, including mockery, scolding, obsequiousness, complaint, reproach and intimate confidence (Lee 1992, p.175). Therefore, Lee warns of the dangers of seeing the Comment component or voice as a homogenous entity, notwithstanding the finding that the standard variety is preferred in this component.

The concepts of ‘overt prestige’ (associated with status) and ‘covert prestige’ (associated with solidarity) are useful in understanding the contrasting values which are related to the aims of the ads (Lee 1992, p. 179). The notion of overt prestige, proposed by Trudgill (1972), accounts for changes in speech which are above the level of
consciousness and usually in the direction of prestigious linguistic forms, which are said to have ‘overt prestige’. Trudgill distinguishes this from Labov's (1966a) notion of ‘covert prestige’ which refers to his observation that while speakers who use stigmatised linguistic forms are aware of their inferiority, we must suppose that they have a favourable disposition, if only covertly, towards them in order to maintain the approval of their peer group and to indicate group identity. These forms can be said to carry ‘covert prestige’. The aims of the ad, Lee points out, are firstly to create an acceptance of the product through consumer identification with the actors who ‘represent’ the product, partly achieved through the use of local varieties and secondly to sanction the action of purchase through the use of High German and its associations with authority and expertise. Therefore, while acknowledging Lee’s caveat with regard to seeing these components as homogenous entities as discussed above, the location of a particular variety or sub-variety in the Action or Comment component can be an indication of its function within the ad and can provide valuable insights into the language ideologies which direct this strategy.

3.2.3 Juxtaposition of variety within the ad: Exploiting the ‘dialogic contrast of languages’

In addition to exploiting ‘high’ and local varieties in the diglossic context, as discussed above in relation to Lee’s study, the mixing of English and local languages by advertisers has been observed by Piller (2001). In her study of a corpus of German ads, as outlined above, she finds that in the slogan, the language used typically changes from German into English. This strategy enables advertisers, in the words of Bhatia (2000, p.169) to ‘optimize the strength and appeal of their messages’ rather than promoting conflict between local and global values. This has resonance with Bakhtin’s view (Bakhtin 1981, p.364) that ‘the dialogic contrast of languages creates a feeling for these
boundaries, compels one to sense physically the plastic forms of different languages’. Bakhtin sees the use of borrowings from other languages as changing not only the nature of the borrowed words but also of the borrowing language but in a positive way, resulting in ‘not a single language but a dialogue of languages’ (Bakhtin 1981).

It is interesting to apply Bakhtin’s notion of the ‘dialogic contrast of languages’ to accent and dialectal variety as opposed to variety in terms of different languages and to look at this concept in terms of Action and Comment. The contrasting values relating to the twofold aim of the ad, as discussed in the previous section, are linked to prestige and local varieties in Lee’s study. Lee refers to a number of commercials which combine, within the ad, the use of the prestige or standard variety in the Comment with the use of local varieties in the Action, thus optimizing the potential of the diglossic situation (Lee 1992, p.176) and appealing to both status and solidarity related values, as discussed in relation to ‘overt’ and ‘covert’ prestige (Lee 1992, p.179). This notion of standard or prestige or local can also be applied in the context of this study, at the inter-varietal level in relation to standard British English and Irish English and at the intra-varietal level in relation to non-local and local sub-varieties of Irish English, as described in chapter 2, section 2.3.8. In relation to the intra-varietal level, Kelly Holmes (2005a p.123) refers to a series of Irish radio ads for a well-known Irish brand, Brennan’s Bread, which juxtapose an extreme stereotypical representation of local Dublin accent and dialect, in which a dialogue between the narrator (characterised as an employee of Brennan’s bakery) and his boss, ‘old Mr Brennan’ is recounted, against what she refers to as a ‘neutral’ 18 Irish female radio voice in terms of accent (ibid), which is associated with the authoritative voice of the ad (see also Kelly-Holmes 2005b). This strategy of juxtaposing prestige against local varieties or sub-varieties could also be said to display

18 This ‘neutral’ voice is discussed more comprehensively in section 3.3. below
‘the clearer separation of voices’ (Cook 2001, p.193), as discussed above in section 3.2, with the monologic Comment voice gaining strength and authority through its contrast with the less prestigious Action voices and leaving the listener in no doubt as to the overall message of the superficially heteroglossic ad. In the context of the studies cited, Standard German (Lee 1992), English language (Piller 2001) and the non-locally situated or ‘neutral Irish radio voice’ (Kelly-Holmes 2005a) are seen as prestige forms and represent the voice of authority as against more locally associated voices. This juxtaposition within the ad of prestige or standard variety in the Comment with the use of local varieties in the Action can be indicative of the operation of particular language ideologies; while the Action component associates particular varieties with solidarity-related values, the scenario of this component is then interpreted by the Comment, highlighting its more serious role in the ad. This strategy can also be interpreted in terms of the concept of indexicality which is the subject of the following section.

3.3 Indexicality and heteroglossia

As we have seen in section 3.2, Bailey (2007, p.258) defines heteroglossia in terms of its addressing the simultaneous use of different kinds of forms or signs, and the tensions and conflicts among those signs, based on their sociohistorical associations. As discussed, the reference to sociohistorical associations relates to the Peirician notion of indexicality. Indexicality is generally understood as ‘The link between an expression or form and what it meaningfully stands for’ (Coupland 2007, p.22). As we have seen in section 3.2, the concept of ‘voice’ relates to the social intention associated with a particular form or word and it is such intentions, as opposed to linguistic markers, that allow for the distinction among voices (Woolard 2006, pp.87-88). As Woolard (2006, p.86) puts it, ‘Language...is not only heteroglot but also indexical from top to bottom’.
According to Peirce’s semiotic theory (1893-1913/1998), an ‘index’ is a relationship between a sign and its referent, ‘physically connected with its object’. This contrasts with the concept of a ‘symbol’ which is ‘connected with its object by virtue of the idea of the symbol-using mind’ but based on arbitrary associations rather than any natural links between the sign and its referent. In addition, the concept of ‘likeness’ relates to the perception of a natural resemblance between the sign and its referent, but not to a physical connection between the two (ibid). Gal and Irvine (1995, p.972) point out how ideologies ‘recognise’ difference among linguistic practices and work to identify varieties with ‘typical’ persons. Using Peirce’s sign relationships outlined above, they identify three processes by which this occurs. Iconicity refers to the process in which linguistic forms are interpreted as being natural, iconic representations of these groups and as depicting inherent qualities of the group; this leads to the second process, recursiveness, which involves an expansion of a meaning relation. In discussing these concepts, Coupland (2007, p.22) uses the example of how the meaning ‘uneducated speaker’ becomes connected with a particular speech feature. Finally erasure is the process whereby sociolinguistic variation in a group which undermines the iconic analysis of language differences is ignored in order to strengthen the iconic interpretation. These processes, Coupland (2007, p.23) points out, indicate that indexical relationships may change over time. In this way, they can indicate changing ideologies in relation to particular ways of speaking.

Milroy (2004, p.167) refers to Silverstein’s (1992; 2003) distinction between first-order indexicality (the association of a linguistic form or variety with a social group) and second-order indexicality (which relates to awareness, discussion and rationalisation of first-order indexicality). Referring back to Moore’s (2011) discussion of media reports in relation to advanced Dublin English in chapter 2 (section 2.4.4), Moore refers to the
movement away from local accents by the speakers of this form as ‘“first-order” avoidance’ which is itself an ‘unavoidably “second-order” indexical phenomenon. Milroy (ibid) points out that ideologies derive from this second-order indexicality. Therefore, second-order indexicality (the awareness of associations between variety and social group) may lead to the exploitation of first-order indexicality (the association of variety with ‘typical’ persons or groups) manifested in choice of the specific variety in particular contexts.

In discussing indexicality and social meaning Coupland (2007, p.22) points out that a standard language feature can be said to have symbolic meaning as ‘middle-class’ as the link between the two is an arbitrary rather than a natural one. Woolard (2006, p.88) (in discussing codeswitching) highlights how the indexical value (or social intention) of a linguistic form can change; it can be ‘transferred ideologically, not just from context to context, but from context to speaker, or vice versa, and can be transformed in the process’. Therefore, language which is associated with authority in one context can be understood as authoritative in another context. In addition, speakers who use language associated with authority can project themselves as having this trait, and in this way it comes to be ‘real’. However, such ‘authoritative’ language is also open to reanalysis and transformation as, for example, the language of anger or effeminacy (Woolard 2006, p. 88). This resonates with Coupland’s (2009) observation of changing orders of indexicality in relation to standard forms discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.4.1). The notion of shifting indexical values are also illustrated in a study by Bishop et al (2005, pp. 369-370) in relation to the use of the Welsh language in a 150-year sample of consumer ads from a North American Welsh community newspaper. In this sample, the use of Welsh moved from an unmarked code to a marker of intimacy to a ‘display resource’ evoking ‘old Wales’.
The use of languages, accents and dialects as ‘display’ in advertising discourse is examined by Kelly-Holmes (2005a, p.22); she observes that their presence in a text can be used, not only as a means of communication but also as what she terms ‘linguistic fetish’ which relates to symbolic value. She applies Marx’s idea of ‘commodity-fetishism’ to the use of foreign languages or varieties in advertising (Kelly-Holmes 2005a, pp 23-24). Through fetishization, the use value of the commodity (in this case the language or variety) becomes secondary to its symbolic value. As Kelly-Holmes (ibid) observes, while the symbolic value of the variety ‘appears part of the natural order’ it is in fact derived from relations between countries, based on social, political, economic, historical and linguistic factors. This, she says, leads to ‘the separation of essence and appearance’; particular varieties become ‘signifiers of socially and culturally (and commonly shared) meanings’. In this way, such symbolic value can be said to have indexical value. The use of different varieties and accents can be understood as heteroglossia and this heteroglossia, she claims, is in fact a fetish (Kelly-Holmes 2005a, p. 21).

Styles, however, derive their meaning through contrast and difference (Coupland 2007, p. 21). Therefore the indexical value of an accent or dialectal variety may only exist in its relationship with another such variety; for example, in order to have a ‘non-standard’ variety, there must be a ‘standard’ one. Bakhtin observes that ‘An image of language may be structured only from the point of view of another language, which is taken as the norm’ (Bakhtin 1981, p.360). If we view this ‘image of language’ in terms of accent or dialectal variety or sub-variety, the potential symbolic value of the accent or dialect used becomes apparent. As discussed above (section 3.2.3), Kelly Holmes’ (2005a p.123) study of the Brennan's Bread ads show how stereotypical local Dublin accent and dialect is juxtaposed against a ‘neutral’ (in terms of accent) Irish female radio voice
(ibid), as referred to in the previous chapter (section 2.3.8). This ‘neutralized’ voice (Kelly-Holmes 2005a, p.124), in what Sperber and Wilson (1986) refer to as ostension, pronounces and helps to interpret and process new important information. Kelly-Holmes uses the term ‘neutralized’ cautiously, however, in that, as she explains:

Far from being without connotation or association, the [neutral] accent represents the authoritative voice, the voice of education and sophistication. It is the voice that has linguistic capital in the sense that it is to be taken seriously, and …to give credibility …

(Kelly-Holmes 2005a, p.124)

This ‘neutralised’ voice, as it is used in the Brennan’s Bread example, can be seen in terms of Sussex’s Comment component, while the narration of the conversation is positioned in the Action component, in Sussex’s terms. The voice of the Action component is indexical of the traditional Dublin working-class and culture. However, the voice of the Comment, Kelly-Holmes, observes, is not ‘without connotation’; given the fact that this voice indexes speakers who have authority and expertise, it could be said to be exploited in a similar way to that of the English language in Piller’s (2001 pp.163-173) example above, where one of the characteristics of the implied receiver of the ad is that of ‘sophistication’.

However, it is important to recognise that indexical values of particular varieties are not absolute. We have referred above to how the indexical value of a linguistic form can be transformed (Woolard 2006, p.88) over time and across contexts. Language varieties are often ‘differently noticed, rationalized, and evaluated from community to community and from nation to nation’ (Milroy 2004, p.167). The use of ethnocultural stereotyping as an advertising strategy in particular environments relates to such differences. Haarman (1984, p.103) looks at the employment of foreign languages in the context of Japanese advertising. He discusses the significance in modern life of the use of
ethnocultural stereotypes in Japanese advertising and observes a community’s view of
other groups as essential to its self-awareness as a distinct entity. Therefore Japanese
identity is embodied, not only in the Japanese people’s pride in their culture and
language, but also in how they see other nationalities, for example, Americans, Koreans
and so on. Haarman points out that ethnocultural stereotypes supporting a community’s
awareness of its own value systems have been in evidence among ethnic groups even as
far back as the late 18th century before the concepts of ‘nation’ or ‘nationality’ came
about in European thought (Haarman 1984, p.102). In Japan, ethnocultural stereotypes
have undergone minimal change in spite of the Western influence on Japanese lifestyle.
Advertising managers exploit ethnocultural stereotypes in order to raise awareness of a
product, because stereotypes, in that they are familiar to all Japanese people, provide the
largest bank of elements in the minds of people which can usefully serve the purpose of
product awareness-raising. Therefore, ads may be given an English, French, or Italian
‘touch’ to evoke the particular stereotype, thereby emphasising the prestige of the
product (Haarman 1984, p.104). It is interesting that while the Japanese language is
neutral with regard to prestige and to stereotypes, other languages, for example English
and French, are used deliberately to associate a product with a particular stereotype, for
example, English to quality (T.V. sets), reliability (cars, engines) and French to
elegance (fashion) and taste (food). The extent of use of such stereotypes, not only in
advertising products from the country associated with the language, but also in
advertising for Japanese products is indicative of the power of these stereotypes.
Haarman points out that advertising texts using foreign languages evoke such
stereotypes, not alone through using the setting of the country associated with the
language (for example, England or France), but also in Japanese settings in which case
the desired stereotype is evoked through the foreign language elements in spite of the
context or environmental framework (Haarman, 1984, p.105). With regard to the positive reception by the Japanese public of foreign language use in the media, Haarman concludes that, rather than serving a communicative function, such usage is designed to make the receiver feel like a part of a modern, cosmopolitan society achieved through the prestige value of the foreign language. We will discuss this idea further below in relation to accommodation strategies and referee design. However, it is important to note that such associations are, of course, ideologically constructed.

The implications of the indexical value of varieties in advertising are germane to this study’s concern with language ideologies. Notwithstanding the putative benefits to advertisers of mixing languages and exploiting the ‘dialogic contrast of languages’ (Bakhtin 1981, p.364) as discussed in section 3.2.3, Piller (2001, p.173) argues that bourgeois values which centre on social status and prestige are supported through advertising ‘by defining desirability as attached to social status and prestige’. This prestige system, she claims, incorporates multilingualism in modern-day German advertising, often in the form of bilingualism in English, (English in many cases being used as the authoritative voice in the voiceover or slogan of the ad, as discussed). The implied receivers of bilingual advertisements tend to be associated with qualities such as ‘internationalism, future orientation, success and elitism, sophistication, fun, youth, and maleness’ (*ibid*), as referred to in section 3.2.1.

However, even where stereotypes associated with languages are positive, they have been considered as unhelpful in understanding cultural relations, instead serving to define boundaries in ethnic identity. Haarman (1984) suggests that while, on the face of it, language stereotypes comprised of positive features appear to be harmless, the fact that attitudes which derive from these stereotypes do not allow for the evaluation of
other attitudes which do not fit into the framework of the stereotype may impede true understanding of human relations. For example, the use of the French stereotype, while it is often positive, does not enhance our understanding of French culture and society.

Furthermore, the fetishised use of minority languages, accents or dialects may have a negative effect in terms of status (Kelly-Holmes 2005a, p.139). Kelly-Holmes observes that the ‘serious business of advertising information’ is often reserved for the dominant language resulting in ‘commonsense assumptions’ about which varieties can be said to be ‘authoritative’ and ‘non-authoritative’. The fetishization process serves to mystify and make irrelevant the communicative value of the words. The symbolic value of variety, although it appears as an independent entity, is in fact created through social relations between countries, which are mystified and obscured by the process of fetishization (Kelly-Holmes 2005a, p.24). Therefore, the negative potential of heteroglossia may supersede its positive potential (Kelly-Holmes (2005a, p. 139).

The concept of indexicality can be related to the notion of the characteristics of the implied receiver of the ad. For example, in Piller’s (2001) study, the implied receiver of the ads in her corpus were found to be characterised by ‘success orientation’ and ‘sophistication’ among other traits. Therefore, English use in the German context could be said to be fetishized with such characteristics. The construction of the identity of this implied reader is tied in with the theory of referee design, one of a number of theories relating to speech accommodation, and a further means by which language ideology may manifest itself. These theories will be dealt with in the following section of this chapter.
3.4 Speech accommodation theory and audience and referee design

With regard to the advertising message, the role of language choice in achieving social approval and in creating a relationship with the receiver of the communication is key. Researchers in the area of speech convergences in mass communication have employed accommodation theory in seeking to clarify the basis of and motives for convergent (and divergent) behaviour (Lipski 1985; Montgomery 1988; Bell 1991a). While requiring modification in order to be applicable to mass communication, nevertheless Speech Accommodation Theory and its derivative Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) and the related theories of audience and referee design are useful in explaining variety choice in the advertising context together with its ideological associations.

The concept of speech or communication accommodation, which arises from a background of social psychology, and that of audience design from a sociolinguistics background, can be viewed as parallel approaches (Bell 1991a, p.106) and will be used in looking at strategies of convergence and divergences.

The following section examines the origin of and basic concepts on which Communication Accommodation Theory is based. It looks at how this theory can be applied in mass communication, including advertising, and highlights how language choice, as a way of achieving social approval, is an important accommodation strategy and fosters the creation of a relationship with the intended audience. The concepts of audience and referee design are then described and related to both media and face-to-face communication and more specifically to advertising. Key strategies in referee design are examined followed by a brief discussion of the cultural implications of this concept. The relationship between audience and referee design is considered in light of
Bell’s (2001) ‘rethinking’ of the model. Piller’s (2001) view of advertising as ‘constructing identity’ is examined and related to the ‘initiative’ and ‘responsive’ dimensions of audience design. The notion of accommodative strategies in advertising as indicative of ‘the ideological temperature’ of society is considered. Finally the application of the concepts of audience and referee design to the present study is discussed.

### 3.4.1 Communication accommodation theory

The notion of ‘Speech Accommodation Theory’ (SAT) model was proposed by Giles (1973) and encompassed the concept of interpersonal accent convergence and ‘accent mobility’ in an interview situation. The theory proposed that social attractiveness and communication efficiency were the main motivational factors for accommodation. This paradigm challenged Labov’s (1972) theories of prestigiousness of speech styles as being associated with degree of attention paid to speech and degree of formality of context. The theory was further developed through empirical studies by Giles, Taylor and Bourhis (1973) and Giles and Powesland (1975). SAT aimed to clarify the cognitive and affective processes behind speech convergence and divergence. Following on from this, the notion of ‘communication accommodation theory’ (Giles, Mulac, Bradac and Johnson, 1987; Coupland and Giles 1988) developed in order to broaden the focus to include convergences and divergences on nonverbal and discursive levels as well as specific linguistic variables.

The term ‘convergence’ in the context of accommodation theory refers to

> a strategy whereby individuals adapt to each other’s communicative behaviors in terms of a wide range of linguistic-prosodic-nonverbal features including speech-rate, pausal phenomena and utterance length, phonological variants, smiling, gaze and so on

(Giles, Coupland and Coupland 1991, p.7)
Divergence, on the other hand, is defined as ‘the way in which speakers accentuate speech and nonverbal differences between themselves and others’ (Giles et al 1991, p.8). Upward convergence or divergence refers to a shift in the direction of a prestige variety while downward refers to a move towards forms which are seen as being less prestigious, for example a non-standard accent. This relates to the notions of ‘overt and covert prestige’ as discussed in relation to the dual aims of ads (Lee 1992). Giles et al point out that convergence on some linguistic features does not necessarily imply convergence on all dimensions and that convergence on some features and divergence on others may occur at the same time (Giles et al 1991, p.11). Additionally, speakers can ‘hyperconverge’ (Giles 1971, cited in Giles et al 1991, p.13) in the sense that one or both speakers ‘overshoot’ either moderately or to a greater extent. Giles et al (1991, pp.13-14) refer to Giles’ (1980) concept of ‘upward’ and ‘downward crossover divergence’; this relates to a speaker not only moving away from his or her interlocutor towards an opposing reference group, but also demonstrating linguistically a greater identification with that other’s reference group than these others can themselves demonstrate. In the context of this study, the latter type may be illustrated in the use of strong Irish English vernacular to demonstrate identification with local values.

Giles at al (ibid) refer to a distinction between subjective and objective accommodation, as proposed by Thakerar, Giles and Cheshire (1982). Objective accommodation refers to independent measures of convergence or divergence whereas subjective accommodation refers to speakers’ beliefs as to whether convergence or divergence is taking place in their interactions. Thakerar et al (1982) found that in some cases, interlocutors shifted towards their perceptions of where their partners were in terms of speech style, rather than towards their actual speech style. Giles et al (1987 cited in
Giles et al (1991, p.15) developed this notion further and argued that speakers can also converge, not only to where others believe them to be in terms of speech style, but also to where others expect them to be. This is particularly relevant with regard to radio advertising, as speech accommodation can only be based on such perceptions and expectations as regards the speech style of the audience.

Even when the accommodation strategies are ‘on target’, that is they are in line with the linguistic realities, mismatches can occur (Giles et al 1991, p.16) These authors cite Giles and Bourhis’ (1976) study of black West Indian immigrants in Britain whose convergence towards the working-class local white variety was interpreted by local whites, not as convergent, but as moving in the direction of a variety from which they were trying to disassociate themselves. In the relation to the present study, the use of strongly vernacular Irish English to an Irish audience who wish to dissociate from the values associated with local Irish English forms (as discussed in relation to advanced Dublin English in chapter 2, section 2.4.4) may be ‘mismatched’.

Key to understanding communication accommodation theory and how it can be exploited in the context of accent or variety choice in advertising is an examination of the socio-psychological theories from which this model evolved (Giles and Smith 1979). The model has its basis in four main theories described briefly as follows:

*Similarity-attraction theory* (Byrne 1971) proposes that the more similar our attitudes and beliefs are to those of certain others, the more likely it is that we will be attracted to them. Speech convergence is one means of achieving such similarity and hence increasing attraction between the participants. Giles et al (1991, p.19) suggest that the greater the need of the speaker for the social approval of a given other, the greater the degree of convergence there will be. With regard to Irish radio advertising, this suggests
that advertisers in their quest for approval will attempt to converge to the speech practices of their audiences, through the exploitation of Irish English.

*Social exchange process,* as it relates to accommodation theory, proposes that convergence takes place if the perceived costs of such an act are proportionately lower than the rewards anticipated. The rewards for upward convergence may be greater for women than they are for men. A study by Elyan, Smith, Giles and Bourhis (1978, p. 129) found that RP-accented females in Britain are perceived as more competent and as having better communicative skills than those with regional accents. Costs, on the other hand, may be in terms of loss of personal and social identity as well as effort expended. Again, the same study (Elyan et al, 1978) shows that females with RP accents are downgraded as regards social attractiveness and personal integrity. Linguistic behaviours may have multiple social meanings for their recipients, for example, the use of standard forms may be associated with high status while being low on the dimensions of trustworthiness and friendliness (Giles et al 1991, p.21), as in the value dimensions of status and solidarity

*Causal Attribution* process proposes that we interpret other people’s behaviour, and evaluate it according to the motives for their behaviour. Convergence will be positively evaluated by recipients when it is attributed to positive intent on the part of the speaker, that is, the desire to reduce tension. However, if convergence is seen as being motivated by some external pressure, for example, by the perceived desire to exert undue influence on the listener (Koslow et al 1994, p.576), it may not be evaluated positively (Giles et al 1991, p.23). Therefore, accommodation to the speech patterns of the receiver of the ad, in terms of its perceived motivation, cannot always be assumed to be received positively and to be successful with regard to achieving its aims.
The Theory of Intergroup Distinctiveness proposed by Tajfel (1974) has been cited to support the notion of convergence or divergence as a conscious process on the part of the speaker. Intergroup comparisons may lead individual group members to look for features which distinguish them from the outgroup in order to establish the social identity of the ingroup. This ties in with the notions of overt and overt prestige, as discussed above. Based on this theory, advertisers in the Irish context have the option to exploit Irish language lexical items or vernacular Irish English in order to associate with Irish identity.

The accommodation model, however, is viewed by a number of theorists (Giles and Powesland, 1975; Giles and Smith, 1979) as presenting difficulties in relation to its assumption that accommodation is motivated by the desire or need to seek approval. With regard to optimal levels of convergence, in some contexts, full rather than partial convergence may be seen as ‘patronising, condescending, threatening or ingratiating.’ (Giles and Smith 1979, p.54).

Although CAT developed as a reaction to an over-emphasis on the influence of social rules and norms for language use, it does in fact include a role for norms. Gallois and Callan (1991, p. 253) argue that norms put limits on the accommodative moves that are seen as desirable in an interaction. Where the strength of norms is low, violations are not evaluated very negatively, but where norm strength is high, evaluation of violation will be seen as negative. In this case, communicative shifts in order to avoid negative evaluation are more likely to take place.

Accommodation theory has been cited as helpful in understanding consumers’ perception of and reaction to language use in the advertising context (Koslow et al 1994, p.576). The following section focuses on accommodation theory as it applies in
media contexts.

3.4.2 Accommodation theory and the media

Accommodation theory has now been extended for use in examining accommodative behaviour in mass communication including radio and television broadcasting. However, the theory required modifications in order to be applicable in the context of mass-communication. According to the original speech accommodation (SAT) model, the hearer B evaluates the performance of speaker A and A takes Bs feedback into account. B as speaker then takes A’s evaluation into account while also self-monitoring his or her language performance. This model had to be adapted to take into account the shortfalls in relation to absence of production of language by the audience and the delay, poor quality or lack of feedback with regard to mass-communication as opposed to inter-personal communication. In mass communication, speakers can only accommodate to a stereotype of the speech of their audience (Bell 1991b, p.73). Thakerar, Giles and Cheshire (1982) observe, however, that SAT also recognises this in that speakers can often accommodate to their perception of the speech of their interlocutor rather than to the interlocutor’s actual performance, as discussed in the previous section in relation to subjective and mismatched accommodation. In addition, as there is a lack of language production by the audience, communicators must be self-monitoring of their speech performances as in the SAT model described above. This process, in the case of the mass media, involves the moulding of the language performance by professionals such as writers, editors and so on, through their monitoring and modifying of the production of other communicators. In this way, the SAT model actually becomes simplified when applied to mass communication. (Bell 1991b, p.73).
SAT also concerns itself with examining the motives behind such accommodative strategies. Bell (*ibid*) points out that although, with regard to mass communication, many of the SAT communication strategies do not apply, notwithstanding this, we can apply some concepts relating to SAT, for example divergence and convergence, to mass communication. In accommodation theory, identifying the motivations for particular accommodative strategies, for example, approval seeking, is essential, as is the case in mass communication.

Although obstacles, for example in relation to feedback, exist in mass communication, language choice, as a way of achieving social approval, is an important accommodation strategy in mass communication and promotes the building of relationships with the intended audience (Koslow et al 1994). In mass communication, in cases where accommodation to the audience is unsuccessful, the audience will shift to a style that suits them, leaving the communicators with an audience who suit the style but may not in fact be the targeted audience or indeed possibly leaving them *without* an audience (Bell 1991a, p. 107).

In addition, accommodation theory can be useful in examining how consumers in particular cultures or subcultures perceive advertisers and how they respond to the message of the advertiser (Koslow et al 1994). This relates to the *causal attribution* process discussed in the previous section in relation to the theoretical basis of accommodation theory, in which rewards for convergence are evaluated according to the motives for such behaviour. Koslow et al (1994) employ accommodation theory in their investigation of how United States Hispanic (minority subculture) consumers respond to Spanish language usage in advertising. Accommodation theory, rather than hypothesizing that the use of Spanish in advertising targeting Hispanic consumers will
be directly rewarded, proposes two intermediate steps before this can take place. Firstly, the advertiser must be perceived by Hispanic consumers as being aware of and having respect for their culture and secondly that, on the basis of these perceptions, positive affective, cognitive and behavioural responses towards the ads will be achieved (Koslow et al 1994, p.577). Koslow et al refer to the observation by Giles et al (1973) that accommodation theory assumes that, with respect to advertising, the minority subculture consumers feel positively about their language and culture. Koslow et al point out, however, that this is not always the case and cite Haarman (1986) and Platt and Weber (1984) in attributing this to linguistic insecurity and inferiority complexes (ibid). Therefore, the use of the minority language by advertisers may not be seen as being culturally sensitive by the targeted consumer due to such inferiority complexes. Bourdieu’s concept of ‘the institutional circle of collective misrecognition’ (1991, p.153), and Lippi-Green’s (1997 p.68) ‘language subordination process’ are useful in understanding such attitudes. These concepts, discussed in relation to the ideological context for Irish English in the previous chapter (section 2.3.5), attempt to explain how the position of English is strengthened on the linguistic market and how speakers of other languages accept and support discrimination in relation to their own languages to some extent (Bourdieu 1991).

The results of this study by Koslow et al (1994, p.581) reveal that although local variety or language does have some practical function in relaying information to the advertisee, its role is by no means limited to this and its symbolic function is evident from their experiment. The perception of advertisers as being sensitive to Hispanic culture is crucial to Spanish language advertisements’ success as it has a positive and significant influence on affect towards such advertisements. Thus, what these advertisements tell Hispanics about their importance as consumers is more valued by them than their
informational function. Linguistic accommodation is successful in this study in that it recognises Hispanics as both Spanish and English speakers and as both Spanish and American individuals, that is, as having multiple identities. The results suggest that with regard to the optimum amount of Spanish for a positive effect, benefits accrued from even the lowest level of usage and no significant benefit was found with an increase in Spanish language usage (cf Giles and Smith 1979, p.54). Indeed it was suggested that the use of Spanish only may have a negative effect due to the role played by linguistic inferiority complexes. Such inferiority complexes (which can be affected by the strength of ethnic identification and degree of assimilation) may impact on how effective linguistic accommodation in advertising is. In the context of this study, this would suggest that the use of vernacular Irish English as an accommodative strategy needs careful consideration, in light of the potential negative effect of the overuse of such a strategy. The impact of language ideologies is clearly of paramount importance in the creation of such a complex.

3.4.3 Audience and referee design

As we have seen, communication accommodation theory accounts for convergences and divergences on specific linguistic variables as well as nonverbal and discursive levels. In the context of media communication, and in particular, advertising in the media, given its dependency on audience approval, this may involve shifts in the style of speakers in response to their audience. A related theory to account for the style shifts of speakers in both face-to-face and media communication has been proposed by Bell (1984), who puts forward the ‘elegantly simple’ framework of audience design. The framework ‘assumes that persons respond mainly to other persons, that speakers take most account of hearers in designing their talk’ (Bell 1984, p.159). Bell points out that a speaker’s linguistic choices are necessarily based on audience design. He refers to
audience design as the ‘responsive’ dimension of style in which language and social situation are linked, and points out that this theory is used to explain style variation in media language based on factors such as the audience of the medium (1984, p.147; 1991a, pp.126-7). Bell also refers to the way in which the pressure to seek approval grows with audience size and how this is manifest in the importance of the influence of the addressee in mass communication. He cites his 1982 (Bell 1982a) study of how newsreaders on New Zealand radio shifted style according to two different stations aimed at a ‘higher status’ and ‘lower-status’ audience (1984, pp. 171-172).

In examining the motivation of advertisers in the use of linguistic codes from outside their speech community, Bell (1984, p.182) identifies, in addition to the responsive dimension of style, another dimension which he terms the ‘initiative’ dimension; in this dimension, the shift in style leads to, rather than results from, a change in the situation. Initiative style shifts are, in effect, what Bell terms ‘referee design’; this concept is dealt with more fully below.

The audience design framework is relevant to the present study in a number of its features which can be summarised as follows (Bell 1997, pp. 243-248).

Style is designed primarily for and in response to audience. Audience design is usually demonstrated where speakers shift style or converge in order to be more like that of their audience. In this way, style shift is based on response but is actively rather than passively so. However, given that the need for social approval has been cited as one of the motivational factors in accommodation theory (Giles et al 1991) as we have seen in section 3.4.1, the notion of style for the audience is questionable (Coupland 2007, p. 80). This is particularly relevant in the advertising context in which the communication of the advertising message could be seen as more important for the advertiser than the
advertisee. Audience design applies to all codes and levels of a language repertoire, involving features such as language choice in monolingual and multilingual contexts, terms of address or personal pronouns, politeness strategies and use of pragmatic particles.

Style variation within the speech of an individual speaker derives from variation on the ‘social’ dimension. Historical differences in the language of different groups gave rise to particular styles and these styles, due to their association with the language of certain groups, hold a particular social meaning.

As well as the ‘responsive’ dimension of style, of particular relevance to the advertising context is the ‘initiative’ dimension, as referred to above, in which the shift in style initiates rather than results from a change in the situation. In responsive style shift, shifts in social situation may cause a shift in style, based on what is appropriate in terms of the norms of the speech community. Initiative style shifts exploit the association between language and social situation. Language itself influences the situation. Therefore, bilingual speakers may switch from their local language to a prestige language in an argument with a family member. In this type of style shift, speakers use the resources available to them from outside their speech community (for example, socio-economic, ethnic or age groups), other regions or other times (Bell 1991a, p.128) in a creative way. Bell (1997, p.248) cites the work of James Joyce and Tolkien with regard to this ‘stylization’ (Bakhtin 1981, cited in Bell 1997, p.248) in which other dialects or languages are used to create a unique voice.

Initiative style shifts are in essence ‘referee design’ by which the linguistic features associated with a group can be used to express identification with that group. Essential to the effectiveness and orientation of initiative style shifts is their associations with
particular types of individuals or groups. With referee design, talk is designed to focus on an absent reference group or model and therefore a stereotyped rather than actual recipient of the communication. Addressees are treated as someone else (for example, someone from a different socio-economic group), which Bell refers to as the ‘referee’. Referees are third parties who, though absent from the interaction, are sufficiently important to influence style while not being physically present. In effect, the identity of the speaker in relation to his audience is redefined by the speaker himself. The effect of referee design is to make the speaker shift style as if speaking to a referee group member. Bell gives the example of the use of ‘Upper British’ variety in New Zealand TV ads to suggest associations with ‘gracious, upper-class living’ (1991a, p. 139).

Interestingly, Fairclough (2001 p.41) also discusses this concept of the ‘absent’ audience and refers to the absent audience as the ‘ideal subject’. In other words, as producers of media discourse cannot know who their audience is comprised of and furthermore cannot cater to such a diverse audience, they must design their discourse with some receivers in mind, that is the ‘ideal subject’ with which the actual receivers must negotiate a relationship. The way in which the variety associated with this ‘ideal subject’ or ‘referee’ reflects particular language ideologies is key to the present study.

3.4.4 Referee design in media and face-to-face communication

Referee design has been categorised as applicable to both media and face-to-face communication in the following ways (Bell 1991a, pp.128-129): The speaker may be a member of the referee group (ingroup referee design), intensifying his or her normal speech patterns for a particular occasion, or may not belong to the referee group (outgroup referee design); the addressee may also be a member of either the ingroup or outgroup; referee shift, though by its nature short term, can in some cases be more long
term; it may occur in isolated contexts or in intra or inter-group situations; referee design generally involves linguistic divergence, with a shift away from the speech patterns of the addressee; however, it may sometimes converge towards the speech patterns of the addressee; the repertoire of the speaker may be monolingual, diglossic or bilingual and thus referee design may impact the speaker’s repertoire in different ways; the shift towards the referee may be accurate or inaccurate.

The referee design framework makes an essential distinction between ingroup and outgroup referees (Bell 1991a, p.129). Two types of ingroup referee design are identified; firstly the speaker shifts to an extreme version of his or her own ingroup style with an outgroup addressee. In this case, the speaker is taking the initiative in not identifying with the addressee so as to identify with an absent referee. The second type of ingroup referee design involves addressees from the speaker’s own ingroup. The speaker appeals to his or her solidarity with the addressee based on a common language or dialect which is not shared by the outgroup. Therefore, for example, the use of dialectal features of Irish English in the Irish radio advertising context could be understood as an example of ingroup referee design.

With outgroup referee design, speakers diverge from the speech patterns of their ingroup to the linguistic code and identity with which they wish to identify and which holds prestige for them for a particular purpose. The fact that there is consensus between the interlocutors on the prestige of the outgroup language for the particular purpose renders it powerful. In the case of conversation, the shift can only be short term as prolonging it would be in breach of the conversational norm or could even involve a change in the nature of the relationship away from that of an intimate one. However, Bell points out that outgroup referee design, in contrast to other types of initiative shift,
can be long term and refers to diglossia as characteristic of this phenomenon. In this case, the high form belongs to an external referee whose society and culture is regarded as superior by the group in question. As both speaker and addressee have such a common reference point, the shift to the referee code can be more long term and widespread but may also be limited to particular settings, topics or genres. This is illustrated in the use of High German in Switzerland for formal media genres and Swiss German in less formal genres (Burger 1984 cited in Bell 1991a, p.130), as discussed in relation to Lee’s (1992) study in section 3.2.2. Bell’s 1982 study (cited in Bell 1984, p. 172), referred to above, in which newscasters on New Zealand radio used RP for the higher status radio station, illustrates the concept of this common reference point well. As Bell (ibid) points out, the newscasters on the higher status station are in fact shifting away from the actual speech of their audience to an external, ‘ideal’ referee, the RP (or SSBE) speaker. However, because the audience of this station sees RP as appropriate for the context of broadcast speech, this divergence is seen by both the radio station and the audience in terms of positive accommodation or as Thakerar et al (1982, cited in Bell 1984 p.171) ‘linguistic divergence motivated by psychological convergence’. This resonates with Haarman’s (1984) discussion of the positive reception of audiences to the employment of foreign languages in Japanese advertising, as discussed in section 3.3 above.

The lack of direct feedback in referee design (except in the cases of ingroup referee design in which the speaker will know the language or variety) is seen as problematic for the performance of the speaker due to the absence of the referee from the audience and consequent lack of an adequate model of outgroup speech; this can lead to inaccurate referee design. This raises questions with regard to the ways in which identification with external reference groups can be expressed; for example, the kind of
linguistic items which represent referee design and whether they come from discourse, phonology, syntax, lexicon or other levels of language. In addition, the question as to whether native-like competence in the target variety is necessary for successful referee design is an interesting one (Bell 1991a, pp.134-135). These questions will be revisited in the next section.

3.4.5 Referee design in advertising

The structure of broadcast advertisements can be said to simulate referee design conditions; they are short; they have an initiative function, that is to persuade, challenge and capture the attention of the audience; distance or intimacy of relationship is demonstrated through the language used. Multilingualism is exploited in the mass media in order to provide an association of a product with a particular value (Bell 1991a, pp.135-136). Bell refers to Haarman’s study (1984; 1986) of Japanese adverts and gives the example of the use of English and French as ‘content’ languages in Japanese advertisements. Consensus between advertiser and advertisee on the prestige of certain dimensions of such languages means that the advertisee is not alienated, nor is his or her identity threatened. This concurs with Bell’s (1982) study cited above in which the use of RP was seen as positive accommodation by the audience of the higher status radio station.

Bell (1991a, p.137) describes his study of a sample of 150 advertisements from New Zealand TV in 1986 which illustrates audience design as well as three of the four referee design categories; ingroup referee design to ingroup audience through association of the product with ingroup values through the use of strong local dialect; short term outgroup referee design through the use of non-native dialects, for example British or American; long-term outgroup shift in a specific genre illustrated in the fact
that singing contains traces of American accent. The fourth category of ingroup design to outgroup audience is not in evidence as the audience is a NZ English ingroup. Interestingly, in light of the present study, he found that what he classes as ‘Upper British’ and ‘Upper NZ’ (New Zealand) were used in authoritative claims and voiceovers.

Returning to Bell’s (1991a, pp.134-5) questions, as referred to in the previous section, regarding the ways in which identification with external reference groups can be expressed, referee design was found in Bell’s study to involve the use of phonological, lexical, syntactic and discourse features, but not equally (Bell 1991a, p.140). Discourse and syntactic markers were not at all as frequently used as lexical and phonological markers (see also Van Gijsel, Speelman and Geeraerts 2008)). Lexical items were used to show ingroup identity. However, he found that the advertisements appear to have been designed in order to maximize the use of phonological features, which was the most common strategy found. Bell observes that while phonological differences in dialects are displayed mainly in the vowel systems, in his study it is ‘the consonants [which] do much more than their share of work’, for example in the portrayal of working-class London dialects, stereotypical ‘Cockney’ phonological features were employed. (1991a, p.141). With referee design, Bell claims, the strategy is to focus on individual occurrences of important variants rather than evaluating it on a quantitative basis. Successful referee design employs the strategy of repetition of a small number, or even just one variant. In the context of the present study, the occurrence of non-rhotic /r/ could therefore be indicative of outgroup referee design, even if other RP or SSBE-associated features are not displayed (1991a p.143).

With regard to accuracy of production of dialect or language, this appears not to be
crucial to success of referee design, but rather the perception by the addressees of that production and whether or not it is suggestive of the intended reference group. Therefore a badly reproduced Spanish accent, for example, can be just as effective as a referee strategy as that of a standard native speaker if it conjures up an association with the particular reference group (Bell 1991a, p.144).

In looking at the cultural implications of referee design, the use of external languages or dialects in advertising can often be attributed to a colonial history and is demonstrated through ‘linguistic colonialism’ (Bell 1991a, p.145) where the external referee code is seen as prestigious and the local as inferior. This affects attitudes to language which are in turn echoed in media usage and in more explicit media commentary on language. Bell observes how ‘it has taken New Zealand broadcasting many years to start realizing that “this isn’t the BBC” ’, citing the example of how announcers spoke with an accent close to RP in prestige New Zealand radio and TV broadcasts in the 1980s (see Bell 1982b). He notes, however, that in recent times there has been a tendency towards US accents. Notwithstanding this change, he claims that in cases where advertisers have the option to select a particular variety with which to link their product, British varieties are often selected over US dialects.

As discussed in section 3.4.2, in media communication, speakers can only respond to a stereotypical representation of the target audience (Bell 1991b, p.73). This leads to the question as to whether media language can be considered as audience or referee design. Bell points out that, in some senses, all media language can be regarded as referee design (Bell 1991a, p.146). As the media audience is always absent (in terms of direct face-to-face communication), there is a lack of genuine feedback and therefore the speaker must design his or her talk based on an ‘ideal’ or stereotypical audience. The
language of the communicator creates a relationship as opposed to responding to a relationship that already exists. However, Bell suggests that media communication differs from referee design and finds more common ground with audience design in that the mass audience are in fact, receivers of the communication, albeit not in a face-to-face situation.

In reviewing his audience design theory, however, Bell (2001, p.147) suggests that the concept of referee design and its relationship to audience design is the element of the model which is ‘in most need of serious rethinking’ He points to the need for a framework which acknowledges the extent to which our interpersonal linguistic behaviour show discernible patterns (audience design), but also one which acknowledges how we represent our linguistic identities through the ‘creative and dynamic’ choices we make, in particular with those salient others with whom we are interacting (referee design) (2001, p.165). Bell points out that his original theory of referee design was problematic in that it was difficult to determine the boundary between audience design and referee design or the shift from responsive to initiative mode. His reworking of the theory proposes that the initiative and response dimensions of style are ‘complementary and coexistent’ and ‘operate simultaneously’ in speech events. While we design our talk for our audience, we are simultaneously designing it in relation to other referee groups, including that of our own ingroup. Referee design may still be viewed in a sense as a derivative of audience design, given that the impact of style in referee design is determined by the normative use of style in a particular context. However, audience and referee design are better viewed as ‘concurrent, pervasive processes’ rather than the latter being viewed as an ‘add-on’ to the audience design concept. This means that stylistic analysis needs to be both quantitative and qualitative. While audience design is more amenable to quantitative analysis due to its
more long-term nature, referee design may occur in just one salient feature, as discussed above, and therefore qualitative analysis may be more appropriate (Bell 2001, p.167). Notwithstanding this, Coupland (2007, p.76) warns that in either case it is important not to over-depend on quantitative data in interpreting the ‘intensity’ of social meaning; this highlights the importance of contextualisation which demands a qualitative approach. This is discussed in chapter 4, section 4.4 in relation to the present study.

It is important, therefore, to apply both audience and referee design frameworks to analyses; regular patterns are more likely to be interpreted as audience design while movements away from these patterns may be interpreted as referee design (Bell 2001, p.166). Bell (ibid) observes the recognition of the pervasiveness of both initiative and responsive dimensions of language use in the work of other researchers whose frameworks and approaches to style can be seen in terms of both of these dimensions (Bakhtin 1981; Blom and Gumperz 1972; Myers-Scotton 1993; Rampton 1995; Coupland 2001b). With regard to one such approach, Bakhtin’s (1981) concept of Style and Stylization, the former corresponds to the responsive dimension and the latter to the initiative dimension. The concept of stylization and authenticity as discussed by Coupland (2001a; 2007) has been examined in chapter 2 (section 2.4.3), in relation to the ideological construction of authenticity.

Referee and audience design can also be seen in some ways as having a symbiotic relationship. The role of the media in constructing contemporary cultural identities, often based on being part of the global consumer market, has been highlighted (Piller 2001, p.155). Piller claims that advertising discourse is crucial in the construction of such identities. As discussed in section 3.3 in relation to indexicality, Piller (2001, p. 163) examines the characteristics of the implied (German-English bilingual) reader in
her corpus of German bilingual advertisements. She observes that despite the fact that receivers of such ads do not have uniform identities, they tend to be perceived in the realm of advertising with at least some if not all of these attributes (2001, p.173). Relating Piller’s study to audience and referee design, we could say that the language of such German advertising has an ‘initiative’ dimension in that it creates a relationship with its audience rather than responding to a pre-existing relationship. In effect, this ‘initiative’ dimension could be said to be instrumental in the construction of identity as discussed above. In other words, by addressing the target mass audience as if they have the particular attributes outlined above, such advertising discourse is, in effect, playing a vital role in constructing the identities of successful middle-class Germans. Such advertising can also have a ‘responsive’ dimension in that, having helped in constructing this particular identity for its audience, it responds to the characteristics which are part of this identity.

3.4.6 Audience design and referee design in the Irish radio advertising context

In his 1986 study, Bell (1991a, p. 138) finds that a substantial proportion of the ads exploit an audience-designed style which he classes as ‘mainstream New Zealand media speech’ as against ‘Upper New Zealand’, the style used by newsreaders on national TV and radio. In the context of this study, notwithstanding Bell’s (2001, p. 165) more recent view of audience and referee design as ‘complementary and coexistent’, it is important to examine what variety can be termed as audience design as opposed to referee design. As Bell argues, while we design our talk for our audience, we are simultaneously designing it in relation to other referee groups, including that of our own ingroup. This suggests that within a given ad, more than a single strategy in relation to accommodation may be in evidence. Bell (2001 p. 167) points out that regular patterns of linguistic behaviour are more likely to be associated with audience design while
deviations from these patterns may be interpreted as referee design.

With regard to the audience for the ads, we need to consider the radio station on which the ads were aired. While up to 1979, RTÉ\textsuperscript{19} radio 1 was the national broadcaster’s only English language radio channel available in the Irish republic, RTÉ Radio 2, with a focus on popular music and chat, was launched in that year; this established RTÉ Radio 1 as the more serious channel, covering news, current affairs, music, drama and variety features, agriculture, education, religion and sport (see chapter 4, section 4.2). As all the ads from the corpus were aired on this station, its more serious nature suggests a more conservative and mature audience than that of Radio 2. Broadly speaking this audience could be associated with the supraregional southern speaker of Irish English. Similarly, the subgroup of people who work on these ads as presenters or actors could be said to belong to an ‘educated’ and professional class associated with this variety. This is, of course, a generalisation and does not take into account other audiences for this channel, for example the farming population, often associated with a conservative vernacular quite distinct from the supraregional southern variety. However, as the supraregional southern variety is the more traditional conservative mainstream variety, we can, in general terms, take this style as broadly indicative of an audience design style while deviations from it can be regarded as referee design.

Bell (1991a, p.146) refers to Vestergaard and Schroder’s (1985, p.121) observation that advertising functions as a way of ‘taking the ideological temperature’ of society and points out that referee design is a useful concept for social and cultural research. He observes how in his study, British dialects were chosen by advertisers to associate with particular products, thus reflecting high prestige for an image based on British cultural

\textsuperscript{19}Raidió Teilifís Éireann, Ireland’s national broadcaster (see chapter 4, section 4.2)
norms. Therefore advertising can serve as an effective gauge of the prevailing ideologies in a society and changes in such ideologies. This is illustrated in the study by Bishop et al (2005) (referred to in section 3.3) of the use of the Welsh language in a 150-year sample of consumer ads from a North American Welsh community newspaper. In this study, the categorisation of the Welsh language as ‘ingroup’ remains constant throughout the 150 years; however, the way in which it is ideologised changes over time (2005, pp.373-374).

With regard to the present study, the way in which strategies of convergence and divergence are employed in Irish radio advertising can also serve as a gauge of the ‘ideological temperature’ of Irish society through the decades to which the corpus relates. Whether the authoritative voice of the ad is associated with an audience designed style or that of an ingroup or outgroup referee will be informed by ideologies relating to language. For example, the advertiser may wish to attempt to sanction the act of purchase of the particular product by means of an ‘intelligent’ and ‘educated’ voice. The options available in the context of advertising in Ireland may be non-local Irish English, for example supraregional southern (audience design), local Irish English, for example local Dublin (ingroup referee design in that it is an intensified form of Irish English) or SSBE (outgroup referee design). The choice of referee design (SSBE or local Irish English) as opposed to audience design (supraregional southern) or the choice of an outgroup referee (SSBE) as opposed to an ingroup referee (local Irish English) is based on associations of the particular variety or sub-variety with particular traits, such as education and intelligence, which in turn is driven by the operation of language ideologies. As Bell points out, in mass communication, speakers can only accommodate to a stereotype of the speech of their audience. Therefore, both audience and referee design are necessarily based on stereotypical models of the audience and the
referee. The constructions of such stereotypes are informed by the prevailing language ideological climate.

### 3.5 Summary and conclusions

This chapter has examined frameworks and theories employed in the study in analysing variety choice in radio advertising in Ireland. The first part of the chapter focused on production-related aspects of variety choice which centre largely on the structure of the ad. Bakhtin’s (1981) concept of heteroglossia or multivoicedness was discussed in relation to ‘voice’ as accent and dialectal varieties in a text (for example, Kelly-Holmes 2005a) as well as ‘voice’ in terms of genre (for example, Cook 2001). These ‘voices’ are related in that, as Maybin (2001, p.66) points out, ‘the way we say [things]’ varies within the particular speech genre. The concept of voice as genre has also been examined in relation to that of intertextuality which is based on ‘common knowledge’ (Sperber and Wilson 1986). We have seen that while ‘the voices’ of broadcast ads may be compared with the heteroglossia of the novel, this heteroglossia may in fact be concealing a monologic discourse in which one voice dominates, given the nature of the ad and the need for a final, closed judgement (Cook 2001, p.193). This monologic voice can be related to Piller’s (2001) concept of ‘voice of authority’.

The notions of accent and dialect and genre as ‘voices’ of the ad were brought together through a key framework for analysing variety choice in the study, that of ‘Action and Comment’ (as used by Lee 1992). The division of the ad in terms of the Action and Comment components (Sussex 1989) is based on the genre of the discourse and the location of particular accent and dialectal varieties in these components can indicate the function of this variety. In Lee’s (1992) study, the Comment component (which is generally monologic and decontextualised) is associated with discourses of power while
the Action (generally comprising context based scenarios) is associated with everyday interaction. These components can be said to appeal to the dual aims of the ads with regard to status (sanctioning the act of purchase) in the Comment and solidarity (identification with the actors who represent the product) in the Action. These aims are related to the notions of overt and covert prestige (Trudgill 1972). The position of the variety within the particular component can therefore reflect its function in the ad in terms of its association with the authoritative voice or that of informal day-to-day interaction.

The strategy of juxtaposing prestige and local varieties in the Comment and Action components of the ad respectively, and the exploitation of contrasting varieties within the ads was discussed in terms of its potential to appeal to the ‘dual aims’ of the ad as related to the dimensions of status and solidarity (Lee 1992). This strategy can be seen in positive terms as exploiting the ‘dialogic contrast of languages’ (Bakhtin 1981) and allowing advertisers, to ‘optimize the strength and appeal of their messages’ (Bhatia 2000, p.169, cited in Piller 2003, p.176). This juxtaposing within the ad of prestige or standard variety in the Comment with the use of local varieties in the Action can also, however, be indicative of the operation of particular language ideologies in which the standard is the one which interprets the ad, thus reinforcing the ‘monologic voice’ in the overall message of the ad.

The chapter then directed its focus to an examination of reception-centred aspects of variety choice; the concept of ‘indexicality’ based on Peirce’s (1893-1913/1998) semiotic categories, relates to the social meaning of linguistic forms and the association of such forms with ‘typical’ persons in order to account for variation (Gal and Irvine 1995, p.972). This concept was discussed in relation to ‘linguistic fetish’ (Kelly-Holmes
both concepts being based on symbolic rather than ‘real’ connections or associations.

The importance of contrast and difference in giving meaning to particular styles was highlighted (Coupland 2007, p.21). This was illustrated through Kelly Holmes’ (2005a; 2005b) study of ads for Brennan's Bread, in which stereotypical and fetishized local Dublin accent and dialect (connoting a ‘working class’ speaker) is juxtaposed against a ‘neutral’ Irish female radio voice (connoting an educated and sophisticated speaker). Therefore, the indexical value of an accent or dialectal variety can be highlighted through its juxtaposition against another variety. In addition, the observation by Milroy (2004, p.167) of how language varieties are ideologised in different ways across communities and nationalities was considered with reference to Haarman’s (1984, p.103) examination of ethnocultural stereotyping as an advertising strategy through the employment of foreign languages in the context of Japanese advertising. Although ethnocultural stereotypes associated with languages may be positive, they are viewed as unhelpful in understanding cultural relations. Similarly, the fetishized use of minority languages, accents or dialects may have a negative effect in terms of the status of the variety (Kelly-Holmes 2005a, p.139). Therefore, the negative potential of heteroglossia may supersede its positive potential.

The concept of indexicality was discussed in relation to the notion of the characteristics of the ‘implied receiver’ of the ad (Piller 2001) in that a particular variety can be said to index speakers who have particular traits, for example sophistication, success orientation and so on.

The construction of the implied receiver of the ad relates to the theory of referee design, one of a number of theories relating to speech accommodation, and a further means by
which language ideology may manifest itself. Speech accommodation theories and the related concepts of audience and referee design formed the second reception-centred aspect of variety choice discussed in the chapter. The origin and theoretical basis for Communication Accommodation Theory (Giles 1973; Giles, Mulac, Bradac and Johnson, 1987; Coupland and Giles 1988) was examined. The concepts of upward and downward convergence or divergence (Giles et al 1991, p.11) were related to the notions of ‘overt and covert prestige’ as discussed in relation to the dual aims of ads (Lee 1992); different strategies in relation to accommodation were discussed. The discussion looked at how accommodation theory can be applied in mass communication, including advertising, and outlined the limitations in this respect, for example, the fact that in media contexts, speakers can only accommodate to a stereotype of their audience and also the lack of audience feedback (Bell 1991b). The discussion also highlighted how language choice, in achieving social approval, is an important accommodation strategy, promoting the creation of a relationship with the intended audience, and therefore applicable in mass communication contexts. In addition, accommodation theory can be useful in examining how consumers in particular cultures view advertisers and how they respond to the message of the advertiser (Koslow et al 1994).

The concepts of audience and referee design were also introduced. Bell (1991a) points out that a speaker’s linguistic choices are based on audience design, which he refers to as the ‘responsive’ dimension of style and is used to explain style variation in media language based on the media audience. ‘Referee design’ is identified as the ‘initiative’ dimension of style in which the shift in style leads to rather than results from a change in the situation. Talk is designed with reference to an absent reference group or model and therefore a stereotyped rather than actual receiver of the communication.
The referee design framework was examined in terms of its distinction between ingroup and outgroup referees (Bell 1991a, p.129). In the case of ingroup referee design, the speaker may shift to an extreme version of his or her own ingroup style with either an outgroup addressee or one from his or her own ingroup, in the latter case appealing to his or her solidarity with the addressee based on a common language or dialect which is not shared by the outgroup. With outgroup referee design, speakers diverge from the speech patterns of their ingroup to the style with which they wish to identify and which holds prestige for them for a particular purpose. The existence of consensus between the speakers and addressees on the prestige of the outgroup language for the particular purpose, however, means that it is seen as positive (Bell 1984 p.171).

The discussion highlighted how broadcast advertisements can be seen in terms of referee design in that they have an initiative function, in terms of persuading, challenging and getting the attention of the audience (Bell 1991a). Bell found that referee design was achieved mainly through phonological elements and that accuracy of production is not essential for successful referee design but rather whether it is suggestive to the audience of the intended reference group. The use of outgroup referee design in terms of the use of external varieties in advertising is sometimes demonstrated through ‘linguistic colonialism’ (Bell 1991a, p.145) where the external referee code is seen as superior and the local as inferior due to a colonial history.

Bell’s (1991a p.146) considerations of media language as referee design or audience design were outlined. At one level, all media language can be seen as referee design; as the media audience is always absent, the speaker can only accommodate to a stereotypical audience and therefore create a relationship as opposed to responding to a relationship that already exists. However, to the extent that the media audience do in
fact receive the communication, it can be seen as audience design. However, Bell’s (2001) ‘rethinking’ of the theory proposes that the initiative and response dimensions of style are ‘complementary and coexistent’ in that we design our talk for our audience and in relation to other referee groups simultaneously. Regular patterns of speech, he claims, are more likely to be interpreted as audience design while movements away from these patterns may be interpreted as referee design. Bakhtin’s (1981) concept of Style and Stylization was cited as one of a number of examples of how researchers recognise the occurrence of both initiative and responsive dimensions of language use; style corresponds to the responsive dimension and stylisation to the initiative dimension (Bell 2001). With regard to the present study, as the supraregional southern accent sub-variety is the more traditional conservative mainstream variety, it was established as broadly indicative of an audience design style with deviations from it regarded as referee design.

The notion of advertising as ‘constructing identity’ (Piller 2001) was discussed in relation to the ‘initiative’ and ‘responsive’ dimensions of audience design in terms of a ‘symbiotic’ relationship; while the initiative dimension (referee design) helps to construct audience, having constructed this identity for the audience, the response dimension (audience design) responds to this newly constructed identity.

With regard to the present study, the potential of accommodation and audience and referee design strategies in advertising to serve as a measure of the ‘ideological temperature’ (Vestergaard and Schroder 1985) of Irish society was considered in terms of the association of the authoritative voice of the ad with an audience designed style or that of an ingroup or outgroup referee. The stereotypical models on which the audience and the referee are based are informed by the language ideological climate.

This chapter concludes our review of literature relevant to the study. The following
chapter describes the research methodology employed in the study.
Chapter 4. Methodology: Context and description

4.1 Introduction

This research is concerned with the issue of language ideological change in the Irish context. The study questions the extent to which language ideologies and language ideological change are visible in variety choice in radio advertising in Ireland in the final decades of the twentieth and the early part of the twenty first century. It attempts to address this question through the analysis of variety choice in a radio advertisement corpus in terms of a number of factors through which the operation of particular language ideologies may be manifested (as outlined in chapter 1, section 1.4 and discussed in chapter 3) This analysis is carried out at both inter-varietal (in relation to different languages exploited in the corpus as well as broad varieties of English) and intra-varietal levels (in relation to sub-varieties of Irish English) and uses a mixed method approach, combining both quantitative and qualitative components. This chapter describes the radio advertisement corpus on which the study is based and the methodology for the analysis of this corpus. In order to establish the context for the study, it begins with a brief account of the history and background of Irish radio advertising. It goes on to describe the source of the radio advertisement corpus on which the study is based and to provide a brief economic and social backdrop to the decades spanned by the corpus. This is followed by a description of the corpus itself, and the compilation process employed. The research approach and the rationale for a longitudinal study based on quantitative and qualitative methods are established with reference to the research questions posed by the study. The basis for the identification and classification of variety, with reference to particular features, both phonological and
dialectal, are outlined. The tables relating to the specific sub-corpora which are used for the quantification of the features are explained. The processes for the quantitative analysis are described and explained with reference to the research questions. The approach to the qualitative analysis is outlined and, as with the quantitative analysis, the basis for this analysis in terms of the research questions is described.

4.2 Radio advertising in Ireland: Background and history

Radio broadcasting in Ireland began in the 1920s with the Dublin station 2RN; however, advertising on this medium did not establish itself until the 1930s. Initially, 2RN had negligible revenue from advertising and in practice was similar to the BBC model which was dependent on licence fee revenue (Oram 1986, p.506). Following examples from continental radio stations, sponsored programmes were introduced in 1930. Raidió Éireann was established in 1938, and despite initial suspicions of advertising by the Raidió Éireann authorities, it became an important means of earning revenues for the broadcasting station. Although advertising declined in the years of World War 2 due to goods shortages, the sponsored programmes resumed after the war. Most of these programmes were associated with national brands (Oram 1986, p. 541).

Raidió Teilifís Éireann (RTÉ) was established in 1960, and Radio Éireann was transferred to the new authority, which was also responsible for the new television service (*Telefís Éireann*); both the radio and television services became known as RTÉ in 1966. The sponsored programmes reached their peak between 1950 and 1970. After this, the old format of 15 minute programme slots was replaced by ‘strip’ programming and longer programme slots (Oram 1986, pp.502-555) and advertising by means of the sponsored programmes was replaced by all spot advertising, following the lead of Radio
Luxembourg. As the earliest sub-corpus of ads used in this study is from 1977, the ads which make up the research corpus come under the classification of spot advertising.

Although Raidió Teilifís Éireann (RTÉ) now has several terrestrial and digital-only channels, up to 1979, RTÉ radio 1 was the broadcaster’s only English language radio channel available to listeners throughout the Republic. With the advent in 1979 of the popular music and chat channel, RTÉ Radio 2 (later RTÉ 2FM), Radio 1 was established as the more serious channel, providing coverage of news, current affairs, music, drama and variety features, agriculture, education, religion and sport; broadcasting on this channel was predominantly in English although the Irish language was used to a limited extent in certain programmes and features.

Turning more specifically to focus on the radio ads themselves and the voices employed in these ads, changing trends in the use of voiceovers in advertising in Ireland have been noted in recent years. Oram (2010) refers to Noel Storey of Beacon Studios who points out that while in the 1990s, 90 per cent of voiceovers were done by 10 per cent of the available voiceover professionals, this is no longer the situation. In the advertisement corpus, this is borne out by the fact that the voices of well known radio and TV personalities are employed, particularly in the earlier sub-corpora. Oram (2010) cites Storey’s observation that voiceover ‘veterans’ such as Larry Gogan, a well-known Irish presenter on RTÉ Radio 1 and later Radio 2, and the Irish actor, Bill Golding, are no longer used to the same extent. It is notable that the voices of these ‘veterans’ are featured in the 1977 sub-corpus and to a lesser extent in that of 1987 (see Table 1.1 in Appendix A) but disappear in the later sub-corpora. Interestingly, Oram (2010) observes that advertisers are now demanding voices which target 18 to 25-year-olds and also regional voices. This observation is particularly interesting, given our concern with
language ideologies; the demand for regional voices suggests the operation of ideologies which value vernacular authenticity, as discussed in chapter 2, section 2.3.2. In addition, the suggestion that there exists a demand for voices targeting a younger age bracket begs the question as to whether such a voice can be understood to be that of advanced Dublin English, the dissociative pronunciation form claimed by Hickey (2005, p.73) to be indicative of the ‘current youth subculture’ (see chapter 2, section 2.4.4). Oram also points out that advertisers are now demanding the ‘safe’ voice, and he cites Richard Brennan of Endline Voiceover Management, which was set up in 2004, who comments that 80 per cent of voiceover work for ads are ‘straight reads, with less demand for funny voices and impersonations’. Again, this is significant with regard to our concern with the use of dialect stylisation in the corpus (see chapter 2, section 2.9).

We have looked at the background of Irish radio advertising and at changing trends in the voices used in advertising in Ireland. The following section describes the radio advertisement corpus on which the study is based. It begins by describing the source and compilation of the corpus and its context in terms of the social and economic backdrop for the time period in which the ads which make up the corpus were broadcast.

4.3 The radio advertisement corpus

The radio advertisement corpus on which the study is based is comprised of 160 radio advertisements from RTÉ Radio 1, the principal radio channel of Irish public-service broadcaster, Raidió Teilifís Éireann. This compilation was drawn from a larger bank of adverts. The original set of adverts (aired in the years 1977, 1987, 1997 and 2007) was compiled from the RTÉ archives for an earlier research project by a former University of Limerick MA student, Mr John Drennan, who worked for RTÉ (Drennan 2009). This
collection was subsequently made available to Dr Helen Kelly-Holmes of the University of Limerick (see Figure 4.1 in section 4.3.2, below).

In order to facilitate a longitudinal study (see section 4.3.3 below) and based on the data available, the corpus was divided into four sub-corpora; each sub-corpus is made up of 40 ads from the years 1977, 1987, 1997 and 2007. The corpus, therefore, spans the thirty year period, from 1977 to 2007. This period is interesting in that it is framed by two major events in Ireland’s economic and social history - Ireland’s accession to the European Economic Community in 1973 and the demise of the Celtic Tiger in 2007. Coupland (2010, p.59) points out how social change plays a part in the reshaping of language use and language ideologies. In this regard, it is important to looks, albeit briefly, at this period in terms of its economic and social background.

4.3.1 The corpus: Economic and social context

Ireland became part of the European Economic Community (now the European Union) in 1973. This opened up markets in Europe to Irish products and also allowed for industrial investment in manufacturing, while Ireland’s infrastructure was developed through European funding. From a social perspective, it is interesting to note how, for most Irish people, the focus of interest in the mid-fifties and sixties (the decades immediately prior to the period of the advert corpus) had moved away from topics relating to the Republic and independence to matters associated with the common European market, economic growth, employment, education and so on (O’Faolain 1969, cited in Ferriter 2004, p. 662). According to historian, Diarmaid Ferriter (2004), these topics and others such as the health system, the high cost of living, currency issues and racism continued to be to the fore up to the turn of the millennium. This was in spite of the conflict regarding a united Ireland which was taking place in Northern Ireland
during the thirty year period from the late 1960s to the late 1990s and suggests a preoccupation with social and economic issues at this time.

From the mid 1980s to the early years of the 21st century, Ireland’s economy experienced a major shift from being primarily agricultural-based to what is termed a ‘knowledge economy’ with a focus on high-tech industries and services. Fuelled by a low corporate tax rate and low interest rates from the European Central Bank, a period of rapid economic growth accompanied by a rise in living standards from 1995 to 2000, gave rise to the application of the term ‘Celtic Tiger’ to Ireland’s economy. Business investment continued to increase and consumer spending rose due to an expansion of credit. The infrastructure of the country was improved substantially with new transport services and improvements to roads. The construction industry experienced a major boom due to a property ‘bubble’ in which property prices rose rapidly to reach unsustainable levels. The Celtic Tiger years continued until the property bubble burst in 2007 when Irish banks, which were over-exposed to the property market, came under pressure due to the global financial crisis. This led to the collapse of the construction and banking sectors and heralded the onset of a major recession in the country (ESRI 2013). Interestingly, with regard to the advertisement corpus, the most recent sub-corpus was broadcast in 2007, the year which saw the end of the boom period.

The thirty year period from the 1960s to the 1990s saw a significant change in attitudes in terms of issues such as marriage, contraception and the family. In the early 1990s, Ireland had a very young population with views which were far removed from that of the previous generation. The role of women in society was also undergoing change with forty percent of married women in paid employment by the end of the twentieth century as against only five percent in the mid-1960s. In addition, the probability of marriage
for women fell from ninety to sixty percent between 1975 and 1995. Ferriter also remarks on the widening divide between the rural and urban sector during this period with some farming communities coming under serious threat (Ferriter 2004, p. 666).

The period of the ‘Celtic Tiger’ saw unprecedented changes in Irish society. Ferriter (2004, p. 662) describes how ‘A new middle-class generation, on the cusp of adulthood in the late 1990s, had never known anything but economic prosperity’. The effect of this period of growth and Ireland’s transformation during this time is epitomised in Stephen Castles’ (2011 p. xix) discussion on post Celtic Tiger Ireland. Castles speaks of how ‘fifteen years of staggering economic growth, legal, political and mental adaptation to being part of the European Union, and - above all - rapid growth in diversity have transformed the country in irreversible ways.’ He refers to the speed at which these changes came about with Ireland moving from being Britain’s ex-colony on the European periphery to the epitome of neo-liberal globalization’. Munck (2011, p. 3), in the same volume, writes of how this period saw the image of Ireland change from one which was ‘mono-cultural and mono-ethnic’ to one which not only integrated and identified with the concept of globalization, but also experienced a type of ‘cultural renewal’ by virtue of its opening its doors to over 180 different nationalities.

The Irish journalist and economist David McWilliams writes of how it is common nowadays to talk about how Ireland has become ‘more American’ (2007, p. 97). Indeed the exposure of Irish people to American accents and culture in the media, in particular television, since the middle of the twentieth century has been well documented (for example, Hickey 2013). In a blog post in 2006, McWilliams describes Ireland as ‘the most Americanised country in Europe’. In his analysis of Ireland on the eve of the financial crisis in 2007, he suggests that while this Americanisation is often seen as a
criticism, nevertheless the concept of the ‘Great American Dream’ which encapsulates a bright and improving future, is one which has an appeal for Irish people (McWilliams 2007, p.97). The degree to which this Americanisation is visible in variety choice in the corpus is explored in the analysis of inter-varietal choice at the broader level in relation to the display of North American English features; however, the use of advanced Dublin English (Hickey 2013) (an accent sub-variety of Irish English, as discussed in chapter 2, section 2.3.6) in the corpus may also be illustrative of this process as we will see below.

The expansion in the urban population and the increase in cosmopolitanism in Ireland, together with Ireland’s improved economic position internationally and increased affluence was, as discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.3.6), associated with an aspiration for ‘urban sophistication’ (Hickey 2005, p.7) particularly among young Irish people. As we have seen, this aspiration is represented linguistically by the advanced Dublin English pronunciation form. As discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.8), particular features of this form have parallels with North American English, although Hickey (2005) argues vehemently that these parallels are not a result of the North American influence. The notion of the ‘Americanisation’ of Ireland as discussed above, however, suggests that the advanced Dublin pronunciation may indeed be part of this process.

We have seen in chapter 2 (section 2.3.4), how Tymoczko and Ireland (2003) refer to a ‘cultural confidence’ which took hold in Ireland at the end of the twentieth century. In the same vein, Amador-Moreno (2010 p. 60) looks at how Irish people have attempted to highlight their distinct identity or ‘otherness’ through the use of Irish words or Irish ‘tokenism’, as observed by Tristram (2007, p. 312). McWilliams also writes of how Ireland is only [in the late 2000s] realising the strength of the ‘brand’ of Irishness which he says is ‘the deepest resource any country could have’ (2007 p. 273). The later sub-
corpora could therefore be expected to exploit markers of Irishness to a greater degree than the earlier decades. However, increased cosmopolitanism and identification with the concept of globalisation as discussed in chapter 2, may also be brought to bear on variety choice and place limits on such strategies.

The thirty year period in which the ads which make up the corpus were aired, is therefore a particularly interesting one to explore, given the changes which Ireland has undergone, both economically and socially, within this period and the potential of this period to reflect particular outlooks and ideologies which may be manifested through language.

4.3.2 Description of the corpus

As outlined above, the corpus spans the thirty year period from 1977 to 2007. In the original corpus, compiled by Mr Drennan, the 1977 set of recordings contained just 40 ads, while in each of the other 3 recording sets (from 1987, 1997 and 2007), a greater number of ads was available. However, for consistency reasons, as regards the corpus compiled for the present study, 40 ads were selected from the recordings from these years to make up the 3 remaining sub-corpora (see Figure 4.1, below).
The ads for the 1977 sub-corpus were broadcast over several months throughout the year while those for 1987, 1997 and 2007 were aired over a number of days in the month of December in the year in question. With the exception of a number of ads in the 1977 sub-corpus, (the times of broadcast for which definitive data is unavailable), all ads were broadcast on weekdays between 9 am and 11am. The majority of the ads in the 1977 and 1987 sub-corpora were broadcast during the very popular ‘Gay Byrne Show’ which featured forums and discussion, often around what were, at the time, taboo subjects in Irish society. Oram (1986, p. 551) points out that in 1986, this show attracted ‘44 percent of all housewives in the country and pull[ed] in over 1 million’s worth of advertising a revenue a year.’ The ads comprising the 1997 sub-corpus were aired around a current affairs magazine programme, ‘Today with Pat Kenny’ which acted as a replacement for ‘The Gay Byrne Show’, following the retirement of its presenter. This show was preceded by a talk-based entertainment programme, ‘The Tubridy Show’, to form the context for the 2007 sub-corpus.

The majority of the ads are for Irish products and services and, in several cases, particularly in the 1977 and 1987 sub-corpora, they feature voiceovers by well-known
Irish broadcasters and actors, as discussed in section 4.2 above (see also Table 1.1 in Appendix A).

Following Lee (1992, p. 173), as discussed in chapter 3 (section 3.2.2), the ads in the corpus are categorized according to Sussex’s (1989) components of ‘Action’ and ‘Comment’; the Action component is generally made up of context-based dialogic interaction (although in this corpus, the Action scenarios often feature just one speaker) while the Comment, which names the product and provides general information on it, is generally monologic and decontextualised. The rationale for the choice of this framework for analysis is based on Lee’s (1992) claims, as discussed in chapter 3, (section 3.2.2), that the most important factor in code choice in advertising texts is the format of the genre. We have seen in chapter 3 how, according to Lee, the Comment component functions as a ‘purveyor of privileged information’ an important function of the discourse of power (Lee 1992, p.172-3) while the Action component, ‘articulates with discourses of everyday informal interaction’. Therefore, the location of a particular variety in terms of Action and Comment can provide important indications of the function of that variety in the advert and the language ideologies on which the association of variety with a particular function is based.

The ads are referred to according to their component parts of Action and Comment as identified by Sussex (1989) and described above. Three types of ad are identified; ‘Action only’, ‘Comment only’, and ‘Action and Comment’ (in which both components are combined within the same ad). A third component which Sussex identifies (as referred to by Lee, 1992, p. 172) is that of ‘Chorus’ or ‘Song’. The analysis of this component was felt to be outside the scope of this particular study (see chapter 8, section 8.3).
Following the preliminary examination of the original ad compilation, the ads which would make up each of the sub-corpora were selected. As we have seen, the 1977 data comprised only 40 ads and therefore all these ads are included in the sub-corpus for that year. While the compilation of the remaining 3 sub-corpora was based mainly on random selection, some adjustment was necessary in order to allow for a representative sample. As a large proportion of the study is based on qualitative research as part of a mixed method methodology (see section 4.4 below), this approach was deemed to be the most useful and appropriate one.

4.4 Research approach and basis for analysis

This study is based on a longitudinal analysis of 4 radio advertisement sub-corpora which provide a snapshot of ads, broadcast on Irish radio in the years 1977, 1987, 1997 and 2007. Researchers have used longitudinal studies for the identification of both stability and change. A study by Van de Velde, Gerritsen and van Hout (1996) identifies periods of stability in change from below as demonstrated by the devoicing of Dutch fricatives by radio announcers in broadcasts between 1935 and 1993. Divita (2013) shows how popular ideologies in relation to the Spanish language and its speakers have undergone little change in the past 50 years through a chronological analysis of household Spanish handbooks published in the USA between 1959 and 2012, which were designed to assist communication between English-speaking employers and their Spanish-speaking employees. Bishop, Coupland and Garrett (2005) examine ‘the shifting values’ associated with the Welsh language and Welsh identity within the Welsh diaspora of North America, through analysis of the changing content and language choice in a 150-year sample of consumer ads from a North American Welsh community newspaper. (see chapter 3, section 3.3). As the present study is interested in
the extent of language ideological change, a longitudinal analysis is appropriate in that it can provide information on the extent of stability or change in variety choice and the ideological implications relating to language.

This longitudinal study employs a mixed methods research approach, combining both quantitative and qualitative methods. This approach to research is becoming increasingly popular; Dörnyei (2007, p. 42) refers to Miles and Huberman (1994, p.310) who see the use of mixed models as effective, in that the quantitative and qualitative dimensions of the investigation ‘can support and inform each other’. With regard to the development of theory, Strauss and Corbin claim that

Qualitative and quantitative forms of research both have roles to play in theorising. The issue is not whether to use one form or another but rather how these might work together to foster the development of theory.

(Strauss and Corbin 1998, p.34)

Dörnyei (2007, p. 45) sees a positive aspect of this approach as lying in the ability of the strength of one method being used to overcome the weaknesses of another. Referring to a common criticism of the generalisations stemming from a purely quantitative methodological approach as ‘overly simplistic, decontextualized and reductionist’, Dörnyei points out that a mixed methods study can counteract this in allowing for a quantitative component to be followed by a qualitative one, as he puts it, ‘by adding depth to the quantitative results and thereby putting flesh on the bones.’ In addition, Coupland (2007, p.76) points out that ‘to map a linear dimension of “social meaning intensity” precisely onto numerical arrays’ does not take account of the importance of contextualisation of variants in discourse.

While longitudinal research has traditionally been associated with quantitative methods, longitudinal qualitative methods have recently been coming to the fore (Dörnyei 2007,
As Neale and Flowerdew (2003, cited in Dörnyei 2007, p. 80) put it, the focus in the longitudinal qualitative study is ‘on the plot and detailed story lines of the key actors rather than the grand vistas of the epic picture’ as provided by the longitudinal quantitative data. Dörnyei (2007, p. 88) argues that the mixed methods approach can be justified in longitudinal research due to the concern of this type of research with micro and macro levels of change and cites Neale and Flowerdew (2003) who see the quantitative and qualitative methods of longitudinal research as complementary.

As discussed, the research questions the extent to which changing language ideologies and language ideological change can be reflected in variety choice in radio advertising in Ireland. It attempts to answer this question through analysis of the radio advertisement corpus at both inter-varietal (in relation to different languages exploited in the corpus as well as broad varieties of English) and intra-varietal levels (in relation to sub-varieties of Irish English). As outlined in chapter 1 (section 1.4), the analysis is based on a number of factors which can manifest the operation of particular language ideologies and changes with regard to such ideologies: firstly, longitudinal changes in the occurrence of particular varieties; secondly, (changing) function of variety within the ads, as indicated by location of these varieties according to advert component and furthermore by the juxtaposition of varieties within the ads; thirdly, (changing) indexical values in relation to particular varieties and finally (changing) accommodation strategies exploited in the ads. The research sub-questions are based on these factors. The employment of a mixed method research approach is designed to address these questions. The quantitative component of the analysis measures longitudinal change in occurrence of variety and also in function of variety in terms of location of the ad component across the sub-corpora, as well as the extent to which particular varieties are juxtaposed within the ads. The qualitative analysis allows for a more in-depth
examination of particular ads which illustrate the quantitative findings, outside the constraints of quantitative methods. Furthermore, it facilitates the examination of indexical values and the identification of accommodation strategies, additional means by which the operation of language ideologies may be brought to light. In addition, in view of Bell’s (1991a) finding that advertisements appear to have been designed in order to capitalise on the use of phonological features, (as discussed in chapter 3 (section 3.4.5) in relation to referee design), the question of whether inter-varietal differences are demonstrated to a greater extent through phonological or dialectal items in the advert corpus can be addressed through a quantitative comparison of the extent of use of phonological versus dialectal features in the corpus.

4.5 Identification and classification of variety in the corpus

In order to analyse variety choice at both inter-varietal and intra-varietal levels in the corpus, the basis for the identification and classification of varieties and sub-varieties must be established. As discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.3.6.), Hughes et al (2012) distinguish between the terms accent and dialect. They define dialect as varieties differentiated by differences of grammar and vocabulary and see Standard (British) English as a dialect of English. Accent, on the other hand, refers to variations in pronunciation (Hughes et al, 2012, p.3,13). These authors point out that the pronunciation form which is generally used as a model for the teaching of British English is that of Received Pronunciation (RP). RP is associated with those who are high on the social scale in terms of education, income and profession or title and is not associated with a specific region (2012, p.3). The term Standard Southern British English (SSBE) (see chapter 1, section 1.2), however, is now favoured over RP by a number of linguists due to negative associations with the latter term. In this study,
SSBE is differentiated from Irish English accent variety on the basis of syllable-final /r/ retention (rhotic) or deletion (non-rhotic). With regard to the rationale for this distinction in the identification of SSBE and Irish English accent, at the level of phonology, retention of syllable-final /r/ (where /r/ is pronounced in syllable-final position (as in river, fur) and where followed by a consonant (as in dark, yard) (Amador-Moreno 2010, p.77) is seen by Hickey (2004, p.41) as a key phonological feature of Irish English. This is based on a general view of Irish English rather than on particular vernacular varieties, for example, ‘lower class Dublin English which is non-rhotic or only weakly rhotic’ (Hickey 2005, p.28), as discussed in chapter 2, section 2.4.1). Hickey also suggests that the absence of this feature (i.e. ‘r-lessness’ or ‘non-rhotic’ pronunciation) indicates that a speaker is not Irish. Similarly, Amador-Moreno (2010) views the rhoticity of Irish English as one of its most characteristic features. The inter-varietal distinction between SSBE and Irish English at the level of phonology for the purposes of this study is thus based on rhotic as opposed to non-rhotic pronunciation in terms of the quantitative analysis, although other features are discussed in relation to the qualitative analysis. Rhotic accents which are not Irish English (for example, North American English) are identified based on particular distinguishing features (see Appendix B) (see also definition of ‘non-standard British English’ in chapter 1, section 1.2).

With regard to the intra-varietal analysis, Irish English, in terms of accent, is comprised of ‘local’ and ‘non-local’ accent sub-varieties, as described in chapter 2, section 2.3.8. These features are based on Hickey’s (2004a; 2013) lexical set realisations.

In relation to dialectal variety, the dialect (in terms of grammar and lexis) generally used as a teaching model is termed ‘Standard English’, the dialect of ‘educated people
throughout the British Isles’ (Hughes et al 2012, p.13), but is not confined to a particular social group as is RP. Hughes et al see ‘Standard English’ as including the standard varieties of England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland (ibid). They point out that in the latter two varieties, regional features can be found which are considered as ‘standard’ due to their regular occurrence even in formal writing, although variation between these standard dialects is generally small. For the purposes of this study, the term SSBE (although it refers to accent) is understood as implying standard dialectal (grammatical and lexical) as well as pronunciation features, as discussed in chapter 1, section 1.2). However, the notion of a ‘Standard (Irish) English’ dialect as including regional Irish English dialectal features (as described above by Hughes et al) is not used in this study. For the purposes of this study, while Irish English, in terms of accent, is comprised of ‘local’ and ‘non-local’ accent sub-varieties, (as described in chapter 2, section 2.3.8), the term Irish English dialectal variety is used to refer to lexical, grammatical (and sometimes pragmatic) features which are viewed as associated with Irish English, regardless of whether they may come under the standard umbrella in the Irish context (see chapter 1, section 1.2).

In the study, therefore, Irish English dialectal variety, is understood as including grammatical, lexical and pragmatic items (such as politeness expressions and pragmatic markers) which have been described as being associated with Irish English by researchers including Bliss (1984), Dolan (2004) and Amador-Moreno (2012) in the case of lexical items, Filppula (1999) in the case of grammatical items and Clancy (2000) and Kallen (2006) with regard to pragmatic markers. In the initial analysis of inter-varietal variation at the broad level in the corpus (see research sub-question 1.1, chapter 1), Irish language elements are differentiated from those of Irish English in order to determine the extent to which the Irish language is exploited in radio
advertising; however, it was decided that in the analysis which focuses on the main varieties in the corpus, that of Irish English and SSBE (see research sub-question 1.2, chapter 1), these Irish language lexical items should be classified as Irish English dialect, given that they are used within an Irish English context. For example, the expression *Níl aon tinteán mar do thinteán féin* (*There’s no fireside like your own fireside*), in ad ref.23/77 (Appendix B:Table1.1) for *Ergas* from the 1977 sub-corpus, is an expression familiar to speakers of Irish English, even those who have a poor command of the Irish language. However, Irish language items, such as names of individuals or organisations (e.g. Órla Duane (ad ref. 30/77, Appendix B: Table 1.1), Cór na nÓg (ad ref. 22/07, Appendix B: Table 4.1)) are excluded as it was felt that in the context of the ads, their use is purely referential. The use of the Irish language name Máire in the 1997 ad (ad ref. 33/97, Appendix B: Table 3.1) for Barry’s Tea, however, is included as its use is thought to be connotational rather than referential in the particular context. The sources for the Irish English associated dialectal items displayed in the corpus are presented in Table 4.1 below.

*Table 4.1:* Sources for Irish English dialectal items displayed in corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad Ref.</th>
<th>IrE dialectal item</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23/77</td>
<td><em>your only man</em></td>
<td>Irish novelist and poet, Flann O’Brien (1939) from <em>At Swim-Two-Birds</em>: ‘A pint of plain is your only man’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/77</td>
<td><em>Níl aon tinteán mar do thinteán féin</em></td>
<td>Irish (language) proverb (Dolan 2004, p. 240)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39/77</td>
<td><em>grand</em></td>
<td>Irish English malapropism (Bliss 1984) e.g. That’s a grand day!’ (Dolan 2004, p. 114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39/77</td>
<td><em>listen</em></td>
<td>Commonly used as marker in Irish English (from Irish ‘éist’) (Dolan 2004, p.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/87</td>
<td><em>below in the Moonlight ballroom</em></td>
<td>Dolan (2004, p. 1) defines the Irish English word ‘above’ as loosely meaning ‘up’ as in ‘We were above [up] in Dublin’. The word ‘below’ in this context can be understood in a similar way. i.e. ‘We were down in the Moonlight ballroom’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/87</td>
<td><em>Herself starts towards me.</em></td>
<td>Reflexive pronoun in subject position and without reference to an antecedent (Filppula 1999, pp. 77-78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/87</td>
<td><em>(Sure) you know</em></td>
<td>The pragmatic marker ‘you know’ is far more common than the marker ‘I mean’ in ICE-Ireland (see chapter 2, section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/87</td>
<td>at all</td>
<td>Sentence tag echoing the Irish tag ‘ar chor ar bith’; an example of rhythmic retention resulting from language shift (Todd 1999; Dolan 2004, p. 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/87</td>
<td>leppin'</td>
<td>‘Leap’ is pronounced 'lep' by our people’ (Joyce 1979, p.98; Dolan 2004, p. 139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/87</td>
<td>like*</td>
<td>Pragmatic marker ‘like’ in clause-final position (Clancy 2000, p 56; Kallen 2006, p. 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/87; 19/97; 15/07; 38/07; 40/07</td>
<td>sure</td>
<td>Functional Irish English opener (Amador-Moreno 2010, p.120; Kallen 2006, p. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/87; 1/07</td>
<td>sany</td>
<td>Common term for Santa Claus in Ireland (Sammon 2002, p.182)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/87</td>
<td>Janey</td>
<td>Abbreviation of ‘Janey Mac’, a euphemism for ‘Jesus’ (Dolan 2004, p.129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/87</td>
<td>your man</td>
<td>Loose usage of second person possessive adjective (cf Ir ‘mo duine’, lit. ‘My man’) (Dolan 2004, p. 258)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/87</td>
<td>says I</td>
<td>says+personal pronoun quotative expression (Dolan 2004, p.197).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/87</td>
<td>Brenner</td>
<td>The –er suffix is especially common in the Hiberno English of Dublin in the coining of nicknames (Dolan 2004, p.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/87; 31/07</td>
<td>just like yourself</td>
<td>Reflexive pronoun use without reference to an antecedent (Filppula 1999, pp.77-78; O’Keeffe 2005, p.358; Dolan 2004, p. 207; Kirk and Kallen, p. 104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/97</td>
<td>How’s she cuttin?</td>
<td>Expression meaning ‘How are things going?’ Possible origin – reference to hay-making (Dolan 2004, p.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/97</td>
<td>slán</td>
<td>Irish language greeting (Dolan 2004, p.215)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/97</td>
<td>Suaimhneas siorai dóibh</td>
<td>Irish (language) blessing ; (loosely meaning ‘May they rest in peace’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/97</td>
<td>Lord/God*</td>
<td>Preponderance of religious references in spoken IrE taboo language (Farr 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/97</td>
<td>Would you take the turkey out there</td>
<td>Filler (without necessarily indicating location) (Dolan 2004, p. 238)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/97; 38/07</td>
<td>Mammy; Mam</td>
<td>From Irish language term for ‘mother’, Mamaí (Dolan 2004, p.148)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/97; 15/97</td>
<td>You’ve a great appetite on you; I had drink on me</td>
<td>Preposition ‘on’ to express a physical state (Filppula 1999, p.220)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34/97</td>
<td>Máire</td>
<td>Irish language first name (cf Amador-Moreno 2010, p. 60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/07; 33/07</td>
<td>the cousins in England; the gran etc*</td>
<td>Use of the definite article in reference to family members (Filppula, 1999, p. 56).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38/07</td>
<td>Doesn’t that beat Bangher</td>
<td>The saying ‘That beats [often pronounced /be:ts/] (or bangs) Banagher’ is a common reaction to something extraordinary or absurd (Dolan 2004, p.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40/07</td>
<td>lads*</td>
<td>Use of the term ‘lads’ as vocative in Irish English contexts (Murphy and Farr 2012, p.214)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* It should be noted that those items indicated with * are not exclusive to Irish English.

Accent and dialectal elements outside of the two main varieties of Irish English and SSBE are also identified in the study. While in the analysis of Irish English features, ‘dialectal’ items are understood in terms of grammatical, lexical and pragmatic items which are associated with Irish English and as such are ‘non-standard’, in the analysis...
of variety at the broad level (see research sub-question 1.1), ‘dialectal’ items may include not only ‘non-standard’ features of varieties of English other than Irish English (for example North American, non-standard British English) but also lexical items from language varieties such as French, Irish etc, which are displayed in the sub-corpora. In addition, phonological factors are identified, for example English with a French or North American accent.

Having described the basis for the identification and classification of accent and dialectal features relating to variety in the corpus, the following section describes the way in which these features were quantified in the study.

### 4.6 Description of tables for quantification of accent and dialectal features in the corpus

Following compilation of the sub-corpora, each ad was aurally examined for the presence of features which differentiate variety in the corpus. Significant phonological and dialectal (grammatical, lexical and pragmatic) features were noted as they applied to particular ads. In order to facilitate the quantification of accent and dialectal features according to variety and sub-variety in the corpus, these features are presented in Tables 1.1, 2.1, 3.1 and 4.1 which relate to the sub-corpora of 1977, 1987, 1997 and 2007 respectively, in Appendix B. Each table lists the ads of each sub-corpus by name, reference number\(^{20}\) and type (‘Action only’, ‘Comment only’ or ‘Action and Comment’).

The display of accent and dialectal features in these tables is categorised as either ‘Irish English’ or ‘other’ variety features. This latter term denotes varieties other than Irish

---

\(^{20}\) The reference number indicates the order of the ads in each sub-corpus as well as the year of the sub-corpus. Ad Ref. 1/97, for example, indicates the first ad listed in the 1997 sub-corpus.
English (in relation to languages which are not mutually intelligible (e.g. French, Irish etc), as well as varieties of the same language (e.g. North American English, SSBE etc)). These features are classified in terms of accent and dialect and according to whether they appear in the Action or Comment component of the particular ad. Irish English phonological features are identified in the ads, firstly in terms of the more broad-based categorisation of rhotic as opposed to the SSBE associated non-rhotic pronunciation for the inter-varietal analysis, but also, at a more micro level, in terms of Irish English phonological sub-varieties as described in chapter 2, section 2.3.8, for the intra-varietal analysis. Therefore, for example, Rh (SrS) refers to Irish English rhotic supraregional southern pronunciation (see chapter 2, section 2.3.8). Particular varieties and sub-varieties are illustrated through examples of sounds displayed in particular lexical realisations and are presented in word samples from the ads; these are based on Hickey’s (2004a; 2013) lexical set realisations (based on both vowels and consonants) in his classification of varieties of Irish English.

SSBE is identified by the non-rhotic (Nrh) accent, as discussed above. Where a non-rhotic accent shows ‘telltale’ Irish English phonological features (and thus appears to be simulated (see chapter 5, section 5.3.4), the accent is classified as Nrh-IrE (non-rhotic with Irish English features). This classification includes ads which may show occasional deviations from non-rhotic to rhotic pronunciation. In the Nrh-IrE classification, the Irish English features are shown in a word sample form the particular ad; for example, ad ref. 1/87 (Appendix B: Table 2.1) demonstrates a Nrh-IrE accent in its Comment component through the non-rhotic pronunciation of [spəkl] sparkle. However, the speaker also displays the pronunciation of white as [wɔt] rather than the standard /wɔt/, the former being associated with Irish English (see chapter 2, section 2.2.3).

With regard to other varieties, where accent features are patently simulated, for
example, the French (Fr) or North American (NthAm) accents, this simulation is indicated in the table (e.g. pseudo-French).

Features relating to dialectal variety are illustrated through examples of the use of such variety in the ad component. For example in ad ref. 6/87 for Perrier in Appendix B: Table 2.1, Irish English dialectal variety is indicated through the expression at all, at all (see also Table 4.1 above for information on the source of this feature). Also, with regard to lexical items from other languages, these are represented in the dialect column of the tables, for example, the French language address form, ma petite, in the same ad.

Having described the main features of the tables used for the quantitative analysis, the processes for the sub-sections of the quantitative analysis, based on the research sub-questions (as outlined in chapter 1, section 1.3) are described and explained below.

4.7 Processes for inter-varietal quantitative analysis

The inter-varietal analysis initially examines the range of varieties displayed in the corpus overall (for example, varieties of English such as SSBE, non-standard British English, Irish English and North American English as well as French, German and Irish language use among others). However, as this initial analysis revealed that Irish English and SSBE were the predominant varieties in the corpus, this is the main focus of the analysis at the inter-varietal level. The processes for analysis at these levels are described below in relation to research question 1 and its sub-questions, 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3.

4.7.1 Variety (at broad level) according to advert component

The initial quantitative analysis at the inter-varietal level examines the four sub-corpora for evidence of all varieties (Irish English and other varieties including those of SSBE
and non-standard British English) according to advert component. This analysis is designed to address research sub-question 1.1 (as outlined in chapter 1, section 1.3) relating to longitudinal change in occurrence and function of variety (as indicated by location of these varieties according to advert component) at the inter-varietal level.

The numbers of each type of ad (‘Action only’, ‘Comment only’ or ‘Action and Comment’) vary according to the sub-corpus and the number of tokens of each component was counted, irrespective of the type of ad in which it was incorporated. For example, the 2007 sub-corpus is made up of 4 ‘Action only’, 22 ‘Comment only’ and 14 ‘Action and Comment’ ads (see Appendix B: Table 4.1). Therefore, in this sub-corpus, the total number of Action tokens is taken as 18 (14+4) and the total number of Comment tokens as 36 (22+14). However, those ad components which could not potentially display the feature of syllable-final /r/ retention or the contrasting feature of r-lessness were excluded from the quantitative analysis. (For example, in the 1997 sub-corpus, the Comment component of the ad for Cadbury’s Roses chocolates (ad ref. 36/97, Appendix B, Table 3.1) was excluded as its Comment slogan Cadbury’s Roses – the nicest way to say thank you does not allow discrimination between the two pronunciation forms). However, its Action component is included in the quantitative analysis. Exclusions on this basis are itemised in tables (Tables 1.2, 2.2, 3.2, 4.2) beneath the main sub-corpus tables (Tables 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1) in Appendix B by the term Excl. A

While the features displayed are predominantly phonological, for example SSBE or French accents (or simulations of these accents), in some cases, lexical items from languages other than English are found, for example Irish, French and German. This initial quantitative analysis (addressing research sub-question 1.1) is based on the
presence of any feature (lexical, grammatical, pragmatic or phonological) indicative of the particular variety. The ads were examined aurally and the number of ads which displayed any such feature were counted rather than the number of occurrences of such features within the ad component. For example, in the 1977 sub-corpus (Appendix B, Table 1.1), ad ref 37/77 (Action only) for *Tayto Hillbilly Bacon* potato crisps displays both accent and dialectal North American English features. As no other variety is displayed in the ad, the ad is given a value of 1.0 for the category of North American English. (It should be noted that despite the occurrence of both dialectal and phonological items relating to this variety, the weighting is nevertheless restricted to 1.0). The presence of a variety (as indicated by accent features, dialectal features or a combination of both) in a given ad component is expressed as a percentage of the total number of tokens of the particular component (Action or Comment) in the sub-corpus, less the excluded ads as described above.

In instances where more than one variety is displayed in a particular ad, the quantitative weighting is adjusted to show the presence of the two varieties. An ‘Action only’ ad (ad ref. 34/77 in Appendix B: Table 1.1) for *RTV* television rentals from the 1977 sub-corpus, for example, displays SSBE non-rhotic pronunciation by one character while a second displays North American accent and dialect. In this instance, the North American category and the SSBE are each given a 0.5 value. As the aforementioned ads are the only ads in the 1977 sub-corpus which display dialectal or phonological elements of North American English, the value for North American English in the 1977 sub-corpus is 1.0 (ad ref. 37/77) + 0.5 (ad ref. 34/77). The total value of 1.5 is expressed as a fraction and percentage of the total number of Action components in this sub-corpus (less those excluded on the basis of not being able to differentiate between rhotic and non-rhotic pronunciation). As no such exclusions applied to the Action components.
in the 1977 sub-corpus, all 11 Action components were included. Therefore, the value for North American English is calculated at 1.5/11 or 13.5% (see Table 5.1 in chapter 5).

In some instances, a dialectal item relating to a particular variety may be displayed by a speaker using an accent which relates to another variety, for example, ad ref. 29/07 (Appendix B, Table 4.1) for Peat’s World of Electronics, in which a character uses the North American English associated term bro’ but with an Irish English rhotic accent. In this case, the weighting is divided equally between Irish English and North American, to represent the occurrence of the two varieties in the ad component.

Although, simulated accents are indicated on the table, no distinction is made between simulated and non-simulated accents for the purpose of the quantitative analysis. Therefore, for example, an accent classified as Nrh-IrE (non-rhotic with Irish English features, discussed in section 4.4.2 below) is not distinguished from a non-rhotic (Nrh) accent in the quantitative analysis. However, this distinction is discussed in the qualitative analysis.

4.7.2 Irish English accent variety (rhotic) and SSBE (non-rhotic) according to advert component

Following the preliminary analysis of broad variety in the corpus, Irish English and SSBE are identified as the predominant varieties; in light of this finding, the analysis refines its focus to concentrate on these two varieties in response to research sub-question 1.2. Therefore, the inter-varietal analysis, at this level, is focused on longitudinal change across the corpus with regard to these two varieties of English and also on the function of these two varieties as indicated by location in terms of ad component. The first part of this analysis in relation to research sub-question 1.2
concentrates on accent as indicated by rhotic or non-rhotic pronunciation. For the purposes of this part of the analysis, the ads were again examined aurally and in addition to the exclusion of those ad components which could not potentially distinguish between rhotic and non-rhotic accents (Excl. A), those ad components which exclusively displayed accents or pseudo-accents other than Irish English or SSBE were also excluded to allow for an overall comparison between the two main varieties. Exclusions on this basis are itemised in tables beneath the main sub-corpus tables (1.2-4.2) in Appendix B by the term Excl. B. Therefore, the presence of Irish English rhotic pronunciation, or SSBE, in a particular component, is expressed as a percentage, not of the total number of that component in the particular sub-corpus, but of the total number of that component which displays Irish English or SSBE. In the 1997 sub-corpus (Appendix B, Table 3.1), for example, the Action component of the ad for Alka Seltzer (ad ref. 35/97) was excluded despite the presence of syllable-final /r/ retention, as it contained North American (albeit pseudo) accents only, in its Action component. On the other hand, the Action component of the Nina Ricci ad (ad ref.36/77 in Table 1.1, Appendix B) was included as it contained a rhotic Irish English accent in addition to a pseudo-French accent in this component.

As with the previous analysis, the number of ads displaying rhotic or non-rhotic pronunciation in the particular component, as described above, were counted rather than the number of occurrences of such features within the ad component. Therefore, for example, if a particular ad showed Irish English rhotic pronunciation only, in its Action component, this was counted as one instance of this pronunciation and given a weighting of 1.0.

In a number of cases, however, both rhotic and non-rhotic pronunciations were
displayed in the Action components of a particular ad as a feature of the pronunciation of different characters. In these cases, the weighting was divided. Therefore, in a particular Action component, if one speaker displayed Irish English rhotic pronunciation while a second showed SSBE non-rhotic, each variety was assigned a 0.5 weighting. If, however, a character displayed an accent outside of Irish English or SSBE (e.g. French), this was not included in the weighting for this part of the analysis. For example, in the Nina Rici ad (ad ref. 36/77, Table 1.1, Appendix B) cited above, where one character displays a pseudo French accent while another displays Irish English rhotic pronunciation, the full weighting of 1.0 is given to the rhotic pronunciation, as there is no occurrence of SSBE non-rhotic pronunciation in this component. For the purposes of this part of the analysis, accents other than SSBE or Irish English are excluded as the analysis is confined to these varieties.

The presence of the particular accent (rhotic or non-rhotic) in a given ad component is expressed as a percentage of the total number of tokens of the particular component in the sub-corpus, less the excluded ads as described above. For example, the 1997 sub-corpus (Appendix B: Table 3.1) contains 40 Comment component tokens. However, the Comment components of two ads (ad ref. 36/97 and 39/97) are excluded as they do not have the potential to display syllable final /r/-retention or r-lessness, as described above. The Comment components of a further two ads, (ad ref. 22/97 for Glen Ellen Californian wines) and ad ref. 25/97 for Le Piat d’Or wines) are excluded as these components respectively display exclusively North American and French accents (accents other than SSBE or Irish English). Therefore the number of ads displaying rhotic pronunciation (24) is expressed as a fraction of 36 rather than of 40, giving a figure of 67% for this feature in the Comment components of this sub-corpus (see Appendix B, Table 3.2 and also chapter 5, Table 5.3 and Figure 5.3).
While for the most part, non-rhotic accents are either those of SSBE speakers (Nrh) or Irish English speakers simulating SSBE pronunciation (Nrh-IrE), in a very small number of ads, non-rhotic pronunciation is employed as part of a non-standard British accent, (for example ad ref. 4/77 from the 1977 sub-corpus (Appendix B: Table 1.1) and ad ref. 37/97 from 1997 (Appendix B: Table 3.1), both for Kleenex). While these accents are classified as non-standard British English (NonStBrE) in the initial broad analysis of variety (accent and dialectal features) in the corpus (relating to research sub-question 1.1), at this level of the analysis, they are not distinguished from SSBE, given their low occurrence.

In a number of ads, as discussed in section 4.6 above, a non-rhotic pronunciation is demonstrated by speakers in combination with Irish English features. Such pronunciation is indicated in the tables and illustrated through word samples which demonstrate (1) syllable-final /r/ deletion and (2) Irish English phonological features as outlined in Hickey’s (2004a; 2013) lexical sets. This is discussed in chapter 5, section 5.3.4 and the occurrence of this pronunciation form (Nrh-IrE), as compared with non-rhotic pronunciation in which Irish English features are not visible (Nrh), is illustrated in Table 5.5 and figure 5.5 in chapter 5. The figures for these forms are expressed as fractions and percentages of the total numbers of the particular component which displays SSBE non-rhotic accent in the sub-corpus (see Table 5.3 chapter 5 for non-rhotic pronunciation figures).

However, for the purpose of the quantitative analysis in relation to rhotic and non-rhotic pronunciation, no distinction is made between the two forms, Nrh or Nrh-IrE.

4.7.3 Irish English dialectal variety according to advert component

The analysis in relation to research sub-question 1.2 of Irish English at the inter-varietal
level (as compared with SSBE) includes dialectal variety as well as accent variety (see chapter 1, section 1.3). Given that SSBE, (for the purposes of this study) is understood as implying ‘Standard British English’ dialect (see chapter 1, section 1.2), the focus of this analysis is on the use of Irish English dialectal variety as compared with Irish English accent variety (see Table 5.2 and Figure 5.2. in chapter 5, section 5.3.1).

Using the same data, with exclusion of ads as outlined in relation to the analysis of Irish English (rhotic) accent and SSBE (non-rhotic) accent for control purposes (*Excl. A* and *Excl. B*, see Tables 1.2 - 4.2 in Appendix B), the ads were analysed according to component for the presence of Irish English dialectal features. As with the analysis of Irish English accent and SSBE, the occurrence of these features in a particular component is expressed as a percentage not of the total number of that component in the particular sub-corpus, but of the total number of that component which displays Irish English or SSBE features in the sub-corpus. As outlined in section 4.3 above, notwithstanding the distinction between the classification of Irish English and Irish language items in the broad analysis of variety in the corpus, it was decided that for the purposes of quantifying Irish English dialectal features at this level of the analysis, Irish language lexical items should be classified as Irish English dialect, given that they are used within an Irish English context.

Again, as with the phonological analysis, the number of ads displaying dialectal Irish English features in the particular component were counted rather than the number of instances of such features within the ad component. For the purposes of this part of the analysis, the examination is confined to Irish English dialectal variety; ‘Standard (British) English dialect’ (as explained in chapter 1, section 1.2) is implied in the classification of SSBE for the purposes of this study. As with the phonological analysis,
in cases where, for example, one speaker in the Action component exhibits Irish English dialectal features while the second displays standard features, a value of 0.5 is assigned to the category of Irish English dialectal variety. For example, in ad ref. 39/77 (Appendix B: Table 1.1) for Hedex, one speaker in the Action component uses an Irish English dialectal item while the second uses ‘Standard English’ dialect; in this case Irish English dialectal variety is assigned a value of 0.5. Therefore the weighting in relation to Irish English dialect is relative to ‘Standard English’ dialect. Dialectal features from other varieties are not weighted for the purposes of this analysis. For example, the Action component of ad ref. 6/87 (Appendix B: Table 2.1) for Perrier is included in this part of the analysis as, despite the fact that it displays French language items, it also displays Irish English dialectal items as a feature of the speech of both speakers. As this section of the analysis is focused on Irish English as it operates in relation to Standard (British) English, however, the French language items are not weighted; therefore a value of 1.0 is assigned to Irish English dialect.

4.7.4 ‘Action and Comment’ ads: Juxtaposition of Irish English accent variety and SSBE

As discussed in chapter 3, section 3.2.3, Lee (1992, p.176) observes that a number of ads in his study exploited the diglossic situation through combining the use of the standard variety in the Comment with the use of local varieties in the Action. Research sub-question 1.3 relates to the existence of such a strategy in the corpus. In order to examine the existence of this phenomenon in the corpus, the total number of ‘Action and Comment’ ads (those ads which are comprised of both an Action and a Comment component), less those excluded based on criteria as outlined above, formed the basis of the quantitative analysis. On this basis, those ads which did not have the potential to discriminate between rhotic and non-rhotic pronunciationand those exclusively
displaying accents other than Irish English or SSBE in the Action or Comment components were excluded in calculating this figure. (Excl.A and Excl B: see Tables 1.2-4.2 in Appendix B). Ad ref. 36/77 (Appendix B, Table 1.1), for example, for Nina Ricci, although it displays a French accent in its Action component, was nevertheless included as it also displays Irish English in both components. Given that Irish English was found to be demonstrated to a greater extent through accent than through dialectal items in the ads, the quantitative analysis which addresses this sub-question is based on the juxtaposition of rhotic Irish English as against non-rhotic SSBE accent, rather than dialect.

The analysis was again based on syllable final /r/ retention and the following categories were used for analysis:

- Rhotic: Action / Non-rhotic: Comment
- Non-rhotic: Action and Comment
- Rhotic: Action and Comment
- Non rhotic: Action / Rhotic: Comment

In the case of analysis on the basis of the juxtaposition of rhotic and non-rhotic pronunciation in ‘Action and Comment’ ads, the number of ‘Action and Comment’ ads displaying a combination of features in the particular patterns (above) were expressed as a percentage of the total number of ‘Action and Comment’ ads less those excluded as described. For example, in ad ref. 1/87 (Appendix B, Table 2.1), the Comment component displays a non-rhotic (Nrh-IrE) accent while the Action displays an Irish English rhotic (local Dublin) accent (Rh (LocD)); in this case, the category Rhotic: Action / Non-rhotic: Comment was assigned a weighting of 1.0. In some ads, both rhotic and non-rhotic pronunciations are displayed in the Action components of a particular ad as a feature of the pronunciation of different characters. In these cases, the weighting
was adjusted accordingly. For example, ad ref. 39/77 (Appendix B, Table 1.1) for *Hedex* has a non-rhotic Comment component juxtaposed against an Action component which displays both rhotic and non-rhotic accents. For this ad, the category of *Rhotic: Action / Non-rhotic: Comment* is weighted at 0.5 while that of *Non-rhotic: Action and Comment* is also assigned a value of 0.5. As in the analysis described in section 4.7.2, adjustments were not made for accents outside of Irish English and SSBE. In ad ref. 6/87 (Appendix B, Table 2.1) for *Perrier*, for example, the Comment component displays a non-rhotic accent and the Action displays both an Irish English and a pseudo-French accent. In this case, the full weighting of 1.0 was given to the category *Rhotic: Action / Non-rhotic: Comment*, (See Table 5.6 and Figure 5.6 in chapter 5)

### 4.8 Processes for intra-varietal quantitative analysis

In relation to research question 2, sub-varieties of Irish English are examined at the intra-varietal level. Initial findings showed that Irish English pronunciation, as indicated by syllable-final /r/ retention increased steadily in the sub-corpora through the decades. Furthermore, the juxtapositioning of non-rhotic accents in the Comment and rhotic in the Action, which was prominent in the 1977 and 1987 sub-corpora, was far less visible in the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora, in which rhotic pronunciation in both components was more common. Therefore, a more in-depth examination of rhotic Irish English accents in the corpus, particularly with regard to the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora was called for. This forms the basis of the intra-varietal analysis. The process for analysis at this level is described below as it relates to research question 2 and its sub-questions (see chapter 1, section 1.3).
4.8.1 Irish English rhotic accents: ‘Local’/ ‘non-local’ pronunciation according to advert component

This analysis was carried out in response to research sub-question 2.1.1, relating to the extent to which sub-varieties of Irish English, (as identified by Hickey (2005), and described in chapter 2, section 2.3.8), were employed across the sub-corpora, and also to establish their location within the ad components, thus shedding light on their function. This analysis of accent sub-varieties is more pertinent to the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora than it is to those of 1977 and 1987 in that in the two earlier sub-corpora, the focus is on the broader categories of SSBE non-rhotic pronunciation and Irish English rhotic pronunciation. Nevertheless, the Irish English accent subcategories are analysed quantitatively for all four sub-corpora in order to provide a more in-depth picture. (see chapter 5, Table 5.4 and Figure 5.4; chapter 6, Table 6.1 and Figure 6.1). However, at the qualitative level, the later sub-corpora are the focus of the intra-varietal analysis.

Further to this examination, the ads in the corpus which displayed rhotic pronunciation, were analysed to determine the broad category of Irish English into which they could most appropriately be placed.

The accent categories are divided broadly into ‘local’ and ‘non-local’ (as discussed in chapter 2, section 2.3.8), with sub-divisions as below:

**Non local**

- Moderate Dublin (ModD)
- Advanced Dublin English (AdvD)
- Supraregional southern (SrS)

**Local**

- Local Dublin (LocD)
The Action and Comment components of the sub-corpora which displayed rhotic pronunciation were analysed with a view to classifying them according to the above categories. Hickey’s (2004a p. 54-63; 2013) lexical sets for Irish English were used to situate the particular accent in the most appropriate category. Again, the number of ads displaying features of a given category in the particular component, as described above, were quantified rather than the number of occurrences of such features within the ad component. These figures are expressed as a percentage of the total number of ad components (Action or Comment) which displayed Irish English rhotic pronunciation (see table 5.3 in chapter 5 for rhotic pronunciation figures). Therefore, ads displaying other accents were excluded. Exclusions on this basis are itemised in tables beneath the main sub-corpus tables in Appendix B by the term Excl. C, but only for the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpus, given that these sub-corpora are the main focus of the intra-varietal analysis. As pointed out in the case of the previous analyses, in some cases, within the Action components, where there is more than one speaker, more than one accent sub-variety is displayed. In these cases, the weighting is divided. Therefore, if in a particular Action component, one speaker shows advanced Dublin (AdvDE) features, while a second shows those of moderate Dublin (ModD) English, each of the varieties is given a 0.5 weighting in their respective categories rather than 1.0. Similarly, where there are 3 different accent sub-varieties in an Action component, each one is assigned a weighting of 0.33 for its category, for example ad ref. 28/97 (Appendix B, Table 3.1) for Arnott’s which displays rhotic regional (Reg), moderate Dublin (ModDE) and advanced Dublin (AdvDE) Irish English accent sub-varieties in its Action component. Given that in all the Comment components, there was just one speaker (using one sub-variety), the full weighting (1.0) was given for the particular category.
As observed by Hickey (2005 p.28), the analysis shows that in attempting to categorise accents, it must be recognised that in many cases the situation is not clear-cut and that accents exist which display features from a number of different accent categories. Therefore, what might in terms of certain features be categorised as an advanced Dublin English accent could also contain features associated with moderate Dublin or a supraregional southern pronunciation. In the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora, it was found in several cases, for example, that a particular speaker might display features associated with a supraregional southern accent, interspersed with advanced Dublin English features. For the purposes of the study, given the observation of advanced Dublin English as the emergent mainstream accent variety, if a particular ad component displayed salient advanced features (as identified by Hickey (2005)) in conjunction with features of another accent category, it was counted as indicative of an advanced Dublin English accent. (see chapter 5, Table 5.4 and Figure 5.4; chapter 6, Table 6.1 and Figure 6.1).

4.8.2 ‘Action and Comment’ ads: Juxtaposition of ‘local’/ ‘non-local’ Irish English pronunciation

Research sub-question 2.1.2 relates to the way in which different accent sub-varieties are combined in ‘Action and Comment’ ads. In order to determine the extent to which ‘non-local’ categories of Irish English were juxtaposed against local Dublin English and other regional accents, to act as a ‘prestige’ variety, the ‘Action and Comment’ ads which displayed Irish English rhotic pronunciation in both Action and Comment components were analysed to establish the following accent category combination patterns.

- Local: Action / Non-local: Comment
- Non-local: Action and Comment
The number of ‘Action and Comment’ ads displaying a combination of features in the particular patterns (above) were expressed as a percentage of the total number of ‘Action and Comment’ ads which displayed Irish English rhotic pronunciation in both components (see Appendix B, Tables 3.2 and 4.2). In some ads, both local and non-local pronunciations were displayed in the Action components of a particular ad as a feature of the pronunciation of different characters. In these cases, the weighting was adjusted accordingly (see above). For example, in ad ref. 7/07 (Appendix B, Table 4.1) for the Irish Cancer Initiative from the 2007 sub-corpus, the supraregional southern (SrS) (non-local) accent in the Comment combines with three accent sub-varieties displayed by three different speakers in the Action, regional (Reg) (local), supraregional southern (SrS) (non-local) and local Dublin (LocD) (local). In this case, the pattern of Local: Action / Non-local: Comment was given a value of 0.66 (Reg (0.33)+LocD (0.33): Action / SrS: Comment) while that of Non-local: Action and Comment was given a weighting of 0.33 (SrS: Action (0.33) / SrS: Comment). (see Table 6.2 and Figure 6.2 in chapter 6).

4.8.3 ‘Action and Comment’ ads: Juxtaposition of advanced Dublin English and other Irish English accent sub-varieties

In order to explore intra-varietal choice in the corpus more comprehensively, the analysis hones its focus to concentrate on the Irish English sub-variety of advanced Dublin English. Research sub-questions 2.2.1 to 2.2.4 direct this analysis. While the quantitative analysis in relation to research sub-question 2.2.1 has already been described in relation to research sub-question 2.1.1 (relating to longitudinal change in occurrence and function of accent sub-varieties of Irish English), research sub-question
2.2.2 questions the extent to which advanced Dublin English is juxtaposed against local Dublin English and other regional accents and also against older non-local forms, to act as a ‘prestige’ variety. To this end, the ‘Action and Comment’ ads which displayed advanced features in either their Action or Comment components were analysed to establish which variety the advanced Dublin English combined with. The patterns are presented in Table 7.1 in Chapter 7).

4.9 Qualitative analysis

The analysis at the qualitative level is designed to examine the patterns established by the quantitative analysis at a more in-depth level (see section 4.4 above). Therefore, a number of the ads which best illustrate the quantitative findings as regards longitudinal choice and location in terms of advert component of variety (at the inter-varietal level) (Research question 1, sub-questions 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3) and sub-variety (at the intra-varietal level) (Research question 2, sub-questions 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.1, 2.2.2) were selected for qualitative analysis. In addition, however, the quantitative findings are also used to support the qualitative analysis in relation to indexicality and accommodation strategies at both inter-varietal levels (Research question 1, sub-question 1.4 and 1.5) and intra-varietal levels (Research question 2, sub-questions 2.1.3, 2.1.4, 2.2.3 and 2.2.4).

Ads from each of the sub-corpora were therefore selected on the basis of their ability to illustrate the factors through which language ideologies may be manifested (see chapter 1, section 1.4) and on which the research sub-questions are based. These ads were transcribed, for more detailed analysis. In the transcriptions, MCV and FCV refer to the male voice of the Comment component and the female voice of the Comment respectively. M1, M2, F1, F2, C1, C2 etc. refer to the speakers in the Action.
components, indicating first male speaker, second male speaker, first female speaker, second female speaker, first child speaker, second child speaker and so on. Significant features indicating accent variety or sub-variety are transcribed phonetically and highlighted in bold for the purpose of phonological analysis. Dialectal features are also highlighted in bold, where relevant. Transcription conventions based on Charles Antaki’s (2002) *Introduction to Conversation Analysis* are employed where relevant in transcribing the ads (see Appendix C for list of conventions used).

Ads or components of ads which were excluded from the quantitative analysis based on phonological features, are nevertheless in some cases used in the qualitative analysis. Advert ref. 32/97 (Appendix B: Table 3.1) for *Glad* aluminium foil, for example, is examined qualitatively, despite the exclusion of its Action component from that part of the quantitative analysis which focuses on SSBE and Irish English (the exclusion being on the basis of its display of exclusively North American accents). The qualitative analysis in relation to this ad looks at how advanced Dublin English combines with the speakers in the ‘comedy’ scenario who have North American accents.

In addition, while the focus of the inter-varietal analysis, given the quantitative findings, is on SSBE and Irish English, where relevant, other varieties (for example the use of Irish lexical items, (pseudo) French accent etc.) are discussed in the qualitative analysis in relation to how they operate with SSBE and Irish.

### 4.10 Summary

This chapter has described the radio advertisement corpus on which the study is based, including information in relation to its background context and the basis for its compilation. The research approach and the rationale for the methodology have been
established with reference to the relevant research questions. The basis for the identification and classification of the varieties and sub-varieties displayed in the corpus has been outlined. In addition, the tables used for the quantification of the features (Appendix B) have been described and explained. Finally, the processes for the quantitative analysis have been explained with reference to the relevant research questions; the basis for the qualitative analysis has also been described.

The next chapter is the first of three chapters which deal with the findings of the study and focuses on the analysis at the inter-varietal level.
Chapter 5. Choice at the inter-varietal level: Standard Southern British English and Irish English

5.1 Introduction

Chapter 5 is the first of three chapters which deal with the findings of this study. Chapter 3 has outlined factors through which the operation of language ideologies can be manifested through the radio ad corpus and has situated these factors within the context of relevant literature and theoretical frameworks. To recap on these factors, firstly, language ideologies and the dynamic nature of such ideologies can be reflected in longitudinal changes in variety choice and in the function of variety within the ad, as suggested by its position within the Action (associated with context-based, often dialogic scenarios, designed to reflect ‘everyday’ discourses) or Comment component (associated with decontextualised monologues, as in the slogan or voiceover of the ad) through the decades in question (Lee 1992). In addition, the juxtaposing of distinct varieties in these components (Lee 1992, p.176) can highlight the association of particular varieties with the contrasting values relating to the dual aims of the ad in terms of appealing to status and solidarity related values. Furthermore, language ideologies are visible through the social meanings which specific varieties ‘index’ as in the concept of ‘indexicality’ (based on Peirce’s (1893-1913) semiotic categories). Finally, accommodation strategies including audience and referee design (Bell 1984) can be indicative of the prevalence of language ideologies through the association of particular varieties with the audience and referee models. The study attempts to answer the research questions through an investigation of the advertisement corpus based on these factors or mechanisms by which ideologies can be displayed. To this end, the
research sub-questions are centred around these factors as outlined in chapter 1 (section 1.3).

This chapter focuses on the first main research question (and its component sub-questions) concerning the manifestation of language ideologies through inter-varietal choice in the ad corpus (see chapter 1, section 1.3). Inter-varietal choice refers to choice in relation to languages which are not mutually intelligible (e.g. French, English etc.), but also in relation to varieties of the same language (e.g. Irish English, Standard Southern British English, North American English etc.), as described in chapter 1 (section 1.2).

The chapter begins by describing the findings in relation to the first research sub-question as to the frequency and position, in terms of ad component, of particular varieties (in the broad sense, as explained in chapter 1, section 1.2) on a longitudinal basis in the corpus. As this analysis reveals that Irish English and Standard Southern British English (SSBE) are by far the most frequently used varieties, the focus of the chapter narrows to concentrate predominantly on the employment of these varieties in the sub-corpora (research sub-question 1.2). As discussed in chapter 1, the colonial or ex-colonial context is a rich locus for the study of ideological issues associated with standard and non-standard varieties (Lee 1992, p.160). Therefore, a focus on SSBE and Irish English, in that they are associated respectively with the coloniser and the colonised, are interesting in terms of the language ideological repercussions of Ireland’s position as an ex-colony of Britain.

This narrower focus of the analysis on the main varieties calls for an initial examination of the extent of use of Irish English dialectal variety as compared with Irish English accent variety (see chapter 1, section 1.2). The quantitative analysis reveals that the
exploitation of Irish English dialectal variety does not keep pace with that of accent variety (as indicated by rhotic pronunciation); thus the analysis, which addresses the second research sub-question at the inter-varietal level in relation to SSBE and Irish English, focuses on accent, as indicated by the frequency of occurrence and the position of SSBE and Irish English accent (as indicated by non-rhotic and rhotic pronunciation respectively) according to ad component across the corpus as a whole. As the quantitative analysis reveals that the non-rhotic pronunciation form of SSBE is exploited to a far greater extent in the 1977 and 1987 sub-corpora than in those of 1997 and 2007, the more in-depth qualitative examination of these two varieties centres on the earlier sub-corpora, and ads which illustrate the qualitative findings are selected for qualitative analysis.

While the focus of this section of the analysis is an inter-varietal one and therefore on the varieties in broad terms, nevertheless the accent sub-varieties which make up the Irish English rhotic pronunciation are also analysed quantitatively in this chapter in order to shed more light on ideological factors associated with choice of this variety. Similarly, the non-rhotic form as associated with SSBE is also analysed quantitatively with regard to the degree to which it displays ‘telltale’ Irish English features. Particular ads which illustrate the quantitative findings in relation to these analyses are also examined.

With regard to the research sub-question 1.3, quantitative data in relation to the strategy of juxtaposing the rhotic and non-rhotic accent across the corpus is presented in order to provide more information on the ideological implications of exploiting these two forms in terms of their contrasting functions as related to status and solidarity (Lee 1992). The patterns found in relation to the quantitative data are explored more comprehensively
through analysis of particular ads which are representative of the main patterns displayed in the two earlier sub-corpora at a qualitative level, for example, non-rhotic Action and Comment components in ‘Action and Comment’ ads; rhotic Action and non-rhotic Comment components in ‘Action and Comment’ ads. In addition, ads which display Irish English dialectal variety in conjunction with rhotic pronunciation are examined as part of a more general analysis of the juxtaposition of Irish English and SSBE accent in ‘Action and Comment’ ads. The way in which these patterns reflect language ideology is discussed.

Following this, the study looks at two further mechanisms for the analysis of variety choice at a qualitative level; the concept of indexicality and the existence of strategies relating to communication accommodation (Giles et al 1987; Coupland and Giles 1988) and audience and referee design (Bell 1984) are discussed with reference to particular ads from the 1977 and 1987 sub-corpora, already employed in relation to the qualitative analyses discussed above. Again, the display of particular accommodative strategies is discussed in relation to their reflection of particular language ideologies.

5.2 Longitudinal occurrence and location according to ad component of broad inter-varietal features

As we have seen, a number of factors have been identified as key in the analysis of the ideological dimensions of variety choice, the first of which is longitudinal variation in frequency of occurrence of variety together with function of variety as indicated by position according to ad component. This factor forms the basis for this initial section of the analysis which is carried out both quantitatively and qualitatively at the inter-varietal

---

21 This term relates to languages which are not mutually intelligible (e.g. French, Irish etc), as well as to varieties of the same language (e.g. Irish English, North American English etc), as described in chapter 1, section 1.2).
In order to establish the main varieties exploited in the corpus, an initial analysis was carried out with regard to all varieties displayed in the corpus, in response to research sub-question 1.1 (see chapter 1, section 1.3). As outlined in chapter 4, section 4.7.1, this initial quantitative analysis does not distinguish between phonological and dialectal items with regard to variety and is based on the presence of any feature (phonological, lexical, grammatical or pragmatic) indicative of the particular variety. The findings in relation to the main varieties found in the corpus as illustrated by either phonological (e.g. (pseudo) French accent or lexical (e.g. French language words or phrases) features are illustrated in Table 5.1 and Figure 5.1 below.
Table 5.1: Fraction/Percentage of ad components displaying broad inter-varietal features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SSBE</th>
<th>NonStBrE</th>
<th>IrE</th>
<th>Ir</th>
<th>Fr</th>
<th>Ger</th>
<th>NthAm</th>
<th>SthAm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>5.5/11</td>
<td>32/35</td>
<td>0.5/11</td>
<td>0/11</td>
<td>2.5/11</td>
<td>3/35</td>
<td>0.5/11</td>
<td>0/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>4/13</td>
<td>31/35</td>
<td>0/13</td>
<td>0/35</td>
<td>7/13</td>
<td>4/35</td>
<td>0/13</td>
<td>0/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>2/22</td>
<td>12/38</td>
<td>1/22</td>
<td>0/38</td>
<td>11/22</td>
<td>23.5/38</td>
<td>1/22</td>
<td>0.5/38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0/18</td>
<td>4/36</td>
<td>0/18</td>
<td>0/36</td>
<td>17.5/18</td>
<td>31.5/36</td>
<td>0/18</td>
<td>0/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY: SSBE: Standard Southern British English; NonStBrE: Non-standard British English; IrE: Irish English; Ir: Irish (language); Fr: French; NthAm: North American; SthAm: South American; Ger: German

NOTE: Figures represent fraction/percentage of total numbers of the particular component in the sub-corpus less those ad components which could not potentially display the feature of syllable-final /r/ retention (see chapter 4, section 4.7.1).
Figure 5.1: Percentage of ad components displaying broad inter-varietal features

NOTE: Figures represent fraction/percentage: of total numbers of the particular component in the sub-corpus less those ad components which could not potentially display the feature of syllable-final /r/ retention (see chapter 4, section 4.7.1).
Table 5.1 and Figure 5.1 illustrate the quantitative findings with regard to the frequency of occurrence of particular varieties in broad terms according to advert component across the sub-corpora. This analysis shows SSBE (which, as described in chapter 1, section 1.2 refers to accent but in this study also implies ‘Standard English’ in terms of dialect) and Irish English (accent and dialectal variety) to be the main varieties in the corpus overall. SSBE predominates in the earlier sub-corpora, at the expense of Irish English. However, Irish English features show dramatic increases in both ad components in the later sub-corpora, and this is associated with a corresponding fall in SSBE. These quantitative findings as a whole can be understood as indicating the prevalence of ideologies which place SSBE as the variety most appropriate in the transmission of the advertising message in the context of Irish radio advertising in the earlier decades (as represented by the 1977 and 1987 sub-corpora); this is indicated not only by the predominance of SSBE features in the earlier sub-corpora but by the fact that this variety favours the Comment components of the ads. However, the results indicate that this pattern is not maintained; notwithstanding a slight decline in Irish English in the Action components of the 1997 sub-corpus at this level of the analysis, overall there is an increased presence of Irish English in both components in the later corpora. These quantitative findings suggest that standard language ideologies and language associated with traditional establishment authenticities, (see chapter 2, section 2.4.2) dominate in the sub-corpora of 1977 and 1987 but are less prevalent in the later sub-corpora, indicating a potential influence of the conversationalization of discourse (Fairclough 1994) (see chapter 2, section 2.4.1).

Before undertaking a more detailed analysis of these two predominant varieties and how they operate in the two earlier sub-corpora, it is interesting to look, first of all, at the other varieties displayed in the corpus in terms of longitudinal change in frequency and
position according to ad component and the associated ideological implications.

As Table 5.1 and Figure 5.1 illustrate, features relating to the range of varieties in the corpus (outside of SSBE and Irish English) generally favour the Action rather than the Comment components of the ads. There is no significant increase in the occurrence of these features as the decades progress; while the 1997 sub-corpus displays the highest frequency of such features as well as the greatest range, the 2007 sub-corpus shows the lowest frequency overall with just one instance in the Comment component (German), representing 1% of the total, and one in the Action component (North American), representing 3% of the total (see chapter 4, section 4.7.1). This indicates that in the Irish radio advertising context, the increase in diversity with regard to accents and dialects in recent years (Kelly-Holmes 2005a, p. 108) comes in the form of increased acceptability of Irish English features. The low occurrence of features associated with other varieties is somewhat surprising in light of the influx of nationalities and consequent movement away from the mono-cultural image of Ireland (Munck 2011, p.3), as discussed in chapter 4, section 4.3.1.

Interestingly, outside of the dominant varieties of Irish English and SSBE, North American English (in terms of accent and dialect) is the most common variety, followed by French (in terms of French language lexical items as well as French accented English) and then Irish language (in terms of lexical items). The frequency of North American (accent and dialectal variety) features, however, fluctuates from sub-corpus to sub-corpus and does not show a consistent pattern of increase as might be expected given the popular notion that Ireland has become ‘more American’ in recent years (McWilliams 2007, p.97) as discussed in chapter 4 (section 4.3.1).

In contrast to SSBE, North American features are found mainly in the Action
component, with only one instance of use in the Comment. Interestingly, this was also found to be the case by Sussex (1989, p.165-166) in his study of Australian TV ads. This suggests that North American English does not have a major role as the voice of authority in the corpus but rather operates as part of the repertoire of the characters in the dialogic scenarios of the ads. In a number of ads, North American features are associated with intertextual references relating to popular American television, for example, the genre of the detective programme in Ad Ref. 35/97 for *Alka Seltzer*, and that of the sit-com in Ad Ref. 37/77 for *Tayto Hillbilly Bacon*, in which the North American ‘hillbilly’ accent and dialect resonates with a popular TV series of the time (see Table 1.1 in Appendix A and Tables 1.1 and 3.1 in Appendix B). An ad for *Glad Alufoil* (Advert 5.1 Ref. 33/97 below) also employs the sitcom scenario; in this ad, the North American accents of the comic ‘turkey’ characters in the Action are positioned alongside the serious voice of the Comment which uses an advanced Dublin English pronunciation (see section 2.4.4, chapter 2). The use of this accent in the Comment is discussed more fully in chapter 7, section 7.4.

**Advert 5.1 (Ref. 33/97) Glad alufoil**

1997: Action and Comment

001 M1: at home [hoʊm] with the turkeys for Christmas (.)
002 M2: happy christmas honey
003 ((canned laughter))
004 F1: darling [dɑːrln] (.) a coat [kobra] (.) you shouldn’t have (.)
005 and silver is my colour
006 M2: go ahead (.) try it on
007 F1: it’s so warm [wɔːrm] (.) and what is that material?
008 M2: it’s Alufoil [ˈʃəːl] darling (.) aluminium foil
009 with a special thicker embossed surface
010 that makes it stronger [ˈstrɑːŋə(r)] to last longer
it’s alufoil from Glad a special designer foil
it’s gorgeous [ɡɔːrdʒəs] (.).
goodness (. ) did you turn the heating up darling?
no why?
because I’m roasting [rɔʊstɪŋ] in this thing
((canned laughter)).
alufoil [fɔʊɪl] from glad (. ) caring [kɛrɪŋ] for food

Further instances of North American English include the character of the fire safety ‘hound’ voice in the fire safety ad (Ref. 21/87, Table 2.1, Appendix B) from the 1987 sub-corpus and that of Rudolph, Santa Claus’ reindeer in the RTV television rentals ad (Ref. 34/77, Table 1.1 Appendix B). In these examples, the accent and dialect is not associated with realistic characters to whom the audience could potentially relate, but rather suggests caricatures associated with North American television. North American dialect in the form of the use of the North American abbreviation for the word brother, ‘bro’ is employed by a more realistic character in an ad for Peat’s World of Electronics (Ref. 30/07, Table 4.1, Appendix B) from the 2007 sub-corpus. Interestingly, however, this character does not use a North American accent but rather that of advanced Dublin English pronunciation, as described in chapter 2, section 2.4.4. This, together with the relatively low occurrence overall of North American features in the corpus, suggests that the North American influence manifests itself through the advent of the new Irish English sub-variety of advanced Dublin English, rather than more directly through increased use of the North American English variety itself. The use of this accent in the corpus will be discussed comprehensively in Chapter 7.

With regard to French (referring here to French language lexical items as well as French accented English) and Irish language (lexical items), these varieties are also displayed more frequently in the Action than in the Comment components of the ads. Examples of
the use of these varieties and how they operate with SSBE and Irish English will be examined in the analysis of these two main varieties in sections 5.4.2, 5.4.3 and 5.5 below. Additionally, there are two tokens of South American accent, both of which are displayed in the Action components of ads for Trócaire, (an Irish charity organisation), but not in the Comment (Ref 24/97 and 30/97, Table 3.1 in Appendix B). This indicates that these varieties are not a vital part of the ‘serious’ and authoritative voice of the ad. While a German language phrase occurs in the Comment component of Ad Ref. 21/07, (Table 4.1, Appendix B), for the German car company, Audi, it is the only token of German in the corpus.

The low occurrence of Irish language items in the corpus adds weight to the proposition discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.3.4), that the nationalist language ideology model in Ireland is based on Irish English rather than Irish as fulfilling the role of a national ‘language ’ (White 2006).

The pre-dominance of SSBE and Irish English in the corpus as compared with other varieties calls for a more in-depth analysis of these varieties. The findings in relation to this analysis are outlined below. While the focus of the following section of the analysis is on these two predominant varieties and on how they function together, the use of other varieties (for example the use of lexical items from the Irish language, (pseudo) French accent etc.) will be discussed further below in relation to how they operate with SSBE and Irish English.

5.3 Longitudinal occurrence and location according to ad component of Standard Southern British English (SSBE) and Irish English

In this section, as outlined above, the focus of the analysis narrows to concentrate predominantly on the two main varieties found in the corpus overall, SSBE and Irish
English. This section of the analysis responds to research sub-question 1.2 relating to longitudinal change in the two main varieties across the corpus, and in their function in terms of location according to ad component. As the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora show a dramatic increase in the use of Irish English in both ad components, these sub-corpora call for analysis at the intra-varietal level in terms of accent sub-varieties of Irish English. Chapter 6 is dedicated to this analysis. Therefore, in this section of the analysis the main focus is on the 1977 and 1987 sub-corpora, although quantitative data on longitudinal inter-varietal variation is presented in relation to all four sub-corpora.

5.3.1 Exploitation of Irish English phonological as opposed to dialectal features

As discussed in chapter 3, section 3.4.5, based on Bell’s (1991a p.140) finding that advertisements appear to have been designed in order to maximise the use of phonological features, before looking at inter-varietal difference with regard to the two main varieties, it is helpful to look at the extent of use of Irish English dialectal variety (as described in chapter 4, Table 4.1) as compared with Irish English accent variety as indicated by rhotic pronunciation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action (Fraction)</td>
<td>Dialect</td>
<td>Accent</td>
<td>Dialect</td>
<td>Accent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>3.5/10</td>
<td>3/12</td>
<td>8/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action (Percentage)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment (Fraction)</td>
<td>0/35</td>
<td>3/35</td>
<td>0/35</td>
<td>4/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment (Percentage)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: Fraction/Percentage of ad components displaying Irish English accent and dialectal variety in the corpus

NOTE: Figures represent fraction/percentage of total numbers of the particular component which displays Irish English or SSBE features in the sub-corpus (see chapter 4, section 4.7.3).
Table 5.2 and Figure 5.2 show the proportions of the particular ad components (Action or Comment) which display Irish English dialectal variety as against accent variety (indicated by rhotic accent) expressed as a proportion of the total numbers of the particular component which displays Irish English or SSBE features in the sub-corpus (see chapter 4, section 4.7.3). Interestingly, as found by Bell (ibid), Irish English is displayed mainly through the phonological feature of rhotic pronunciation rather than through Irish English dialectal features. While the three most recent sub-corpora show a greater use of Irish English in terms of dialect than that of 1977, nevertheless, dialectal Irish English features do not keep pace with the consistently increasing pattern of rhotic pronunciation; this latter form increases steadily through the decades in both ad components while the occurrence of dialectal Irish English variety remains relatively stable in the three most recent sub-corpora. As with accent variety, dialectal Irish English variety predominates in the Action components as against the Comment components of the ads in the case of all four sub-corpora, with only one ad (Ref. 5/97,

![Graph showing percentage of ad components displaying Irish English dialectal and accent variety](image)
Table 3.1 in Appendix B) in the 1997 sub-corpus displaying Irish English dialectal items in the Comment component. This ad is examined in chapter 6, section 6.2.1. The fact that Irish English is demonstrated to a greater extent through phonological than through dialectal items in the ads bears out Bell’s (1991a p.141) finding that advertisements tend to exploit phonological features to a greater extent than dialectal features.

In chapter 2, section 2.3.7, we have seen how, in the context of this study, it is more useful to look at phonological features in the analysis at the intra-varietal level, given that it is phonological rather than dialectal factors which more definitively distinguish sub-varieties of Irish English. In relation to distinguishing between SSBE and Irish English (in its broad sense), however, dialectal Irish English features, in that they are absent from ‘Standard (British) English’ (see chapter 1, section 1.2), contribute to the distinction between these broad varieties. Therefore, notwithstanding the finding that Irish English accent variety is more prevalent in the corpus than dialectal variety and therefore the focus on accent in the analysis, nevertheless, ads which display dialectal Irish English in conjunction with rhotic pronunciation are examined as part of a more general analysis of the juxtaposition of Irish English and SSBE accent in ‘Action and Comment’ ads in section 5.5.3 below.

5.3.2 Rhotic (Irish English) and non-rhotic (SSBE) pronunciation

In response to research sub-question 1.2, with regard to accent variety, the quantitative findings in relation to the question of longitudinal change in the occurrence of non-rhotic SSBE and rhotic Irish English pronunciation and the location of these forms according to advert component (Action or Comment) are displayed in Table 5.3 and in Figure 5.3 below.
NOTE: In the Action components of the 1977 and 1997 sub-corpora, non-standard British English pronunciation was displayed in a very small number of ads. These are included in the non-rhotic figures (see chapter 4, section 4.7.2).

Figures represent fraction/ percentage of total numbers of the particular component which displays Irish English or SSBE features in the sub-corpus (see chapter 4, section 4.7.2).

As described in chapter 3, section 3.2.2, the Comment component of the ad generally relates to decontextualised monologic discourse in order to sanction the act of purchase and is associated with discourses of power; the Action component, on the other hand, tends to present scenarios designed to create solidarity with the listener through identification with the characters or situations depicted in these scenarios, and is associated with informal interaction (Lee 1992). As illustrated above, in all four sub-corpora, rhotic pronunciation is more prevalent as a feature of the Action rather than the
Comment components of the ads, with non-rhotic pronunciation occurring more often in the Comment components than it does in those of the Action. In addition, the presence of rhotic pronunciation increases steadily through the decades, not only in the Action but also in the Comment component of the ads at the expense of the non-rhotic pronunciation. Also of note is the greater presence of non-rhotic as against rhotic accents in the Action components of the 1977 sub-corpus. This sub-corpus, however, is the only one in which non-rhotic accents exceed rhotic accents in this component and it is notable that in the Action components of the most recent sub-corpus, that of 2007, non-rhotic accents have disappeared. In addition, they have a far lower presence in the Comment, being replaced by Irish English rhotic accents. These finding in general have parallels with Lee’s (1992) study which revealed that, notwithstanding the overall preference of the Comment for the standard variety, High German, local varieties were found to some extent in the Comment components in his corpus, although these Comment components were associated with a less formal discursive range than the Comment components which displayed High German (Lee, 1992, p.175). Additionally, Lee emphasises that the Action components of the ads in his corpus are predominantly based on ‘middle-class’ settings and so the use of non-standard Swiss German is not socially stigmatised in the ads. In the Irish context also, it must be noted that rhotic pronunciation is a feature of the so-called quasi-standard or ‘non-local’ Irish English as well as vernacular or ‘local’ varieties, as described in chapter 2 (section 2.3.8). Therefore, in order to examine the ideology associated with the choice of Irish English rhotic accent, it is important to look more closely at the breakdown of Irish English accent with regard to sub-variety in the earlier sub-corpora.

5.3.3 Irish English rhotic accent analysis: 1977 and 1987 sub-corpora

While this section of the analysis is generally more interested in the broad varieties of
SSBE and Irish English, (rather than focusing on specific accent sub-varieties of Irish English), it is nevertheless important to look at Irish English rhotic accent in terms of the ‘local’ and ‘non-local’ sub-varieties discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.3.8), in order to determine whether this pronunciation is associated with this quasi-standard form or with more local forms.

Table 5.4 and Figure 5.4 below show that the display of rhotic pronunciation in the Comment components of the 1977 and 1987 sub-corpora is comprised of non-local Irish English accent sub-varieties, as associated with the dissociative ‘standard’ or prestige variety, predominantly the supraregional southern sub-variety, as described in chapter 2, section 2.3.8). With regard to the accent sub-varieties of Irish English used in the Action components of these sub-corpora, in the 1977 sub-corpus, local pronunciations (regional and local Dublin) make up 57% of the total while non-local (supraregional southern) account for 43%. The figures for 1987 show little change with values of 56% and 44% respectively, although local Dublin accounts for a larger proportion of ‘local’ accents.
Table 5.4: Fraction/Percentage of ad components displaying Irish English accent sub-variety 1977/1987

Figure 5.4: Percentage of ad components displaying Irish English accent sub-variety 1977/1987

NOTE: Figures represent fraction/ percentage of total numbers of the particular component which displays Irish English accent variety in the sub-corpus (see chapter 4, section 4:8.1).
Examples of ads displaying local accents in their Action components will be examined below in section 5.4.2 in relation to their juxtaposition against non-rhotic pronunciation. With regard to the non-local Comment voice, a ‘Comment only’ ad from the 1987 sub-corpus, Advert 5.2 (Ref. 10/87) for *Friend Fabric Conditioner*, transcribed below, displays a non-local supraregional southern accent, employed by the speaker, a well-known Irish musician (and wife of renowned Irish broadcaster, Gay Byrne, whose radio programme forms the context of the ads from the 1977 and 1987 sub-corpora, as discussed in chapter 4, section 4.3.2.). The voice of this speaker shows no signs of the more prestigious ‘r-lessness’ and displays notable Irish English features such as retention of /ʍ/ in her pronunciation of white [wart] as [wart] (or<hw>for<wh>) (Hickey (2004, p.41) (Lines 008 and 012), a feature which we will discuss further below. However, her speech is careful, with enunciation of the /θ/ sound in ‘Kathleen’ (Line 001) and particular attention is given to the /d/ sound in *Friend* (Lines 002, 004 and 011). Milroy (2000, p. 19) refers to carefulness as a criterion in standardisation, based on traditional definitions and views it as a consequence of standard ideology. Additionally, the register is quite formal and these factors together with the profile of the speaker, combine to associate the accent with educated, middle-class speakers, despite its retention of /t/.

*Advert 5.2 (Ref. 10/87) Friend fabric conditioner*

1987: Comment only

001 FCV: hello () Kathleen[kaθli:n] Watkins here
002 to tell you about Friend fabric conditioner[ka nd] [fænər]
003 an exciting new Irish-made high quality product ()
004 Friend Fabric Conditioner has a tremendous advantage
005 over other fabric softeners [sɔfənəz] ()
006 because it contains famous Reckitt's blue
which for generations has had proven success in whitening whites and brightening coloureds so give your clothes that extra softness and fresh fragrance with Irish-made fabric conditioner it softens whitens brightens

However, despite the association of this accent with the middle-class, educated speaker of Irish English, SSBE is nevertheless the overall preferred option in the 1977 and 1987 sub-corpora, particularly as the authoritative voice in the Comment component. Therefore the choice of the SSBE non-rhotic accent in these earlier sub-corpora, in spite of the option of a ‘prestige’ variety of Irish English, highlights most forcibly the dominance of standard language ideology with regard to these sub-corpora. The ideological implications of the use of local and non-local Irish English accent will be dealt with more fully in Chapter 6.

Returning to the main findings in terms of the occurrence and location of broad categories of SSBE and Irish English accent, as we have seen (Table 5.3 and Figure.5.3), non-rhotic pronunciation is more prevalent in the Comment components of the ads from the 1977 and 1987 sub-corpora. In addition, the Action components of the 1977 sub-corpus favour non-rhotic pronunciation while in the Action components of the 1987 sub-corpus rhotic pronunciation is more prevalent. These patterns will be explored more comprehensively in relation to the third research sub-question regarding the juxtaposition of variety in ‘Action and Comment ads’ in section 5.4 below. However, having looked at the breakdown in terms of accent sub-variety of rhotic accents in the 1977 and 1987 sub-corpora, the next section will look at salient features relating to the non-rhotic accent as associated with SSBE in the earlier sub-corpora.
5.3.4 Standard Southern British English (SSBE) non-rhotic accent analysis: 1977 and 1987 sub-corpora

As discussed above, the more frequent occurrence of non-rhotic pronunciation in the two earlier sub-corpora and its favouring of the Comment components of both these sub-corpora, associates this pronunciation form with discourses of ‘power and authority’ (Lee 1992, pp.172-173). Furthermore, the use of this standard form in the ads exploits, on the face of it, traditional establishment authenticities, as discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.4.2). However, it is noteworthy that on closer examination, a number of ads, although they employ non-rhotic pronunciation, do not consistently use SSBE phonological features and actually display ‘telltale’ Irish English features alongside the feature of /r/ lessness. Indeed, in the majority of the ads which display non-rhotic pronunciation in the 1977 and 1987 sub-corpora, Irish English features are displayed in conjunction with this non-rhotic accent. This accent sub-variety is referred to as Nrh-IrE (non-rhotic accent with Irish English features) as described in chapter 4, section 4.6); the occurrence of this latter form in the earlier sub-corpora is compared with non-rhotic pronunciation in which Irish English features cannot be identified (Nrh) in Table 5.5 and Figure 5.5 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nrh</td>
<td>Nrh-IrE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraction</td>
<td>2.5/6.5</td>
<td>4/6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraction</td>
<td>1.5/4</td>
<td>2.5/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5: Fraction/Percentage of ad components displaying non-rhotic (Nrh) and non-rhotic Irish English (Nrh-IrE) SSBE pronunciation
We will look briefly at two ads from the 1977 sub-corpus which illustrate this finding.

The *Philips* microwave oven ad, (Advert 5.3, Ref. 31/77) for example, although displaying non-rhotic pronunciation, has evidence of a slit fricative /t/ (a well known Irish English feature as observed by Amador-Moreno (2010. p.78) in the pronunciation of *heat* (Line 003). Hickey (2013) discusses the distinction between ‘markers’ and ‘indicators’, (in the tradition of Labov), pointing out that markers are features in a variety which are sensitive to social factors, for example alveolar stops in THIS and THINK lexical sets (Wells 1982); because they mark social subgroups, these features tend to disappear in more formal styles. Indicators, on the other hand, are features in a variety which do not vary according to social grouping or style. Hickey refers to fricative /t/ as an indicator, in that it transcends social class and style changes. Its use is therefore not stigmatised; notwithstanding this, it is indicative of Irish English and thus serves to highlight the rather conscious use of non-rhotic pronunciation alongside Irish English phonological features.
Other noteworthy pronunciation features in the Philips microwave oven ad (Advert 5.3, Ref. 31/77 below) include the introduction of yod in the word minutes [mɪnts] pronounced as [mɪnjɪts] (Line 004). Also, in another ad for the Switzer’s Department Store (Advert 5.4, Ref. 30/77 below), Wednesday [wenzdə] is pronounced as [wedənzdə]. These features can be understood as a form of hypercorrection (Labov 1966b), that is, the tendency by the speaker to ‘overshoot the mark’ in more formal speaking speech styles (Romaine 2000, p.75) in the attempt to adopt the linguistic norms of a higher social group. Here it appears that the speakers adopt what they perceive to be the standard forms of the words in each case. This stylistic feature is more common in women’s than in men’s speech (ibid), so it is interesting that in both of the ads, the speakers are female. The pronunciation of the Irish name, Orla, [ɔrlə] as [ɔːlə] (Line 002) in the Switzer’s ad could also be interpreted as a form of hypercorrection in that a non-rhotic realisation is evident, whereas the standard Irish pronunciation is rhotic. These hypercorrected features combine with non-rhotic pronunciation in what appears to be an attempt to emulate a standard or prestige speech style. This illustrates the concept of overt prestige (Trudgill 1972) which accounts for changes in speech which are above the level of consciousness and usually in the direction of prestige forms (as discussed in chapter 3, section 3.2.2) which have linguistic ‘value’ (Bourdieu 1991). This conscious or deliberate attempt at an emulation of the standard pronunciation form is reflective of the operation of standard language ideology which places SSBE as ‘correct’ and Irish English rhotic pronunciation as a deviant form. It also indicates a leaning towards traditional establishment authenticities, as discussed in chapter 2. However, its appearance as a conscious emulation of the SSBE form and therefore its representation as ‘naturally occurring’ (AL2) is not quite convincing; nor can it be said to be ‘fully owned’ (AL4)
(Coupland 2003, as discussed in chapter 2, section 2.4.2) in terms of its ‘giveaway’ Irish English features, and so its authenticity may be compromised in these ways.

**Advert 5.3 (Ref. 31/77) Philips microwave ovens**

**1977: Comment only**

001 FCV: Philips make their energy saving microwave ovens
002 to make life easier [iːzaɪː] for [fəː] you (.)
003 Philips microwave ovens can defrost (. ) heat [hiːt] or cook a wide variety of food in minutes [mɪnət] allowing you more time to be a good host (. ) hostess (. ) husband or [əː] wife (. )
006 Philips microwave ovens

**Advert 5.4 (Ref. 20/77) Switzer’s**

**1977: Comment only**

001 FCV: Eileen Colgan here [ˈhɪə] with Christmas news from Switzer’s [swtɪzər] (. )
002 meet Orla [ˈɔːrlə] Duane (. ) Opportunity Knocks winner [ˈwʊnər] as Cinderella arriving by open car [kaɪə] down Grafton Street to open Christmas at Switzer’s with the rest of the Duanes on Wednesday [wedənzaɪ] at four pm (. )
005 come along to meet the Duanes and Santa at Switzer’s

As we have seen, the 1977 sub-corpus has a higher percentage of Action components displaying non-rhotic than it does rhotic pronunciation. Examples of such ads will be examined in the next section in relation to the analysis of the existence of the strategy of juxtaposing accents in the corpus.

**5.4 ‘Action and Comment’ ads: Juxtaposition of rhotic and non-rhotic accents**

As discussed in chapter 3, Lee’s corpus (Lee 1992) displays the strategy of combining the ‘high’ variety in the Comment with the local variety in the Action. This strategy
exploits the ‘dialogic contrast’ (Bakhtin 1981, p.364) of different varieties, appealing to the ‘contrasting values’ associated with status and solidarity; these values relate to the dual goals of the ad, to promote acceptance through consumer identification with the actors representing the product, and also to supply the ‘rational sanctioning authority’ for the act of purchase (Lee 1992, pp.179-180). As the employment of this strategy in ‘Action and Comment’ type ads sheds more light on the ideological implications of exploiting these two forms in terms of their contrasting functions in terms of status and solidarity, the extent to which it is employed in the advertising corpus is relevant to this study. This section of the analysis addresses research sub-question 1.3; it measures the extent to which the strategy of combining Irish English rhotic pronunciation with SSBE non-rhotic pronunciation is exploited in ‘Action and Comment’ ads in the corpus. The quantitative analysis is based on the entire corpus, while the qualitative analysis focuses on the two earlier sub-corpora. (Given the pre-dominance of rhotic accents in both ad components in the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora, these later sub-corpora are subjected to a more detailed analysis in terms of Irish English accent sub-variety in chapter 6). Table 1.5 and the corresponding Figure 1.5 illustrate the findings in terms of the accent patterns.
Table 5.6: Fraction/Percentage of ‘Action and Comment’ (A&C) ads displaying particular accent combination patterns: (rhotic/non-rhotic)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rhotic: Action/Non-rhotic: Comment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraction</td>
<td>2.5/7</td>
<td>5.5/8</td>
<td>3/13</td>
<td>1/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-rhotic: Action and Comment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraction</td>
<td>3.5/7</td>
<td>2.5/8</td>
<td>2/13</td>
<td>0/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rhotic: Action and Comment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraction</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>0/8</td>
<td>8/13</td>
<td>13/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-rhotic: Action/ Rhotic Comment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraction</td>
<td>0/7</td>
<td>0/8</td>
<td>0/13</td>
<td>0/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.6: Percentage of ‘Action and Comment’ (A&C) ads displaying particular accent combination patterns: (rhotic/non-rhotic)

NOTE: Figures represent fraction/percentage of total numbers of ‘Action and Comment’ type ads less those ads which exclusively display accents other than SSBE non-rhotic accent or IrE rhotic accent in either component. (see chapter 4, section 4.7.4).

As indicated in Table 5.6 and Figure 5.6, the strategy of combining rhotic pronunciation with the SSBE non-rhotic pronunciation is exploited to varying degrees across the sub-corpora. The percentage of ads which combine rhotic pronunciation in the Action and
non-rhotic in the Comment is substantial in the 1977 and 1987 corpora but declines in the later years with increased rhoticity in both components. However, it is noteworthy that this strategy is less common in the 1977 corpus than in that of 1987. In the 1977 corpus, ads featuring non-rhotic pronunciation in both Comment and Action are more common.

The following section examines particular ads which illustrate the main patterns displayed in the 1977 and 1987 subcopora with regard to this strategy.

5.4.1 Non-rhotic SSBE Action and Comment

As we have seen (Table 5.3 and Figure 5.3 above), the 1977 sub-corpus has the highest occurrence within the corpus as a whole of ads with non-rhotic pronunciation in their Action components. In this sub-corpus, as regards the ‘Action and Comment’ ads, the prevailing pattern is that of non-rhotic pronunciation in both the Action and Comment components.

The 1977 Gloroney’s Home and Garden store ad (Advert 5.5 Ref. 28/77) below, illustrates an interesting finding with regard to the 1977 sub-corpus. The mix of standard phonological (i.e. non-rhotic /r/) and Irish English features is evident also in this ad in the form of yod deletion in the pronunciation of [nuː] as [nuː]. (see chapter 2 (section 2.4.2) and section 5.3.4 above for further discussion of this feature). The first enunciation of the word by Speaker F1 is the standard one (Line 002), but in further enunciations, the speaker uses the Irish English pronunciation (Line 003) as does the MCV (Line 009). As with fricative /t/, discussed above in relation to Advert 5.3, Hickey (2005, p.81) refers to this yod-deletion as a feature of very low salience, not significant as a social marker and having low awareness with speakers (as in Errington’s concept of ‘pragmatic salience’, that is, ‘native speakers’ awareness of the social significance of
different levelled linguistic alternants’ (cited in Woolard 1998, p.13) and discussed above in relation to language ideologies in chapter 2, section 2.3.5). This mix of features again underpins the deliberate or conscious nature of the non-rhotic feature, which can be said to be a more concrete or noticeable feature distinguishing between SSBE and Irish English than the fricative /t/ or yod deletion and thus a stronger indicator of prestige. In this ad, both Action and Comment exhibit this emulation of non-rhotic pronunciation (Nrh-IrE) as discussed in section 5.3.4. This is combined with a very careful pronunciation (as in the noticeable enunciation of final /d/ sound in the words Islandbridge and and (Line 008) to illustrate what Milroy (2000) refers to as a criterion in discussions of standardisation, that of carefulness, which Milroy sees as a consequence of standard ideology, as discussed in relation to Advert 5.2 (Ref. 10/87) above. However, in this case, the Action component also displays non-rhotic /r/ and has no evidence of Irish English dialect. The context is notably middle-class, depicting the couple shopping for fittings for a new house from the ‘international selection’.

**Advert 5.5 (Ref. 28 /77) Glorney’s**

**1977: Action and Comment**

001 F1: I always swore I’d never [nevə] do it again ()
002  once was enough but well: : here we go again () a new [ŋjuː] house
003  and that means a new [nuː] bathroom [bɑːθrum] suite ()
005  windows () doors [dɔːrs] and all the building material ()
006  that’s why John’s off to Glorney’s [ɡlɔː(r)niːz] ()
007  their international [ɪntəˈnɛʃənl] selection means one stop does the lot
008  MCV: Glorney’s [ɡlɔː(r)niːz] () Islandbridge and
009  now new [nuː] spacious showrooms in Townsend Street ()
010  Glorney’s [ɡlɔː(r)niːz] () where houses become homes

Advert 5.6 (Ref. 39/77) below, for Hedex painkillers from 1977, illustrates a similar
pattern where the Action and Comment components display non-rhotic pronunciation. However, the ad is remarkable in that within the Action component, which involves two characters, one of the characters uses non-rhotic pronunciation while the other employs rhotic pronunciation alongside other distinguishable Irish English features.

The context of the ad is a conversation between two housewives with children shouting in the background. One of the housewives, Joan, complains of a headache whereupon the second housewife recommends the product. The second part of the ad is set on the following day and features Joan’s friend telephoning her to ask how she is feeling. Joan replies that she is feeling ‘grand’ (Line 010). This use of the word grand is a recognised Irish English malapropism (see chapter 4, Table 4.1): that is, its meaning is not the same as it is in standard English (Bliss 1984). Additionally, Joan uses the pragmatic marker listen (Line 012), a common feature in Irish English as in the Irish language marker éist (Dolan, 2004 p.85) which also accentuates the quality of Irishness in this character (see Table 4.1 in chapter 4). It is notable that Joan’s pronunciation, while not identifiable with a particular region or county and could be described as supraregional southern (see Table 5.4 and Figure 5.4 above), is however rhotic while that of her friend is non-rhotic. The Comment component, which follows the Action, also employs non-rhotic pronunciation (Line 013). The image of both women is that of middle-class suburban housewives and indeed Joan’s use of these Irish English features could not be said to situate her character as any less middle-class. This has parallels with Lee’s study in that the Action components, in which the localised varieties of Swiss German predominated, were mainly associated with ‘middle-class’ settings (Lee 1992, p.175). However, it is interesting to note that Joan’s friend and ‘advisor’ who first names and goes on to provide the information about the product speaks with a non-rhotic accent and does not use any distinguishing Irish English
lexical features. Her function here could be construed as being similar to that of the Comment voice in naming and providing information on the product (Lee 1992, p.170). She is, in effect, ‘a purveyor of privileged information’ (Lee 1992, p.172). In this case, therefore, the non-rhotic Comment voice reinforces the voice of Joan’s friend in endorsing the product. This strategy is in evidence within the Action component in other ads in the 1987 sub-corpus also (for example, an ad for Siúcra Irish sugar (Ref. 3/87, Table 2.1, Appendix B), in that one character employs a supraregional southern accent and appears to be used for the purpose of consumer identification while a second character displays SSBE non-rhotic pronunciation and is used to consolidate the sanctioning voice or voice of authority, ironically in relation to an Irish product which exploits the Irish word for sugar, siúcra. Again, notwithstanding the exploitation of this distinctive Irish marker in the product name, the choice of the SSBE-associated feature for the ‘expert’ voice can be said to be ideologically founded. The employment of non-rhotic pronunciation in the Action components of these ads is interesting in that it appears to attempt to exploit establishment rather than vernacular authenticities (Coupland 2003) in the traditional sense in representing ‘everyday informal interaction’ (Lee 1992, p.172-3).

Advert 5.6 (Ref. 39/77) Hedex

1977: Action and Comment

001    ((children shouting))
002  F1: oh why can’t they keep quiet () don’t they know I’ve got a splitting headache?
003  F2: why don’t you take something for it Joan?
004  F1: I would but most pain killers [klɔːz] seem to upset my stomach
005  F2: Hedex won’t () here [hɪə] take these
006    I’ll get some more on the way home () they’re easy to swallow-
007    ((phone ringing))
008  F1: hello ()
are you feeling any better [betə] this morning [mə:nə] Joan?

oh I'm feeling grand () Hedex worked marvellously [mə vələsli]

from now on I won't take anything else ()

listen I'll see you at three and we can go -

Hedex () powerful [pauəfəl] against headaches () gentle on your [ʧə] stomach

One ad (Advert 5.7, Ref. 25/87 below) from the 1987 sub-corpus, while it is classified as having the pattern of non-rhotic pronunciation in both Action and Comment components (Table 3.1, Appendix B), is notable in that its Comment component displays several occurrences of rhotic pronunciation (Lines 002, 005 and 006). This phenomenon is also visible in a number of other ads in the corpus (see, for example Ad Ref. 9/77 in Table 1.1, Appendix B) and is interesting in light of Bell’s (1991a p.143) claim that in referee design, it is more important that a marked linguistic variant is displayed once out of a potential ten occurrences than that an unmarked variant occur nine times. For this reason, the Comment voice is categorised as non-rhotic with Irish English features (Nrh-IrE). Advert 5.7 below is for Superquinn, an Irish-owned supermarket. The Action component features Santa Claus (M1) and his wife, Mrs Claus (F1), conversing in rather contrived ‘posh’ accents (although these are categorised as Nrh as no Irish English features were detected), whilst enjoying their Christmas dinner. The Comment voice has a mix of rhotic and non-rhotic accents (Lines 001, 002, 005 and 006) again situating the non-rhotic pronunciation as a conscious choice, as described. However, as observed by Bell (ibid), the use of even a small number of occurrences of this feature are powerful enough to suggest associations with SSBE, although the inaccurate representation may compromise its authenticity as discussed above.
Advert 5.7 (Ref. 25/87) Superquinn

1987: Action and Comment

001 MCV: working [wɜːkɪŋ] on Christmas day would put anyone in bad humour [hjuː.mər]
002 but Missus Claus knows the secret of making Christmas dinner[diːnə] ()
003 a really jolly occasion
004 M1: ho ho ho ho ho -
005 MCV: turkey [tɜːkɪ] and ham from Super [suːpər] Quinn ()
006 tender [tendə] juicy meat and succulent fresh food
007 all year round () especially at Christmas
008 F1: more [mɔː] turkey [tɜːkɪ] darling [dɑːlɪŋ]?
009 ((clinking of glasses))
010 F1: oh () easy on the ↑ wine heh heh
011 M1: it’s alright my [maɪ] dear [diər] () I’m not driving tonight ho ho -
012 Song: come on in and get the whole Superquinn story
013 MCV: this Christmas

As can be seen from Table 5.6 and Figure 5.6 above, while the strategy of juxtaposing non-rhotic pronunciation in the Comment alongside rhotic in the Action is visible to some degree across all four sub-corpora, it is most prevalent in the earlier two sub-corpora and in particular in that of 1987. The percentage of ads which show rhotic pronunciation in both Action and Comment components, however, is very low in the 1977 sub-corpus and this pattern is not visible at all in that of 1987. In the following section, transcriptions of ads which illustrate the more common pattern overall in the earlier sub-corpora of rhotic accent in the Action combined with non-rhotic in the Comment will be discussed.

5.4.2 Rhotic IrE Action/Non-rhotic SSBE Comment

The below ad (Advert 5.8, Ref. 23/77) for Ergas gas suppliers illustrates the pattern of rhotic accent in the Action combined with non-rhotic in the Comment. This ad, from the 1977 sub-corpus, displays local Dublin (Irish English) pronunciation (see section 2.3.8
in chapter 2) combined with Irish English dialectal elements in the Action component. The context is a Dublinman’s musings, on his bus-journey home from work, on the image of his wife setting up their new gas heater in preparation for his return.

Advert 5.8 (Ref. 23/77) Ergas

1977: Action & Comment

001 M1: she’ll be rollin’ [rəʊlɪŋ] the new Ergas automatic
002 very proudly into the living room now gettin’[ɡɛtɪŋ] it nice [næs] and warm (.)
003 ah nil aon tinteán mar do thinteán féin
004 M2: fares please
005 M1: sorry (.) twenty please
006 M2: thank [tæŋk] you
007 M1: and the more I think about it
008 the more sense our change to Ergas heating makes (.)
009 the bills are down [dɛʊn] already and you can’t beat instant heat (.)
010 ah Ergas is yer [jær] only man
011 MCV: don’t just think about Ergas this winter [ˈwɪntər]
012 change now for better [bætə] value all round
013 M1: eh next stop please
014 MCV: Ergas (.) more [mɔːr] gas for your [jəʊ] money

In this ad, the rhotic /r/ combines with other phonological and dialectal features of Irish English local Dublin accent sub-variety, as well as Irish language elements. The pronunciation of thank [θæŋk] as [tæŋk] \(^{22}\) (Line 006) is a recognised feature of local Dublin English (Hickey 2004a, p.31) as is the realisation of rolling [rəʊlɪŋ] as [rəʊlɪŋ] (Line 001), getting as alveolar [ɡɛtɪŋ], nice [næs] as [næs] (Line 002) and also the MOUTH fronting of down [dɛʊn] (Line 009) (Hickey 2004, p.57). The man’s musings

\(^{22}\) Hickey (2004, p.33) assumes that Irish speakers would have used the nearest equivalent sound to /θ/ and /ð/, namely the coronal stops of the Irish language, in the change to the English language.
conclude with the assertion that ‘Ergas is yer only man’ (Line 010), an intertextual reference which echoes the work of the Irish novelist and poet, Flann O’Brien, ‘A pint of plain is yer only man’ (O’Brien 1939; 1967), meaning a pint of stout is the only way to deal with your problems. The image, achieved through such intertextuality, the use of colloquial Dublin English (through mainly phonological but also some dialectal features) is of a traditional, upright, working-class Dublinman whose wife is a competent homemaker. The Irish language proverb, *Níl aon tinteán mar do thinteán féin* (Line 003), *There’s no fireside like your own fireside* consolidates the distinctiveness of the Irish English variety, associating it with the Irish language and lends validity to Irish English as a marker of Irish identity, which appears to be, as Cronin puts it, ‘consciously cultivated as a marker of specificity’ (Cronin 2011, p.56). This is an effective illustration of the ‘blended and hybridised’ (Tymoczko and Ireland, 2003b, p.20) Irish language and English language culture, as discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.3.6); it shows how the idea of the nation as an ‘imagined’ community can be created through cultural representations (Wright 2000, p. 23-24), and highlights how nationalist ideology need not be based on the use of a distinct national language. The use of Irish English features, although exploiting traditional vernacular authenticity (Coupland 2003), is somewhat understated. Therefore, its vernacular authenticity is not compromised as it might be through hyperbolic representations, giving a credibility to the scene which promotes acceptance of the product through identification with the character. The sanctioning voice of the Comment is notably non-rhotic, however, which again reinforces this form as associated with authority.

An ad for the sister department stores of *Switzer’s, Todd’s, Cash’s* and *Moon’s* (Advert 5.9, Ref. 1/87 below), is typical of this pattern which is the predominant one for the 1987 sub-corpus; again its Comment component employs a non-rhotic accent while its
Action displays rhotic pronunciation. However, as we have seen in the analysis of Comment components above, it is notable in this ad also that the speaker in the Comment component does not consistently use SSBE phonological features. As with the ad for Friend Fabric Conditioner (Advert 5.2 above), his retention of [ʍ] is notable in his pronunciation of white [wɔt] as [mɑɾt] (or<hw>for<wh>) (Line 002). Indeed Hickey (2004a, p.41) refers to this as a salient Irish English marker and points to this feature as well as rhoticity as highlighting how speakers from the Irish Republic distinguish themselves from Received Pronunciation (RP) speakers in, what he gives us to understand as a conscious dissociation from RP (Hickey 2005, p.33) (see section 2.4.2 in chapter 2). The appearance of this feature alongside non-rhotic /t/ calls into question Hickey’s theory of its salience in this respect. Again, as with Irish English associated phonological features such as fricative /t/ and yod deletion, it has the effect of highlighting the conscious or affected nature of the non-rhotic pronunciation.

The ad’s non-rhotic Comment component is followed by a local Dublin voice in the Action (illustrated through the short /ʌ/ in hurry [hʌri:] up [ɔp] (Hickey 2005, p.35) (Line 009). The use of non-rhotic pronunciation in the Comment is in marked contrast to the local accent in the Action, and this contrast situates the Comment voice as serious, sophisticated and somewhat refined. This is heightened through the employment of the French language item lingerie in the Comment voice (Line 003). Although the Action component does not contain any Irish English dialectal items, the term knickers (Line 010) contrasts with the French term lingerie and in doing so could be said to associate the Irish English pronunciation with a lack of refinement and sophistication. However, at another level the mocking of the French term through its exaggerated pronunciation in Line 009 serves to ‘other’ (Irvine and Gal 2009) for the listener, not only the French word and to position it as ‘posh’ and foreign, but also the pronunciation of this word by
the speaker of SSBE in the Comment component. In this way it operates to create a representation of Irishness and familiarity through the mocking of the more sophisticated term and its substitution with the more common term, *knickers*. This heightens the effectiveness of the Action component and underpins its contrast with the SSBE features of the Comment voice. The Comment voice achieves a sophistication through the non-rhotic pronunciation but also through the use of the French language term *lingerie* (Line 003) as well as another French language element in reference to a colour *eau de nil* (Line 002). However, this sophistication is effectively deconstructed through the local Dublin English pronunciation combined with the derisive tone of the Action component. This strategy and its ideological implications will be discussed more comprehensively below in relation to the concept of referee design in section 5.6.2 below.

**Advert 5.9 (Ref. 1/87) Switzer’s, Todd’s, Cash’s and Moon’s**

**1987: Action and Comment**

001 MCV:  Christmas at Switzer’s [swɪtsəz] Todds Cashes and Moons ()  
002 and it’s definitely going to be white [ɔ:mt] or possibly slate or even *eau de nil*  
003 because we’ve got *lingerie* [læŋˈʒəri] that’s full of Christmas sparkle [spaːkl] ()  
004 Charno [tʃaːnau] slips from thirteen [θətiːn] ninety nine to twenty one fifty ()  
005 camisole tops by Gossard [ɡɒsəd] Charno and Warner [ˈwɔːnə]  
006 from ten ninety nine to seventeen fifty plus the lovely *Barbara* [ˈbærəbra] range  
007 from sixteen ninety five to thirty [θəsiː] five ninety five  
008 ((laughter of santa bears))  
010 that’s *knickers* to you ()  
011 the santa bears have discovered that camisoles make great parachutes

Although, in both the above examples, local Irish English accent sub-variety is

---

23 Local Dublin English is weakly rhotic. (Hickey 2005, p.40)
employed in juxtaposition with the non-rhotic Comment voice, it is important to note
that other accent sub-varieties of Irish English are also visible in these sub-corpora, as
illustrated in Table 5.4 and Figure 5.4 above. While local Irish English accent sub-
varieties are somewhat more prevalent in the Action components of the two earlier sub-
corpora than non-local Irish English sub-varieties, nevertheless non-local sub-varieties
are also exploited as part of the Irish English repertoire in the earlier sub-corpora. This
can be said to afford these non-local varieties authenticity in that they are represented as
‘everyday interaction’ (Lee 1992) and therefore as ‘naturally occurring’ as in AL2
(Coupland 2003) (see chapter 2, section 2.4.2). As these non-local accent sub-varieties
are Irish English (as opposed to those modelled on SSBE), they are therefore based on
the Irish ‘ingroup norms’ (Coupland 2007 p.181); additionally they are represented in
the ads as the language of ‘ordinary people’ (ibid). As discussed in chapter 2 (section
2.4.2), the issue is not whether the variety is authentic in any real sense, but how it is
represented in the media as this is the basis for our understanding of what language is
(Johnson and Ensslin 2007, p. 3).

The use of non-local Irish English accent sub-varieties is visible in the Cross Writing
Instrument ad (Advert 5.10, Ref. 35/87) from the 1987 sub-corpus, transcribed below. In
this ad, an Irish English supraregional southern accent is displayed in the Action
component of the ad. The context of the Action suggests that the speaker is middle-class
and educated, and this is reinforced by the non-local Irish English pronunciation.
However it is noteworthy that the Comment voice, the ‘voice of authority’ (Piller 2001)
employs non-rhotic pronunciation (Line 011), again indicating the operation of standard
ideologies which situate the standard British variety rather than the quasi-standard non-
local Irish English, as the authoritative voice. The standard pronunciation of the
Comment reinforces the authenticity of the supraregional southern variety as a marker of
Irishness.

Advert 5.10 (Ref. 35/87) Cross writing instruments

1987: Action and Comment

001 M1: dear Dad () hope you like the Cross [krɔ:s] pen I’m sending you for Christmas ()
002 it certainly cost [kɔ:st] enough
003 but then [dɛn] () after all the years you spent looking after[ɑːft ə] me
004 not to mention the money () it’s worth it
005 it’s actually mechanically guaranteed for life () how about that?
006 and it shows that I’m thinking ahead like you always told me to ()
007 I know that your Cross pen will remind you of me every time
008 you write a cheque and even though I’m totally broke right now
009 I see that Cross pen as an investment in my future
010 MCV: Cross writing instruments ()
011 show someone how much you care [kə] this Christmas.

As we have seen in section 5.3.1 above, Irish English is displayed mainly through the phonological feature of rhotic pronunciation rather than through Irish English dialectal variety. Notwithstanding this, as in the case of Advert 5.8 above for Ergas, dialectal items are used in conjunction with rhotic Irish English accent in many ads throughout the corpus. (see Table 5.2 and Figure 5.2 in section 5.3.1), serving to enhance the inter-varietal contrast. Therefore, in order to provide a more comprehensive picture of Irish English as it is used in the corpus, it is useful to look at some examples of how dialectal features combine with phonological features of Irish English to contrast with non-rhotic SSBE in this sub-corpus. In addition, features of other varieties (for example, French) as they operate in conjunction with Irish English features are referred to where relevant.

5.4.3 Rhotic and dialectal IrE Action/Non-rhotic SSBE Comment

As we have seen (Table 5.2 and Figure 5.2 in section 5.3.1), the display of dialectal Irish
English variety is greater in the 1987, 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora than that of 1977. In these later sub-corpora, the percentage of ads displaying dialectal Irish English remains quite consistent. As part of the preceding analysis of the juxtaposition of Irish English accent and SSBE in ‘Action and Comment’ ads, this section examines two ads from the 1987 sub-corpus which exploit a profusion of Irish English dialectal features in conjunction with rhotic Irish English accent in their Action components, juxtaposed against SSBE accent in the Comment. Additionally, as heralded in section 5.2, the use of (pseudo) French accent and lexical items will be discussed in relation to how they operate with SSBE and Irish English in these ads.

The ads are both for Perrier mineral water and employ both Irish English dialectal and accent variety in their Action components, with SSBE in the Comment. In the first of these ads (Advert 5.11, Ref. 17/87, transcribed below), which is set in a Dublin ballroom or nightclub, the image is created of a young Dublin couple engaging in a rather unromantic exchange in local Dublin English. Enhanced by the use of Irish English lexical, grammatical and pragmatic features, the characters and context of the ad resonate to some extent with the novels of Roddy Doyle, a number of which have been made into films, as well as soap-operas set in Dublin city. This again illustrates the strategy of intertextuality in attempting to promote solidarity through such cultural representations and highlights the notion of a community created through the cultural representations which relates to late and post modernist nationalism (Wright 2000, p.23-24) (as discussed in chapter 2, section 2.3.4). The discourse marker, Janey, one of several euphemisms for Jesus (Dolan 2004, p.129), is typically Irish English as is the use of the says+personal pronoun quotative expression, says I (Dolan 2004, p.197) (see Table 4.1, chapter 4). The constitutive intertextuality (Fairclough 1992) in the form of the reference to the Edge, a member of the internationally renowned Dublin rock group,
U2, is the basis for a classic example of wordplay-based Irish humour in Line 004 (*Hm, he’d do himself a favour by fallin’ over one*).

The female character, Assumpta, having ordered her partner (nicknamed *Brenner* in local Dublin style)\(^{24}\) in a loud voice to buy her a *Perrier* mineral water, however, changes from local Dublin vernacular to pseudo-French as she sips the water and speaks romantically to Brenner whom she now addresses as *Brenneur* (changing the suffix to one associated with the French language) and the French endearment, *ma cherie*. Coinciding with the introduction of the French ‘accent’, is a notable fall in pitch in Assumpta’s voice (Lines 009-011) followed by an incredulous response in local Dublin from Brenner (Line 012) with /t/ glottalisation in the pronunciation of *what* (see Hickey 2013). This component of the ad concludes with Assumpta singing to ‘Brenneur’ in the French language. The use of the pseudo-French accent and the French language elements concurs with Piller’s findings (Piller 2001, p.169) of the representation of the French language in TV ads as ‘the language of love’, and its associations with ‘heterosexual eroticism’. Additionally, as observed by Kelly Holmes (2005, p. 56), French has become a symbol of femininity, fashion and beauty. Indeed in this ad, the French accent and language elements transform the character of Assumpta from that of an uncouth, loud and domineering young woman to one who is refined, soft-spoken and feminine. As with Advert 5.9 (Ref. 1/87) for *Switzer’s, Todd’s, Cash’s and Moon’s*, (in which the French term *lingerie* contrasted with the more common term *knickers*), when juxtaposed against the French, the local Dublin variety appears uncouth and unrefined, rendering it wholly unsuitable as the ‘language of love’ and inconducive to the potential romance of the situation. The Comment, which names and describes the product and

\(^{24}\) The –er suffix is especially common in the Hiberno English of Dublin in the coining of nicknames (Dolan 2004, p.85)
refers to its putative source, ‘naturally sparkling from the centre of the earth’ (Line 016), is delivered in a standard non-rhotic accent.

Advert 5.11 (Ref. 17/87) Perrier

1987: Action and Comment

001 F1: like () I don’t know where we are [aːr] but it’s dark [daːrk] and hot [hɑː] ()
003 tryin’ [træsn] to look like the Edge ()
004 hm he’d do himself a favour by fallin’ over one
005 M1: I’m parched [paːrtʃ] () will we get some gargle [gɑːrgl]? ()
006 F1: gargle [gɑːrgl]? () imagine () so says I [æz] () buzz off Brenner I’m meltin’ ()
007 get [ɡer] us a cold Perrier will ya [ja]? ()
008 well pretty soon I’m downin’ the Perrier
009 ah and with [wɪd] each sip the dancing bursting *bubbles [bœ célibz]
010 fill my head [ed] and beckon me on to the floor ()
011 ah Brenner [brenɛər] hold [oːd] me close ma cherie°
012 M1: wha’? [hwɑː]
013 F1: ((singing)) plaisir d’amour
014 M1: Janey [dʒeːni] Assumpta
015 F1: ((singing)) ne dure qu’un moment.
016 MCV: Perrier () naturally sparkling [spɑː.klɪŋ] () from the centre of the earth [ɔːθ]

In a similar ad for the same product (Advert 5.12, Ref. 6/87 below), the accents, as well as a number of lexical and grammatical items, are notably rural; as with the local Dublin vernacular, they are juxtaposed against the mock French accent of romance and sophistication which results from drinking the Perrier mineral water, as well as against the SSBE Comment voice. The setting is below 25 in an Irish country ballroom where Seánín, a young man from a rural background nervously hides behind his Perrier water 26

---

25 Dolan (2004, p. 1) defines the Irish English word ‘above’ as loosely meaning ‘up’ as in ‘We were above [up] in Dublin. The word ‘below’ in this context can be understood in a similar way i.e. ‘We were down in the Moonlight ballroom’

26 The suffix *in* represents the Irish diminutive (Dolan 2004, p. 84).
as he listens to *Mighty Mick and the Sideliners* (Line 002). This intertextual reference is a play on a well-known Irish Country and Western style showband. This music genre is associated stereotypically with rural audiences, contrasting with the reference to the rock band *U2* in the previous ad which is set in the capital, and thus exploiting manifest intertextuality in Fairclough’s terms (1992), as described in chapter 3 (section 3.2). As he is approached by a young woman for a ‘Ladies Choice’ dance, the listener is privy to the man’s anxious thoughts. He tells, in a hesitating voice, of how as ‘herself’ approaches, sure you know, I can’t put a foot under me at all at all’ (Lines 003 and 004). Amador-Moreno (2010 p.120) refers to Joyce’s description of the pragmatic marker *sure* as ‘one of our commonest opening words for a sentence [which] you will hear…perpetually among gentle and simple’ and points to Kelly-Holmes (2005a) observation of its use in signalling Irishness in films and in advertising. Kirk and Kallen (2006, p.108) observe how any Irish English features of one level (for example a lexical item positioned close to a grammatical item) may reinforce that of another to ‘give a flavour of Celticity which is more than the sum of its parts’ and this is illustrated clearly in this ad. The marker *sure* combines with the non-standard reflexive pronoun use and the sentence tag *at all at all* in positioning the character as a stereotypically rural Irish person. The marker *like* Clancy (2000; Amador-Moreno 2010; Schweinberger 2012) in clause-final position (Line 005) is another marker of Irish English and adds to the overall effect (see Table 4.1 in chapter 4).

As he sips the Perrier, Seánín begins to speak eloquently in a pseudo-French accent of the ‘goddess before [him]’ (Line 008). The listener is then brought back to reality

---

27The occurrence of the reflexive pronoun in subject position and without reference to an antecedent is a typical feature of Irish English (Filppula 1999, pp. 77-78)
28The sentence tag ‘at all at all’ is an example of rhythmic retention resulting from language shift. The tag echoes the Irish tag ‘ar chor ar bith’, (Todd 1999).
momentarily by the so-called ‘goddess’ asking Seánín if he fancies ‘a bi’ o’ leppin’ 29. (Line 009). This anachronistic vernacular does not break the spell of the Perrier, however, and Seánín continues speaking confidently and expressively, in the French language. As with the previous ad, this ad concludes with a non-rhotic Comment voice (Line 011).

Advert 5.12 (Ref. 6/87) Perrier

1987: Action and Comment

001 M1:: what (.) I’m below [bɪ lo:] in the Moonlight Ballroom
002 listenin’ to Mighty Mick and the Sideliners
003 when don’t they call a Ladies’ Choice and (.) well (.) herself starts towards me
004 and (.) sure you know I can’t put a foot under me at all at all
005 so I hide behind my [mi:] Perrier with my [mi:] cap well pulled down like
006 and (.) when I take a sip out of the sparklin’ [spɑːkən] liquid
007 with its tiny diamond like bubbles [bɑːbelz] that seem to create a halo
008 round the [ zɛ] golden tresses of the [zɛ] goddess before me (.)
009 F1: hey Seánín (.) d’ya [dja] fancy a bit [bɪ] of [a] leppin’ [lepən]
010 M1: ah ma petit (.) ma petite ballerina (.) allons (.) dansez
011 MCV: naturally sparkling [spɑːklɪŋ] Perrier (.) from the centre of the earth [sə:]

Both of these ads follow the same format; the hyperbolised French accent is sandwiched between the similarly hyperbolised varieties of local Dublin English and rural Irish English, produced first of all by the initial speaker and then by the interjection of the second, throwing it into sharp relief. It is interesting that the use of the French language elements and French accent, although imperfectly reproduced, are enough in themselves to suggest romance and sophistication. Also of note is the use of strongly vernacular Irish English (accent and dialect) alongside the French language and ‘accent’. It is difficult to imagine that the use of an SSBE accent here, given its prestige status, would

29 ‘Leap is pronounced lep by our people’ (Joyce 1979, p.98)
be as effective as a contrast with the French accent as the vernacular is. The Irish
English lexical and grammatical, as well as pragmatic features combine with the
phonological features, in the case of these ads, to portray an image which could be
construed as unsophisticated, culturally stigmatised and comic, bordering on stage-
Irishness, as discussed by Cronin (2011, p.55) and far removed from the ‘noble and
heroic’ representations of Irishness suggested by Tymoczko and Ireland (2003a), as
discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.4.2).

As we have seen, the Comment voice in both these ads is non-rhotic and is juxtaposed
against the local Irish English accent and dialectal sub-variety and the pseudo-French. It
names the product and its putative source; ‘naturally sparkling Perrier, from the centre of
the earth’. Again, this non-rhotic Comment voice is responsible for the serious task of
interpreting the Action scenario and providing information on the product, suggesting
that the standard variety is the most suitable one for this function and exploiting
traditional establishment authenticities.

We have examined particular ads in terms of frequency of occurrence and position of
variety in the ad components and also with regard to the juxtaposition of variety
according to Action and Comment components in ‘Action and Comment’ ads. The next
section looks again at these ads in terms of two further mechanisms for the analysis of
the ideological basis of variety choice; the first of these addresses research sub-question
1.4 in relation to the concept of indexicality and the social meanings associated with
particular varieties while the second responds to research sub-question 1.5 which
concerns accommodation strategies, particularly in terms of audience and referee design.
These analyses are based mainly on the qualitative analysis of particular ads used in the
preceding analyses, although quantitative data may be used in certain instances to
support the qualitative findings. With regard to these two research sub-question, both accent and dialectal features are considered in the analyses.

5.5 The indexical values of SSBE and Irish English

As we have seen in chapter 3, section 3.3, the concept of indexicality can be understood as the association between an expression or form and what it meaningfully represents or stands for (Coupland 2007, p.22). Research sub-question 1.4 is concerned with indexicality as it relates to SSBE and Irish English in the earlier sub-corpora. In addressing this question, reference will also be made to the other varieties in relation to how they affect the indexical values (or social intentions) associated with the two main varieties.

As remarked in chapter 3 (section 3.3), language is indexical ‘from top to bottom’ (Woolard 2006, p.86). Piller (2001, p.160), in her corpus of German ads (see chapter 3, section 3.2.1), finds that the use of English appears to serve a connotational rather than an informative function and allows the recipients of the ads to associate their stereotypes of English and English-speaking individuals and cultures where English is spoken to the product. Kelly-Holmes (2005a, p.139) observes, however, that minority languages are often excluded from the ‘serious business of advertising information’. This, she claims, can lead to ‘commonsense assumptions’ about which varieties can be said to be ‘authoritative’ and ‘non-authoritative’. In terms of accent and dialect, despite the fact that English is the first language of the majority of the Irish population, the use of distinctive SSBE features does not have any added denotational value but rather serves a connotational purpose. The exploitation of such features, most notably non-rhotic pronunciation in the Comment component of the ads as the authoritative voice, can be said to be based on the way in which this form has come to index serious,
authoritative, sophisticated and expert persons and groups and its exploitation, in turn, reinforces this indexical value. Its use as the Comment voice associates it with a ‘clarity’ and ‘transparency’, associated with RP speakers as discussed by Coupland (2003) in relation to the ‘personal authenticity’ of (AL5) (see chapter 2, section 2.4.2). With regard to the use of SSBE in the 1977 and 1987 sub-corpora, the indexical effect is heightened through the strategy of juxtaposing SSBE in the Comment and Irish English in the Action within these ads (for example Advert 5.8 Ref. 23/77, (section 5.4.2), for Ergas). As Coupland (2007, p.21) remarks, the concepts of ‘standard’ and ‘non-standard’ can really only be understood in relation to each other. Through their positioning side-by-side, the SSBE accent is seen as interpreting the Irish English Action scenario for the listener. The ‘apparent’ heteroglossia of the ads (Cook 2001, p.220) through the voice or voices of both Action and Comment is effectively rendered monologic through the dominance of the Comment. The indexical value of the accent associated with this (Comment) voice is therefore reinforced and strengthened.

Where non-rhotic pronunciation is employed in the Action components, it appears to have a similar indexical value to that of the Comment. In Advert 5.6 (Ref. 39/77) for Hedex, for example (as discussed in section 5.4.1 above), the ‘advisor’ uses a non-rhotic accent in contrast to her advisee. In this way, the non-rhotic accent again indexes authority and expertise. This resonates with one of the steps in Lippi-Green’s (1997, p.68) language subordination process, as discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.4.3), in which the use of the standard variety is seen as necessary in order for the speaker to be taken seriously. Additionally, the non rhotic Action voice in Advert 5.5 (Ref. 28/77 in section 5.4.1) above for Glorney’s evokes upward social mobility, conveyed in the context of shopping for fittings for a ‘new house’ from the store’s ‘international selection’. Again, the process of language subordination is visible here in so far as conformers to standard
language are portrayed as positive examples of what can be accomplished through using standard forms (*ibid*).

In contrast to SSBE, as discussed in section 5.2, North American accent and dialect is exploited predominantly in the Action components of the ads and is associated mainly with comic caricatured characters. Therefore it does not appear to index seriousness and authority as does SSBE. Kelly-Holmes (2005a, p. 73) looks at how English is fetishised in multilingual German ads with ‘coolness’ which is associated with UK and North American influenced popular culture. One might expect that the North American accent would have the same effect in the linguistic environment of English-speaking Ireland. However, in the ads which display such an accent in the corpus, there is no concrete evidence of such connotations. This serves to reinforce the authority of the SSBE form.

As discussed in chapter 3 (section 3.4.5), while Bell’s research revealed a trend towards the use of US accents in New Zealand radio and TV, nevertheless, with regard to the selection by advertisers of a particular variety to associate their product, British rather than US varieties were often chosen (Bell 1991a, p.145).

The use of Irish English accent and dialect in the 1977 and 1987 sub-corpora illustrates how varieties and sub-varieties index social class. In Advert 5.8 for Ergas (section 5.4.2), a relatively muted use of local Dublin English is visible. In this case, the local Dublin English indexes the traditional ‘local Dublin’ speaker; a ‘straightforward’, individual from a ‘working-class’ background, a good husband and ‘provider’ who values his home and family. The intertextual literary references and Irish language proverb combine with the accent to set it apart from the standard British variety, highlighting a distinct Irish identity and reflecting nationalist ideologies and vernacular authenticity based on the traditional model as discussed in chapter 2.
On the other hand, the supraregional southern accent in the Action component of the Cross pen ad (Advert 5.10, Ref.35/87 in section 5.4.2) has associations of privileged, educated, middle-class speakers and reflects a sort of ‘entitlement’ culture in which the young man expects financial support from his father. However, the fact that it is juxtaposed against a non-rhotic Comment voice precludes its authoritative indexical value, which is reserved for the non-rhotic Comment voice.

Both the Switzer’s, Todd’s, Cash’s and Moon’s ad (Advert 5.9 (Ref. 1/87), section 5.4.2) and the Perrier ad (Adverts 5.11 (Ref. 17/87) and Advert 5.12 (Ref. 6.87), section 5.4.3) exploit the indexical value of the French accent and language items. In the Switzer’s, Todd’s, Cash’s and Moon’s ad, the French language items in the Comment component connote fashionable, refined and sophisticated speakers. The use of these items in the Comment by the non-rhotic speaker associates this non-rhotic pronunciation with a similar indexical value. However, the interpretation of the French term ‘lingerie’ as ‘knickers’ in combination with the local Dublin accent affords a vulgarity and lack of sophistication to this local accent, particularly marked in its contrast with the refined nature of the Comment voice.

Similarly, as discussed in section 5.4.3, the French accent and lexical items in the Perrier ads have connotations of romance, (Piller 2001, p.169), femininity and beauty (Kelly Holmes 2005, p.56). Through their juxtaposition against the local Irish English varieties, the French elements contribute to the association of the local varieties with a lack of sophistication. Another step in Lippi-Green’s (1997) model of the language subordination process (see chapter 2, section 2.3.5), is the way in which non-mainstream language is handled through trivialisation or humour (Lippi-Green 1997, p.68), often by the portrayal of non-standard accents in the media as ‘cute’, ‘homey’ or ‘funny’ and,
indeed, this could be said to apply in this case. Also, Hill’s (1995, p.205) observation of Spanish loan words in English as producing a ‘jocular or pejorative key’ (as referred to in chapter 2, section 2.3.5) has relevance here. What is really interesting here is that although the French language tokens and ‘accent’ are also used in a humorous way, they are not used pejoratively. However, the exaggerated local Irish English features, in that they are associated with characters who are depicted as unsophisticated, lacking in refinement and (in the case of Advert 5.12) in confidence, could be interpreted as being used in a rather depreciatory way. Indeed, this has particular resonance with regard to our earlier definition of language ideology as ‘representations’ of language (Woolard 1998, p.3; Cameron 2003, p.448) (see chapter 2, section 2.3.1) from which, users of language learn how particular speech patterns are interpreted and understood in their culture. Kelly-Holmes’ (2005a, p.139) contention that, given their symbolic or fetish purpose in ads, the prestige of minority varieties might be compromised as a result of their exploitation in advertising, is relevant here and calls into question Bakhtin’s (1981, p.364) view of the positive effects of mixing languages in this context. We will consider this effect again in section 5.5.3 below, in relation to referee design and the notion of ‘strategic inauthenticity’ (Coupland 2001a).

5.6 Accommodation and audience and referee design strategies: 1977 and 1987 sub-corpora

This section, which responds to research sub-question 1.5, looks at accommodation strategies mainly in terms of referee and audience design, relating to SSBE and Irish English in the 1977 and 1987 sub-corpora. We have discussed in chapter 3 how Bell (1991a, pp. 126-7) refers to audience design as the ‘responsive’ dimension of style based on the tenet ‘that speakers take most account of hearers in designing their talk’ (Bell 1984, p.159). In the mass media, however, speakers can only accommodate to a
stereotype of the speech of their audience (Bell 1991b). Therefore, with respect to advertising, ads are based on a stereotype of their target audience rather than an actual one. The construction of this stereotype can be ideologically founded.

As we have seen in chapter 3, Bell (1991a, p.146) notes that referee design is a useful concept for social and cultural research. He observes how, in his study of New Zealand television ads in 1986, high prestige for images based on British cultural norms was illustrated in the deliberate selection of British dialects (as outgroup referee design) by advertisers. Therefore the variety associated with the referee can reflect the prevailing ideologies of language. This section will look at referee and audience design strategies in the ads examined above and at the ideological implications of these strategies. It is notable that in line with Bell (1991a, p. 140) as discussed in chapter 3, section 3.4.5, the dominance of phonological over dialectal features in the quantitative analysis (see Figure 5.2 in section 5.3.1) suggests that referee design in the corpus is achieved most commonly through the use of phonological rather than non-phonological such as lexical or grammatical features.

The following sections will look firstly at various strategies relating to referee design in the earlier sub-corpora and secondly at the use of audience design in these sub-corpora.

5.6.1 Outgroup referee design

We have referred above to how hypercorrection is visible in the 1977 sub-corpus as illustrated by Advert 5.3 (Ref. 31/77) and Advert 5.4 (Ref. 20/77) in section 5.3.4. Bell (1991a, p.145), in his study of a sample of advertisements from New Zealand TV in 1986, also finds evidence of hypercorrection and speculates that it may be a deliberate attempt to exaggerate notable differences between varieties as part of a strategy of outgroup referee design. As we have seen, with outgroup referee design, speakers
diverge from the speech patterns of their ingroup to the linguistic code and identity with which they wish to identify and which holds prestige for them. The Comment voice of an ad from the 1977 sub-corpus promoting a film (Ref. 10/77, Table 1.1 in Appendix B) for example, shows no sign of the common Irish English feature, epenthesis in the pronunciation of the word film (e.g. film as \([fɪləm]\)) (Amador-Moreno 2010 p.78) but rather employs the standard pronunciation, thereby exhibiting divergent linguistic behaviour with regard to this Irish English feature.

Outgroup referee design is also visible in the strategy of using non-rhotic pronunciation in the Action as well as the Comment components. While the use of non-rhotic accent in the Action components in the context of radio advertising in Ireland might be surprising in light of Lee’s finding that this component tended to be associated with discourses of ‘everyday informal interaction’ (Lee 1992, p.172-3), it is important to look at how this accent is employed. In Advert 5.5 Ref. 28/77 (section 5.4.1 above) for Glorney’s, for example, the speaker in the Action is a ‘housewife’ talking about fitting out a new house. At this time in Ireland, as we have seen in chapter 4 (section 4.3.1), married women were only beginning to move back into the workforce (Ferriter 2004). In the decades of the earlier sub-corpora, in particular, ‘housewives’ made up a large proportion of the listenership of the ‘accompanying discourse’ (Cook 2001) in the form of the radio shows around which the ads are broadcast (Oram 1986 as referred to in chapter 4, section 4.3.2). It is conceivable that ads with this pattern are aimed at women who aspired to upward social mobility and therefore that the notions of overt prestige and outgroup referee design (based on a speaker of SSBE) dominate in these instances. Eckert (1997, p. 214-215) refers to Trudgill’s (1972) speculation that the orientation of women towards overt prestige is a result of their relatively powerless position in society and they consequently develop
linguistic strategies for upward mobility. This is an interesting example of what O’Barr (1994) refers to as secondary discourse, which relates to what ads tells us about society. In addition, the employment of the strategy within the Action component of using a ‘housewife’ with a non-rhotic accent as the more authoritative figure alongside a less ‘expert’ rhotic speaker (for example, in Advert 5.6 Ref. 39/77 for Hedex) can be seen as corroborating the Comment voice. These strategies can both be interpreted as outgroup referee design.

As discussed in chapter 3 (section 3.4.5), Bell (2001 p.167) points out that regular patterns of linguistic behaviour are more likely to be associated with audience design, while referee design is associated with deviations from these patterns. The combination of Irish English phonological elements interspersed with aberrational SSBE features visible in the ads as described above, corroborates Bell’s observation and indicates that the speakers in these ads are shifting style from Irish English (that of their ingroup) to what is regarded as the more prestigious style associated with the speakers of SSBE (the outgroup referee). Interestingly, as already discussed in chapter 3, Bell (1991a, p.143) observes the repetition of a small number or even one variant as a successful referee design strategy. As we have seen this is visible in Advert 5.7 Ref. 25/87 (section 5.4.1) for Superquinn which employs non-rhotic pronunciation whilst occasionally ‘lapsing’ back to rhotic. Therefore, in the context of these ads, even a single variant associated with SSBE is sufficient for this strategy to be effective in suggesting status and prestige. As with Bell’s study, in the case of outgroup referee design in terms of the SSBE accent, in this study also, the consonants as opposed to the vowels, or at least that of the /r/ does ‘much more than [its] share of work’ (Bell 1991a, p.140). In designing their talk to emulate this prestige outgroup style, the speakers in the ads illustrate effectively the initiative dimension of referee design, as discussed in chapter 3, in that they are
constructing the identity of their implied rather than actual audience. In this way, they attempt to appeal to listeners who are, perhaps, aspiring towards upward social mobility. We have referred in chapter 2 (section 2.3.4), to Blommaert and Verschueren’s (1998, p.208) observation of the connection between social mobility and choice of language variety, particularly in multilingual societies, thereby conflicting with popular nationalist ideologies based on the notion of one nation, one language.

These findings lend support to Piller’s (2001) claims that advertising has a role in promoting values based on social status and prestige. Additionally, we have seen (chapter 3, section 3.4.2) that accommodation theory assumes that, with regard to advertising, the minority subculture consumers have positive affect with regard to their language and culture (Giles et al 1973). The employment of SSBE-related features indicate that this may not have been the case and that standard language ideologies and the adoption of the ‘political culture of language’ (Croghan 1986, cited in White 2006, p.222) as discussed in chapter 2, section 2.3.6), has influenced this apparently conscious divergence from Irish English associated rhotic pronunciation and the construction of the outgroup referee as an SSBE speaker. As discussed in chapter 3, (section 3.4.4), as the SSBE form may be viewed by the audience as the most appropriate form for the ‘serious’ message of the ad, this divergence may be seen (by both the radio station and the audience) in terms of positive accommodation or as ‘linguistic divergence motivated by psychological convergence’ (Thakerar et al 1982). Such consensus between advertiser and advertisee on the prestige of certain varieties protects against the alienation of the receivers of the ad or the undermining of their identity, as discussed by Haarman (1986).
5.6.2 Ingroup referee design

As we have seen in section 5.4 (see Table 5.6 and Figure 5.6), the strategy of the juxtaposition of Irish English rhotic accents in the Action against non-rhotic in the Comment components of the ads is most visible in the 1987 sub-corpus. While the use of non-rhotic pronunciation in the Comment can be seen in terms of outgroup referee design, the use of local Irish English (see chapter 2, section 2.3.8) in the corpus is generally indicative of ingroup referee design in which the speaker, a member of the referee group, shifts to an intensified version of his or her own ingroup style. The construction of the ingroup referee shows some variation from a strong vernacular (in the form of hyperbolised local Irish English accent sub-variety combined with Irish English dialectal variety), to a more muted use of such local features. For example, Advert 5.8 Ref. 23/77 for **Ergas** (see section 5.4.2), while it displays Irish English features (mainly at a phonological level, but with some grammatical and lexical including Irish language elements), is not strongly vernacular. Similarly, Advert 5.9 Ref 1/87 for **Switzer’s, Todd’s, Cash’s and Moon’s** department stores (section 5.4.2), while it displays unmistakeably local Dublin English, nevertheless relies on phonological elements and is not hyperbolised. On the other hand, the **Perrier** ads (Adverts 5.11 Ref.17/87 and Advert 5.12 Ref. 6/87, section 5.4.3), through the employment of strongly vernacular Irish English lexical and grammatical features combined with Irish English phonological features, display an extreme hyperbolised version of the vernacular. Therefore, ingroup referee design is exploited in different ways across the sub-corpora, based on the extent to which the speakers in the ads intensify their style. However, the ingroup referee would appear, in all cases, to attempt to exploit vernacular authenticities in the traditional sense (Coupland 2003), although its authenticity may be compromised to some extent in the extreme vernacular representations.
This raises the question as to the language ideological implications of the choice of ingroup referee. According to Bell’s theory of ingroup referee design to an ingroup audience, the speaker can appeal to his or her solidarity with the receiver of the communication by shifting style to an extreme level of that of his or her ingroup (Bell 1991a p.129). The basis for the appeal to solidarity is the ‘common ground’ of a common language or dialect which is not shared by the outgroup. Indeed Bell’s study of a sample of advertisements from New Zealand TV in 1986 illustrates ingroup referee design to ingroup audience through association of product with ingroup values through the use of strong local dialect (1991a, pp.137-138).

Returning to Advert 5.9 Ref. 1/87 for Switzer’s, Todd’s, Cash’s and Moon’s department store, the non-rhotic Comment voice could be interpreted as outgroup referee design. In addition, while the Action voice employs local Dublin pronunciation, the use of the term lingerie and its exaggerated pronunciation in this component could at one level be understood as very short term outgroup referee design. However, as discussed in section 5.4.2 above, the mocking tone in which the term lingerie is used in the Action, serves to ‘other’ the Comment voice for the ingroup listener. Therefore, the intention of the speaker does not appear to be (even short-term) identification with the outgroup; rather the derisive tone of the Action dominates both ad components and effectively renders it as an example of ingroup referee design. The contrasting varieties together with the mocking tone serve to heighten the ingroup values in this case, demonstrating what Coupland describes as ‘an ideological alignment against “posh” ’ (Coupland 2009b, p. 324).

Moving on to the Perrier ad set (Advert 5.11 Ref.17/87 and Advert 5.12 Ref. 6/87, section 5.4.3), strongly local Irish English accent and dialect is used in the construction
of the referee which, in both ads, appears to be informed by characters from popular Irish urban and rural drama and literature. The use of the sentence tag, *at all, at all*, in Advert 5.12, for example, is a feature of the speech of a well-known character from an Irish rural-based soap opera. Additionally, the characters from the Advert 5.11 echo the novels of Irish writer, Roddy Doyle, as discussed in section 5.4.3. This corroborates Tymoczko and Ireland’s (2003a) observation on how Irish culture and identity is celebrated in the media and Wright’s notion of the creation of an ‘imagined’ nation through the cultural representations of the media (Wright 2000, p.24) (chapter 2, sections 2.3.3 and 2.3.4). In this sense, it could be said to reflect an ideological climate based on nationalist values and the promotion of group distinction and national group identity through variety choice which is based on traditional vernacular authenticities.

On the other hand, however, the hyperbolised vernacular in these adverts could be said to display what Giles et al (1991, p.16) refer to as a ‘mismatch’ in accommodation (as discussed in chapter 3, section 3.4.1), where accommodative behaviour is based on stereotypes of how particular social categories *should* sound rather than on reality. In this way, the characters could be said to function to convey an ‘image’ of Irishness through this intertextuality and overstatement, rather than to suggest identification with the receiver. Kelly-Holmes’ distinction between image and identity of a company or country is relevant here; referring to Jaffe and Nebenzahl (2001) she points out that a country’s image can be understood in terms of how it is viewed from outside and is a ‘simplified view’, whereas its identity refers to its understanding of itself (Kelly-Holmes 2005, p.28). It is arguable, however, that the notion of image can be said to apply within the country also in the case of such stereotypical, almost ‘stage-Irish’ representations, which effectively place the characters as whimsical and derisable depictions of Irishness, whose authenticity as ‘ordinary people’ (Coupland 2007) is compromised through these
overstated representations.

5.6.3 Ingroup referee design, through ‘strategic inauthenticity’

These concepts of ‘image’ and ‘identity’ resonate with Coupland’s (2001a) notion of ‘reflexivity’ discussed in chapter 2, section 2.4.3, in relation to the concept of stylisation and its role in relation to newer constructions of authenticity. According to Coupland (2001a, p.371), ‘living a culture’ necessitates self-reflexivity; otherwise cultural authenticity can be said to be observable only by members of the outgroup or researchers such as sociolinguists or anthropologists. Applying this theory to Kelly-Holmes’ comparison of image and identity, the notion of image can be said to be tied in with that of identity and to be key to this identity rather than distinct from it. Before considering how this comes about, we need to look at whether such stereotyped, hyperbolised representations (as in the Perrier ads) can be interpreted in terms of reflexivity. This necessitates the question as to whether they are intended to be viewed as parody or stylisation. As we have seen, Coupland (2001a, p. 345) defines stylisation as ‘the knowing deployment of culturally familiar styles and identities that are marked as deviating from those predictably associated with the current speaking context.’ Coupland (2001a, p.372) claims that the stylisation of dialect can be interpreted as a type of ‘strategic self-deauthentication’ through the employment of features of ingroup speech while indicating ‘less than full ownership’ of this speech style. Coupland (2001a, p. 345) interprets data from English language national radio broadcasts in Wales in which ‘Welshness is self-consciously evoked’ by the radio show presenters. In the stylised representations of Welshness in the data, it is clear to the audience that the representations are ‘put on’ (2001a, p.347) and not designed to be accurate or ‘real’ representations and therefore the dialect is not denigrated. Parody , on the other hand, actively denigrates the cultural forms employed and places the presenters outside or
above them (Hutcheon 1985, 1994; Kelly 1994; Morson 1989, cited in Coupland 2001a, p. 371). The mocking of the Comment voice by the voice of the Action in Advert 5.9 Ref. 1/87 (section 5.4.2), in that it situates the speaker as external to this way of speaking, could be described as parody. On the other hand, in Coupland’s words, in stylisation as represented in his data,

The transparent knowingness of the representation ("this is us momentarily playing at being the real, traditional us") gives the audience license to enjoying the parading of themselves, and even to find it confirmatory, credentializing, and solidary - as well as humorous

(Coupland 2001, p. 371)

I would argue that these ads should be interpreted as stylisation rather than parody. The ads differ from Coupland’s data in that the Comment voice is distinct from the voices of the Action, whereas in Coupland’s radio show the presenters themselves are doing the stylising. However, if we view the ads in terms of one overall monologic voice, as Cook (2001, p.193) does, then Coupland’s stylisation model (2001, p.350; 2007, p.154) becomes very relevant. ‘In this view [of the apparent heteroglossia of ads as a complete sham], there are not many voices in ads at all, but one voice, skilled in ventriloquism and mimicry’ (Cook 2001, p.220). The performances take place within a context or ‘speech event’, in this case one which has a more serious agenda, to persuade the receiver of the ad to purchase the product. The socio-cultural profile of the ‘projected persona’ in the ads are well formed and are based on well known and familiar repertoires (echoing characters from TV drama, for example). The performances in the ads are metaphorical, based on stereotyped ideological values associated with particular groups and situations. They dislocate the overall monologic voice of the ad from the immediate speech event or, as Rampton (2006, p.225) puts it, the business-on-hand (in this context, conveying the message of the ad). They are ‘reflexive, mannered and knowing’ and are
directed at an audience who are capable of interpreting their semiotic value. They are based on normative interpretations of particular speech communities. They facilitate re-evaluation of the real and metaphorical identities of the speakers and in this way allow reassessment of the identity of the listener (receiver of the ad). They introduce a new social context, with new identities and values into the current contextual frame (the ad as unit) and thereby call for reassessment of the existing norms. They are ‘creative and performed’ and require skills and learning. They are emphatic and hyperbolised.

The performances of the Action components of these ads can be said, therefore, to meet the criteria of the model for stylisation as proposed by Coupland and can be analysed as ‘strategic inauthenticity’ (2001a, p.350; 2007, p.154). Crucial to this model is the quality of ‘transparent knowingness’ (2001a, p.371) of the representation. It must be clear to the audience that it is ‘play’, that they, the audience, are party to rather than the object of the joke. As we have seen, Koslow et al (1994, p.577), in their investigation of how United States Hispanic (as a minority subculture) consumers respond to Spanish language usage in advertising, find that in order for this accommodation strategy to be rewarded, the advertiser must be perceived by Hispanic consumers as being aware of and having respect for their culture. Although the Irish situation is not directly analogous, nevertheless the ‘knowingness’ of the representation contributes to a positive reception of the ad by the target group. Koslow et al also observe that in their study, accommodation is successful in that it recognises the multiple identities of Hispanics as both Spanish and English speakers and as both Spanish and American individuals. In a sense, dialect stylisation also recognises these multiple identities - the ‘traditional us’, as Coupland puts it, but also the ‘us’ that has the ability to reflect on and evaluate the representation of the ‘traditional us’, at a remove from that representation.
In the case of these ads, this ‘knowingness’ comes through in the Comment caption which is similar in both ads and contains the words ‘naturally sparkling’. This may be interpreted as suggesting that the characters are also ‘naturally sparkling’ despite the fact that this naturalness is, ironically, contrived and artificial. In this way, the overall effect is one of ‘tongue in cheek’ which heightens the sense of ‘knowingness’ in Coupland’s terms. The fact that the ads stylise both urban (Dublin) and rural speakers (albeit in very general terms) adds to the overall effect of ‘laughing with’ rather than ‘laughing at’ Irish English speakers as a speech community. The non-rhotic Comment voice could be seen as necessary here to accentuate the stylised voices of the Action.

Coupland (2001a, p.350) points out that dialect varieties are suitable for stylised performances due to the socio-cultural and personal associations linked to these forms, for example, high/low socio-economic status, urban/rural, sophisticated/unsophisticated, trustworthy/untrustworthy, or dynamic/dull. Indeed, the Perrier ads could be said to demonstrate the former three dimensions. He highlights the fact that research into language attitudes has found these dimensions to be associated with dialect varieties (e.g. Garrett, Coupland & Williams 1999). In this way we can see how vernacular authenticities are exploited but, as Coupland puts it, ‘in new and creative ways’ to create solidarity with the listener.

As discussed in chapter 3, section 3.4.5, Bell (2001 p.166) observes how Bakhtin’s (1981) concept of style and stylisation can be said to correspond to the responsive and the initiative dimensions of language use respectively. In this way, stylisation of dialect may be seen as corresponding to ingroup referee design. Social identity is indexed through the ads, and while this can be said to play a part in constructing identity as in the case of referee design, it does so in a more creative and complex manner. The stylisation
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of the ads does not depend solely on the familiarity of the accent and dialect in constructing the identity of the receiver of the ad; it employs these familiar features of ingroup speech but simultaneously indicates ‘less than full ownership’ (as in Coupland’s (2003) *AL4*, as described in chapter 2, section 2.4.2) thereby achieving a ‘distanced validation of speakers’ social identities (2003, p.347). As Coupland points out, stylisation is a type of ‘strategic self-deauthentication’ (2003, p.428). Therefore, the ads authenticate and validate the identity of the receiver of the ad through the process of deauthentication. The ads suggest an acceptance, derived from self-reflexivity, on the part of Irish people that vernacular Irish English (both urban and rural forms) cannot compete with French as the ‘language of love’. However this acceptance is a comfortable one, and is consolidated by the familiarity and distinctive qualities of the Irish English features rather than being derived from an inferiority complex in relation to ‘superior’ languages or varieties. It is possible to argue therefore that that these ads illustrate the exploitation of the movement toward a new way of assessing authenticity (Coupland 2007, p.184). Coupland (2007, p. 183) questions whether in the case of stylistic ‘junking’ of linguistic varieties, it is the normative users of the variety that are being deauthenticated or those who are the authors of such ‘junking’. In these ads, I would argue that normative Irish English speakers, who are also, generally speaking, the receivers of these ads, are in effect, deauthenticated by the hyperbolised depiction of the characters in the ads, by allowing them to reassess their identities.

It could be argued, of course, that style shifts as they occur in other ads, for example the use of Irish English in the Action with a shift to SSBE in the Comment could also be seen in terms of stylisation. Coupland (2001a, p.349) tells us that in stylising we speak, for example, ‘as if I endorsed what this voice says’ and this is very much the case with the Nrh-IrE Comment voices. Indeed, in a study by Van Gijsel, Speelman and Geeraerts
(2008) of style shifting in a corpus of Flemish radio and TV advertisements, the authors conclude that style shifts between the informal spoken register and ‘standard’ Dutch can be seen in terms of stylisation. Van Gijsel et al (2008 p.217) draw attention to the fact that although Coupland (2001a p.350) describes stylisation as ‘reflexive, mannered and knowing’, nevertheless ‘this is not to claim that speakers will consciously and metalinguistically represent their motives and strategies’ (Coupland, 2001a, p.348) and highlight that in their study, the speakers are not necessarily ‘consciously playing’ with different stylistic varieties. However, the present study is concerned with the way in which the stylisation process can allow for self-reflexivity and reauthentication, and it is through stylisation as ‘consciously playing’ with varieties that allows for such reflexivity, reauthentication and valorisation. As we have seen, stylisation in this sense is characterised by the way in which it is made clear to the audience that the representations are ‘put on’ (Coupland 2001, p.347) and not designed to be accurate or ‘real’ representations. In this way, the Perrier ads differ from other ads (such as Advert 5.8 Ref. 23/77 (section 5.4.2) for Ergas) which is designed to reflect working class Dublin characters and is therefore more muted in its use of vernacular features. Similarly, the use of the SSBE feature of /t/-lessness in the Nrh-IrE pronunciation form, while it is not an accurate representation of an SSBE speaker, is nevertheless represented as a ‘real’ SSBE accent. Therefore, these latter examples are dependent on an acceptance of traditional authenticities and do not challenge them; these examples are not deauthenticated through ‘play’ and therefore do not have the same potential in terms of self-reflexivity and reauthentication.

As we have seen in chapter 3, (section 3.3), stereotypes, even positive ones, are dangerous in that they tend to inhibit our understanding of cultures and societies (Haarman 1984). Also, in our discussion of indexicality in section 5.5 above, we have
considered how the status of minority varieties might be compromised through their exploitation in advertising (Kelly-Holmes 2005, p.139). However, through the stylisation of stereotypical representations, these dangers can be averted and in fact can augment rather than inhibit a particular society’s understanding of itself. However, with regard to such stereotypes being used in an external or outgroup society or culture, because the outgroup audience may not be capable of interpreting their semiotic value, they may lead to misinterpretation, and in such cases, Haarman’s concerns are valid. The concept of ‘Junk Spanish’ (Hill 1995, p.198) in which Anglos in the US represent the identity of Mexican-Americans through the ‘junking’ of Spanish loan words used in English. is a case in point. However, it is important to note Rickford’s (2001, p.227) observation of how some aspects of stylisation can transcend speech community boundaries and work without ‘community-specific knowledge’.

Returning to the notions of image and identity as discussed by Kelly-Holmes (2005a, p. 28), the simplistic and trivialised image of Irishness in these ads is countered by the self-reflexivity associated with the stylisation. The recognition of the ‘traditional us’, (Coupland 2001a) can be seen as the ‘image’ of Irishness, while the ‘self-reflexivity’, the ability to reflect on and evaluate these ‘images’ can be said to contribute to the country’s understanding of itself, in other words its identity. In this way, the notions of image and identity are linked.

Turning again to the question of the implications of the choice of ingroup referee from a language ideological point of view, the more muted use of local Irish English forms in the construction of the referee could be said to exploit traditional vernacular authenticities and those indexing ‘authentic cultural membership’ (AL6) (Coupland 2003), as discussed in chapter 2, (section 2.4.2), in promoting solidarity and group
membership through the employment of a common variety which is not shared by the outgroup. In that this variety is bolstered by Irish language items and intertextual references and the derision of and ‘othering’ of foreign language and ‘posh’ forms, it also exploits, to an extent, nationalist language ideology.

The employment of more intensified vernacular forms in the constructions of the ingroup referee may appear, on the face of it, to reflect standard language ideology, as discussed in chapter 2 in relation to the language subordination process (Lippi-Green 1997), in that the characters with which these forms are associated are denigrated somewhat through caricature and hyperbole. However, in the Perrier ads from the 1987 sub-corpus, the notion of self-reflexivity as proposed by Coupland (2001) is achieved through stylised representations; this ad set, through the artificiality of the stylisation process, operates to deauthenticate the speaker and therefore to achieve a validation of (Irish) identity and in effect, a reauthentication of this identity. This indicates the advent of an ideological process which allows for the reassessment of notions of authenticity (Coupland 2003; 2007); traditional vernacular authenticities are exploited but in more complex and creative ways.

5.6.4 Audience design

As discussed in chapter 3, (section 3.4.6), given that the radio channel on which the ads were aired is generally associated with a more conservative and mature audience, the supraregional southern variety, as the more traditional conservative mainstream variety, can in general terms be seen as broadly indicative of an audience designed style while deviations from it can be regarded as referee design. This suggests that such a style responds to the audience and is based on the responsive rather than the initiative dimension of audience design. Notwithstanding this, the audience-designed ads can still
only be based on a stereotype of such an audience rather than an actual one. The construction of this stereotype can also have an ideological basis.

We have noted that with regard to the 1977 and 1987 sub-corpora, the Comment components which display rhotic pronunciation are predominantly supraregional southern, while in the Action components of these sub-corpora, both local and supraregional varieties (see chapter 2, section 2.3.8) are displayed (Table 5.4 and Figure 5.4, section 5.3.3). This suggests that, leaving aside the non-rhotic accents which are patently based on an outgroup referee, the predominant rhotic variety used is supraregional southern. This supports its classification as audience design. As this variety is seen as a quasi-standard variety in Ireland, its use could be interpreted in a sense as reflecting a reconciliation of standard and nationalist ideologies, as discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.3.8). However, if we look again at Advert 5.10 ref. 35/87 for *Cross Writing Instruments* (section 5.4.2), we can see that while the Action component employs a supraregional southern accent, a ‘non-local’ prestigious variety, associated with an ‘educated’ speaker, the Comment voice or ‘voice of authority’ employs non-rhotic pronunciation. This effectively reflects the dominance of the standard British form over the ‘quasi-standard’ Irish one. The overall dominance of SSBE over Irish English accent and dialect in the 1977 and 1987 sub-corpora are indicative of divergent accommodative behaviour overall and a reliance on outgroup rather than ingroup referee design or audience design in these sub-corpora.

### 5.7 Summary and conclusions

This chapter has described the findings of the analysis in relation to choice at the inter-varietal level in the ad corpus in terms of the factors discussed in chapter 3 and on which the research sub-questions relating to research question 1 are based. With regard
to research sub-question 1.1 relating to longitudinal occurrence and function of features associated with the range of varieties in the corpus as a whole, the two main varieties displayed are those of SSBE and Irish English. Features associated with other varieties are displayed far less frequently than these two pre-dominant varieties. Where such features associated with varieties outside of SSBE and Irish English occur, they are confined predominantly to the Action as opposed to the Comment components of the ads, indicating that these features are not important in the authoritative voice of the ad. Nor do such features show consistent increases throughout the decades; this suggests that in the Irish radio advertising context, the increase in diversity with regard to variety in recent years (Kelly-Holmes 2005a, p.108) is illustrated in the increased use of Irish English features rather than features associated with other varieties. Of particular interest at this level of the analysis is the finding that North American English is not exploited as an authoritative voice, nor is there a notable increase in its use in the later sub-corpora despite references to the Americanisation of Ireland, as discussed in chapter 4, section 4.3.1. In addition, Irish language features are not prevalent. This corroborates the notion that the nationalist language ideology model in Ireland is not necessarily based on Irish language (White 2006).

Focusing on the two main varieties displayed in the corpus, SSBE and Irish English, it is notable that Irish English is displayed mainly through accent variety as opposed to dialectal variety in the corpus. While the occurrence of dialectal Irish English variety is lowest in the 1977 sub-corpus, it remains relatively stable in the three most recent sub-corpora. Where Irish English dialect is displayed, it is almost exclusively confined to the Action components. As explained in chapter 1, section 1.2, SSBE (for the purposes of this study) is understood as implying ‘Standard (British) English’ in terms of dialect. As regards research sub-question 1.2, the analysis of longitudinal occurrence and function
reveals that overall, SSBE favours the Comment components and Irish English, the Action across the corpus. Also, while SSBE non rhotic accents dominate in the two earlier sub-corpora, the use of rhotic Irish English accent increases steadily in both components as the decades progress with a corresponding decline in SSBE in both components. Where rhotic pronunciation is found in the Comment, it falls into the category of non-local Irish English which is seen in terms of a quasi-standard or prestige variety. However, SSBE is nevertheless the preferred option in the Comment components of the two earlier sub-corpora. This demonstrates the operation of language ideologies which situate SSBE as the variety most appropriate in relaying the advertising message in the earlier decades, with non-local Irish English prestige varieties having a far lesser role as voice of authority in these decades. The exploitation of this form is thus based on traditional establishment conceptions of authenticity (Coupland 2003). This effect is reduced significantly however in the more recent decades, with rhotic accents dominating in both components.

In the 1977 and 1987 sub-corpora, the authoritative voice of the Comment is typified by a very careful (in terms of attention to articulation) and rather consciously enunciated non-rhotic accent as associated with SSBE, interspersed with ‘telltale’ markers of Irish English pronunciation. This indicates the deliberate nature of the employment of this anomalous non-rhotic pronunciation. This conscious adoption of the SSBE feature can be related to overt prestige (Trudgill 1972) related to status values (Lee 1992), and provides further evidence for the existence of ideologies which deem SSBE as the ‘correct’ form and as most appropriate as the authoritative voice, based on traditional establishment authenticities. However, its inaccurate reproduction could be seen as compromising its authenticity to some extent. In the 1977 sub-corporus, non-rhotic pronunciation dominates both components, its use in the Action often being associated
with the communication of ‘privileged information’ (Lee 1992, 172) and expertise, serving to consolidate the Comment voice. This reinforces the ideological dominance of the standard British form.

Research sub-question 1.3 was then addressed. This relates to the extent of the strategy in ‘Action and Comment’ ads of juxtaposing SSBE in the Comment against Irish English in the Action based on the appeal of such a strategy to the ‘contrasting values’ associated with status and solidarity (Lee 1992). This strategy is most prevalent in the 1987 sub-corpus where its effect is heightened through the combination of accent and dialectal Irish English variety juxtaposed against SSBE. In the 1977 sub-corpus, it is more common to find non-rhotic accents in both components of the ad, while in 1997 and 2007, rhotic accents in both components is the more frequent pattern.

Where non-rhotic accents are employed in both ad components, their use in the Action tends to be associated not only with middle-class contexts but also with the character who has most expertise. The employment of the non-local Irish English rhotic forms in the Action afford it a vernacular authenticity (Coupland 2003) in that it is represented in the ads as ‘naturally occurring’ and the language of ‘real’ people. Where the juxtaposition of SSBE in the Comment against Irish English in the Action is found, the Irish English accent and dialect (sometimes including lexical Irish language items and sometimes used to denote intertextual references) is in some instances used to underpin the notion of a distinct Irish identity based on nationalist language ideologies; however, Irish English accent and dialect is also used in such a way that it is associated with comic characters and with a lack of sophistication and refinement as against other varieties such as SSBE and French language and accent, which have associations of seriousness and refinement.
Research sub-question 1.4 concerns the indexical value or social meaning of variety in the earlier sub-corpora. In these sub-corpora, the use of non-rhotic pronunciation tends to be associated with a serious, sophisticated and expert voice in both Action and Comment and has further connotations of upward social mobility in the Action. Its predominance in the Comment components reinforces the qualities of ‘clarity’ and ‘transparency’ associated with RP speakers (Coupland 2003). The strategy of juxtaposing SSBE in the Comment and Irish English in the Action components of ‘Action and Comment’ ads heightens the indexical value, accentuating the prestige of the SSBE form. Furthermore, North American English is not associated with the authoritative voice, which again reinforces the authority of SSBE. However, the decline in its use in the later sub-corpora indicate the onset of changing orders of indexicality in relation to this form in its associations with ‘posh’ and a severing of its links with authenticity (Coupland 2009).

The use of Irish English accent and dialect in these sub-corpora can also index social class; the supraregional southern sub-variety has associations of privilege and education but its lack of dominance as the authoritative voice diminishes its value as regards indexing authority and expertise. The accent sub-variety of local Dublin indexes traditional ‘local Dublin’ working class values associated with vernacular authenticities. However, hyperbolised representations of local Irish English accent sub-varieties and dialectal variety are sometimes associated with vulgarity and lack of sophistication; in some ads, this effect is strengthened by virtue of the positioning of the Irish English accent and dialect alongside French accent and lexical items, which in turn index fashion, romance and sophistication. The apparent pejorative treatment of the Irish English vernacular calls into question the benefits of mixing languages in advertising (Kelly-Holmes 2005a, p.20).
Finally, research sub-question 1.5, relating to accommodation and audience and referee design strategies, was addressed. Both Action and Comment components in the 1977 sub-corpus display non-rhotic pronunciation to a greater degree than they do rhotic. In addition, this sub-corpus shows evidence of hypercorrection in both Comment and Action components. This apparently conscious divergent behaviour can be explained in terms of outgroup referee design; the ‘referee’ in these cases is constructed as a speaker of SSBE. The referee design is based mainly on the use of the repetition of the non-rhotic variant, rather than on a full range of SSBE-related features. In the 1977 sub-corpus and to a lesser extent in that of 1987, referee design appears to be based on the outgroup of SSBE speakers, linked to traditional establishment authenticities, and associated with upward social mobility. However, as there is consensus between advertiser and advertise with regard to the appropriateness of this form for its purpose, the addressee is not alienated (Haarman 1984). As we progress through the decades, however, this accommodative strategy is less in evidence with convergent accommodation strategies evident in the increased exploitation of Irish English features.

With regard to the display of ingroup referee design, the construction of the ingroup referee varies in the sub-corpora in question. The Action components of the ads in the 1977 and 1987 sub-corpora which display Irish English rhotic pronunciation have a balance of local and non-local accents, while the Comment components which display rhotic pronunciation are predominantly supraregional southern. This, together with the relatively low occurrence of dialectal items across the sub-corpora suggests that convergent accommodative strategies (in terms of audience design as well as ingroup referee design) in the corpus as a whole are not dependent on the use of stereotypical vernacular Irish English features but rather based on more muted use of Irish English; in this way vernacular authenticity is not compromised through hyperbolic representations.
However, in some cases, where more strongly vernacular local forms are employed, they are sometimes used in an apparently derisive way. The exploitation of dialectal items in the Action components is visible in the *Perrier* ads from the 1987 sub-corpus. In these ads, Irish English local accent sub-varieties and dialectal variety together with intertextual references based on aspects of Irish culture can, on the one hand, be said to reflect the operation of nationalist language ideologies based on traditional vernacular authenticities. On the other hand, in the scenarios of these ads, French language items and accent are associated with femininity and romance and accentuate the comic, unsophisticated associations of Irish English. At one level, this can be interpreted as a mismatch in accommodation due to the overstated stereotypical image. From another perspective, the exaggerated and fetishized use of Irish English can be seen as designed to create an ‘image’ of Irishness rather than to express ‘real’ Irish identity and thus to compromise its authenticity. This notion of ‘image’ resonates with the notion of self-reflexivity as proposed by Coupland (2001). This reflexivity is achieved through stylised representations in the *Perrier* ad set; this ad set, through the artificiality of the stylisation process, operates to deauthenticate the speakers and therefore to achieve a validation of (Irish) identity and in effect, a reauthentication of this identity. This indicates the beginnings of an ideological process which allows for a reassessment of notions of authenticity (Coupland 2003; 2007) and by which traditional vernacular authenticities (such as those associated with the strong vernacular of the *Perrier* ads) are exploited but in more sophisticated and creative ways. It can be interpreted in terms of the initiative dimension of language use and therefore in terms of referee design (Bell 1984). However, it is a much more sophisticated and self-reflexive form of referee design than that displayed in the outgroup referee design based on SSBE or ingroup referee design which is based on more muted use of the vernacular, in that it allows for reassessments
of the traditional conceptions of authenticity on which it is based. Furthermore, it can allow for the exploitation of hyperbolic forms by countering the negative effects of such exploitation. However, the exploitation of such forms in the case of an outgroup audience does not allow for this self-reflexivity and may therefore lead to misinterpretation.

The accent sub-variety of supraregional southern Irish English is the pre-dominant rhotic variety in the 1977 and 1987 sub-corpora and can be seen in terms of an audience-designed style. Given that this accent sub-variety is seen as a quasi-standard variety in Ireland, it could be said to reflect a reconciliation of standard and nationalist ideologies. However, the overall dominance of SSBE, particularly as the voice of authority, indicates that outgroup rather than ingroup referee design or audience design and divergent rather than convergent behaviour is displayed in these sub-corpora. The modelling of the outgroup referee on speakers of SSBE is based on standard ideologies of language and establishment authenticities.

The next chapter is the first of two chapters which look at choice at the intra-varietal level in terms of accent sub-varieties of Irish English as described in chapter 2. As Irish English dominates in both Action and Comment components of the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora, these sub-corpora will be the focus of the analysis at the intra-varietal level based on the same factors as those used in the inter-varietal study.
Chapter 6. Choice at the intra-varietal level [1]: ‘Local’ and ‘non-local’ Irish English

6.1 Introduction

The previous chapter has shown how Standard Southern British English (SSBE) non-rhotic pronunciation dominates the earlier sub-corpora of 1977 and 1987 and how, in all four sub-corpora, this pronunciation is more prevalent as a feature of the Comment voice (generally monologic and decontextualised) rather than that of the Action (usually consisting of context based scenarios) and is therefore associated with the voice of authority. Correspondingly, the percentage of Action components featuring rhotic Irish English pronunciation exceeds the percentage of Comment components with this feature in all four sub-corpora (see Figure 5.3 in chapter 5). In addition, Irish English-associated dialectal items are almost exclusively confined to the Action components. These findings are broadly in line with those reported by Lee (1992), to the extent that the standard or high variety dominates with respect to the Comment voice.

As discussed, in the case of Lee’s study, while the Action component was dominated by non-standard Swiss varieties and the Comment by High German, nevertheless, Lee stresses that localised Swiss German varieties were also a feature of the Comment components of the ads. This, he says, may be partly attributed to the fact that these varieties have recently become more prevalent in domains previously dominated by standard varieties (as in Fairclough’s (1992; 1994) concept of the democratization and conversationalization of discourse, discussed in chapter 2, section 2.4.1). Lee (1992, p.180) warns, however, of the dangers of seeing the Comment component as a
homogenous entity, referring to the ‘tendency’ of this component to be associated with discourses of authority and expertise, rather than a ‘straightforward relationship between language and generic form’ (Lee 1992, p. 181).

As with Lee’s findings with regard to the local Swiss varieties, Irish English was also found to be exploited to varying extents in the Comment components of all four sub-corpora, but mainly through accent rather than dialect. However, what is remarkable in the sub-corpora is the steady increase in the presence of Irish English rhotic pronunciation through the decades, in both Action and Comment component of the ads. Additionally, the strategy of juxtaposing r-less pronunciation in the Comment and rhotic in the Action is most prevalent in the two earlier sub-corpora (see Figure 5.6 in chapter 5), and falls off to a large extent in the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora, being replaced by rhotic pronunciation in both components. With regard to Irish English dialectal items, only one ad in the 1997 sub-corpus displays such items in its Comment component. All four sub-corpora, on the other hand, display Irish English dialectal tokens in the Action components of the ads (see Table 5.2 and Figure 5.2 in Chapter 5). Although the occurrence of these dialectal items does not show such dramatic increases as that of rhotic pronunciation, nevertheless the use of dialectal items in the Action components does show an increase over the decades of the corpus. With regard to the more recent decades therefore, Irish radio advertising would appear to be situated predominantly within a broad Irish English linguistic environment rather than that of standard British English, particularly at the phonological level of analysis.

The decline of the non-rhotic Comment voice and the prevalence of rhotic Irish English pronunciation in both components of the ad in the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora calls for analysis of how this rhotic Irish English accent operates within these components; it
necessitates an examination of the Comment voice in these sub-corpora in terms of how it compares with the voice of the Action and, given the decline in its exploitation of the SSBE phonological feature, how the Comment voice differentiates itself from the voice of the Action to function as the voice of authority.

As discussed above and in previous chapters, notwithstanding his caveats as regards seeing the advert components as homogenous entities (Lee 1992, p.174), Lee emphasises the significance of the format of the genre in code choice in advertising texts (1992, p.171). While the Action component is often used to promote acceptance of the product through consumer identification with the characters and contexts represented in the ad (Lee 1992, p.179), the Comment component, on the other hand, is generally monologic and not contextually-based and is seen as the voice of authority (see Piller 2001, p.159), acting to endorse the purchase of the particular product (Lee 1992, pp.173, 180). Given the persuasive potential of both these components of the advert, how they are characterised is crucial to the effectiveness of the ad in communicating with its audience. Furthermore, given that in changing societies, the sociolinguistic situation is also changing, the dynamic nature of what constitutes, not only an effective authoritative voice but also a voice with which the listener can identify, cannot be ignored. Coupland (2009a, p.42) discusses, for example, how values relating to varieties referred to as ‘standards’ have become ‘less determinate and more complex’ in late modernity. Also, we have seen how Fairclough (1994) observes a blurring of the boundaries between public and private discourse. Therefore, what constitutes an authoritative voice or what constitutes a voice with which the receiver of the ad can identify may not remain static and must also be re-examined. With regard to the present study, the changing nature of these voices can provide important indications of changing ideologies of language.
This chapter addresses our second main research question, which focuses on variety choice at the intra-varietal level, in terms of sub-varieties of Irish English, and its component subquestions (see chapter 1, section 1.3).

The 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora are examined in terms of broad categories of ‘non-local’ and ‘local’ Irish English (as identified in chapter 2, section 2.3.8). Non-local Irish English, which can be viewed as a quasi standard (Hickey 2005), comprises the subcategories of moderate Dublin, supraregional southern and advanced Dublin English, while local Irish English comprises Hickey's (2005) definition of 'local Dublin’ accents and generally rural or provincial (termed regional for the purposes of the study) accents.

As with Chapter 5, this chapter deals with the findings of the study at both quantitative and qualitative levels. With regard to dialectal Irish English, the quantitative findings for the corpus as a whole have been examined in chapter 5 (section 5.3.1). At the qualitative level, the analysis is guided by the phonological patterns of the ads, as it is these which show the greatest variation. However, in analysing ads with particular phonological patterns, the way in which dialectal elements operate with phonological patterns is discussed. While Chapter 5 focuses mainly on the sub-corpora of 1977 and 1987, this chapter is concerned with the later sub-corpora of 1997 and 2007 as these are the sub-corpora in which rhotic Irish English pronunciation dominates in both components.

Chapter 6 initially addresses the first research sub-question in relation to the display of longitudinal changes in the occurrence and function of different varieties of Irish English within the ads as indicated by location of these varieties according to advert component. Particular ads which illustrate the main feature of the quantitative findings, the predominance of non-local Irish English in the Comment components of the ads, are
examined qualitatively in order to provide a deeper insight into the ideological implications of this strategy. The investigation in relation to the strategy of juxtaposing sub-varieties within the ads addresses the second research sub-question and further develops the analysis of the function of these sub-varieties in light of the potential of this strategy to accomplish the dual aim of the ads. This analysis identifies and examines, at a qualitative level, ‘Action and Comment’ type ads which represent the patterns in the quantitative findings. The ideological significance of these patterns is discussed. The analysis then moves to the third research sub-question relating to the indexical value of the particular accent sub-varieties. The final research sub-question focuses on the extent to which accommodation strategies (in particular audience and referee design) associated with sub-varieties of Irish English are visible in the corpus. With regard to the latter two sub-questions, the analysis is based on the qualitative examination of specific ads analysed in relation to the first two research sub-questions.

6.2 Longitudinal occurrence and location according to ad component of accent sub-variety

As discussed, this section addresses the first research sub-question as to longitudinal changes in the occurrence and location according to ad component of different sub-varieties of Irish English within the ads.

Referring to Figure 5.3 in chapter 5, we can see that in the twenty years from 1977 to 1997, the percentage of Comment components\(^{30}\) which displays Irish English rhotic pronunciation increases from 9% to 67%. As for the 2007 sub-corpus, the overwhelming majority of Comment components (89%) display rhotic pronunciation in this component. This means that in the thirty years from 1977 to 2007, rhoticity, as

---
\(^ {30}\) Figures represent percentage of total numbers of the particular component which displays Irish English or SSBE features in the sub-corpus (see chapter 4, section 4.7.2)
associated with Irish English, changed from being an exceptional to an almost exclusively occurring feature of the Comment component.

Table 6.1 and Figure 6.1 below provide us with a more detailed picture of the Irish English rhotic Comment voice, based on the local/non-local categories outlined above. This analysis reveals that, with one exception, all of the rhotic Comment components in the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora come under the umbrella term of ‘non-local’ Irish accents, and fall into one of its subcategories; the locally influenced moderate Dublin accent, the supraregional southern accent (in which the more local Dublin features are absent) or the more recently established advanced Dublin English. It is notable that the most remarkable difference in the Comment component of these later sub-corpora when compared with those of 1977 and 1987 (see Table and Figure 5.4 in chapter 5), is the advent of advanced Dublin English. These findings broadly support Kelly-Holmes’ (2005a, p.120) observation of the prevalence of what is regarded as a ‘neutral’ Irish media voice in Irish advertising, as discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.3.8).

Notwithstanding the predominance of rhotic accents in the Action component in the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora as illustrated in Figure 5.3 in chapter 5, these components by no means feature exclusively local accents. As we can see in Table 6.1 and Figure 6.1 (below), while the Action components in both sub-corpora show more evidence of local accents than do their corresponding Comment components, of those ads which have an Action component employing an Irish English rhotic accent in the 1997 sub-corpus, only 36% (12% local Dublin and 24% regional) could be classed as such while in the 2007 sub-corpus, the figure for local accents in this component falls to 21% (2% local Dublin and 19% regional). These figures, when compared with those of the Action components of the 1977 and 1987 sub-corpora (Figure 5.4 in chapter 5), show a marked decline in
the occurrence of Irish English local accents as a percentage of rhotic accents as a whole with a corresponding increase in those of non-local including advanced Dublin English, which was not a feature of either component of the earlier sub-corpora.

The pattern of non-local varieties in the Action remains quite consistent as regards frequency of occurrence of variety in both 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora with supraregional southern accents dominating in this component; however, it is notable that advanced Dublin shows an increase in the Action components of the 2007 sub-corpus at the expense of the local varieties. The Comment components of these sub-corpora show a less consistent pattern. Advanced Dublin English shows the lowest usage (of the non-local sub-varieties) in the Comment components of the 1997 sub-corpus with supraregional southern displaying the highest usage followed by moderate Dublin English; in the 2007 sub-corpus, however, advanced Dublin English is the predominant variety, followed closely by supraregional southern, while moderate Dublin English shows a sharp decline.
### Table 6.1: Fraction/Percentage of ad components displaying Irish English accent sub-variety 1997/2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sub-variety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>ModDE</td>
<td>SrS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.83/12</td>
<td>5/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total non-local</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>ModDE</td>
<td>SrS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5/18</td>
<td>6.83/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total non-local</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>AdvD</td>
<td>LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.83/12</td>
<td>1.5/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total non-local</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>AdvD</td>
<td>LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/18</td>
<td>0.33/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total non-local</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Reg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.83/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total non-local</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Reg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.33/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total non-local</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 6.1: Percentage of ad components displaying Irish English accent sub-variety 1997/2007

**NOTE:** Figures represent fraction/ percentage of total numbers of the particular component which displays Irish English accent variety (see chapter 4, section 4.8.1)
The overall increase in rhotic pronunciation in the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora indicates, on the face of it, a decline in the pervasiveness of standard language ideology and the notion of authenticity linked to traditional establishment values (Coupland 2003, as discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.4.2) and the increasing acceptability of Irish English forms. This suggests that these traditional establishment authenticities have become unsustainable as part of the discourse of advertising in Ireland. This may be attributed in part to the conversationalization of discourse (Fairclough 1994) together with the validation of Irish English and its fostering as a marker of Irish identity (Cronin 2011, p.55) as discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.3.4); also, the compromised authenticity of the SSBE accent due to its simulated nature (Nrh-IrE) as referred to in chapter 5 (section 5.3.4), may contribute to its unsustainability in this context.

However, as we have seen, the Action components in both sub-corpora show more evidence of local accents than do their corresponding Comment components which display almost exclusively non-local varieties. Looking at non-local as the quasi-standard, this suggests that standard language ideology may still be at play, albeit based on a different model of what constitutes ‘standard’ in the Irish context. This resonates with Fairclough’s (1994, p.202) suggestion that the democratization of discourse, rather than putting an end to the dominance of standard language ideologies, is allowing for a new form of standardisation. However, this finding also suggests a reconciliation of standard and nationalist ideologies, as discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.3.6.), in that the Irish English form as opposed to the standard British variety is deemed acceptable as the authoritative voice.

We have referred in chapter 4 (section 4.3.1) to the observation by McWilliams (2007) that Ireland has only recently begun to appreciate the value of the ‘brand’ of Irishness
and we have speculated that the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora might exploit markers of Irishness to a greater degree than the earlier sub-corpora. While, overall, this appears to be the case, particularly with regard to the decline in non-rhotic accents, these markers do not appear to be based on local varieties of Irish English so much as on non-local forms, and as such, indicates a movement towards a more globally influenced conception of Irishness. Focusing particularly on the Action components, notwithstanding this general increase in Irish English in the later sub-corpora in the form of rhotic pronunciation, local varieties of Irish English, although they feature in the Action components to a greater extent than the Comment, do not dominate in the Action generally in these later sub-corpora. This finding indicates that such local varieties may not be exploited in this component, as Cronin puts it, ‘as a marker of specificity’ (Cronin 2011, p.55) in the Irish English linguistic environment to the same extent as in the earlier sub-corpora; in addition, it resonates with Oram (2010), referred to in chapter 4 (section 4.2) who remarks on the demand in contemporary advertising for ‘safe’ voices. However, it contradicts his observation of a parallel demand for regional voices.

This raises the issue as to whether the non-local varieties can be said to have authenticity in the traditional sense, as discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.4.2). As we have seen, non-local sub-varieties can be seen as having authenticity in relation to AL1 and AL2 in that they are ‘attested’, ‘attestable’ and are represented as ‘naturally occurring’. However, in that they dissociate from local forms which stem from the Irish language, their authenticity in relation to AL3, AL5 and AL6 (with regard to personal and group authenticity) may be compromised. Despite this, the findings indicate a significant role for non-local varieties in representing ‘everyday informal interaction’ (Lee 1992) and ‘the ordinary speech of ordinary people’, a description which Coupland (2007, p.181) uses in relation to traditional conceptions of vernacular speech. This illustrates the
contrast, referred to in chapter 2 between $AL2$ which relates to the authenticity of ‘naturally occurring’ language and $AL6$ in which authenticity is tied up in delineating groups through ‘cultural authenticity’.

The increase in the 2007 sub-corpus of advanced Dublin English in both Action and Comment components is also noteworthy and ideologically significant. However, in light of the observation by Hickey (2013) that this variety has now become mainstream, the following chapter is devoted to the presence of this pronunciation form in the corpus. The discussion of the ideological implications will therefore be reserved for chapter 7.

The predominance of non-local Irish English rhotic accents in the Comment components of the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora is explored further in the following section through an analysis of particular ads which reflect this pattern.

### 6.2.1 ‘Non-local’ Irish English as Comment voice

In the context of this study, non-local Irish English pronunciation, as outlined in chapter 2, (section 2.3.8) is an umbrella term for the sub-categories of *moderate Dublin, supraregional southern* and *advanced Dublin English*. These accent sub-varieties are viewed broadly by Hickey (2005) as ‘standard’ Irish English and equate generally to the ‘educated, urbane’ voices of the Irish media (Kelly-Holmes 2005, p.120). As we have seen, non-local Irish English is employed almost exclusively in the Comment components of the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora. This section examines a number of ‘Comment only’ ads in order to investigate how the non-local variety operates in this ad type. The employment of non-local sub-varieties in the Comment voice is also further explored with reference to ‘Action and Comment’ type ads in sections 6.3.1 and 6.3.2 below, which address our second research sub-question, in looking at the strategy of juxtaposing sub-varieties within ‘Action and Comment’ ads.
Advert 6.1 Ref. 20/97, below, is one of two ads (Ad Ref. 20/97 and Ad Ref. 21/97, Table 3.1, Appendix B) from the 1997 sub-corpus for a supermarket group (Tesco, Quinsworth and Crazy Prices), delivered by its marketing director, who is also a well-known media figure in Ireland. The moderate Dublin English in these ads could be said to serve a dual purpose in that it has a certain prestige in its non-local quality and consequent association with middle-class speakers but also, at another level, it allows the listeners, through the retention of less stigmatised local Dublin features and the informality of the discourse, to identify with the context of the relationship between the traditional shopkeeper and customer in which the shopkeeper has the interests of the customer at heart. Although Hickey (2005, p.28) views ‘educated’ or non-local Dublin English as distinct from local accents, he recognises that these categorisations can only be abstractions and he acknowledges the existence of sub-varieties with mixed accents. It is important to note that the moderate Dublin variety (as in that of the marketing director of the supermarket group mentioned above) is more locally situated than other non-local Irish English accents, in that it retains features of ‘local Dublin’ vowel realisation such as the fronting of the /au/ diphthong where now is realized as [næu] (Ad Ref. 21/97, Table 3.1, Appendix B) and Sunday with a short /ʊ/ as [sʊndeɪ] (Advert 6.1, Lines 002, 003 and 004, transcribed below). This variety can be said, therefore, to have a local ‘flavour’ differentiating it from the more ‘neutral’ or supraregional southern Irish English realisations from which the local features are absent (Hickey 2005, p.28). This accent has the advantage of being able to exploit the concepts of both ‘overt prestige’ (associated with status) and ‘covert prestige’ (associated with solidarity) (Trudgill 1972). Although this variety is categorised as non-local Irish English, we should not lose sight of its relatively more ‘local’ qualities and the power in relation to both status and solidarity concepts, achieved by virtue of its hybridised nature. In this way, while the
monologic and prestigious non-local Comment voice dominates, its heteroglossic echoes of local Dublin identity have the potential to create solidarity with those who identify with local Dublin values (see Hickey 2004a, p. 44).

Bourdieu’s (1991, p.68) concept of ‘strategies of condescension’ (that is, the derivation of profit from objective power relations between languages through the symbolic subversion of this relation of power), discussed in chapter 2 in the context of standard language ideologies, is also useful in analysing this particular advert. The ‘common touch’ (ibid) is conveyed through the local quality of the accent associated in this case with the authoritative voice of the Marketing Director, thereby exploiting these strategies of condescension. In this way, the accent could be said to exploit both establishment and vernacular authenticities, in the traditional sense (Coupland 2003).

**Advert 6.1 (Ref. 20/97) Tesco, Quinnsworth and Crazy Prices**

1997: Comment only

001 MCV: we thought you might need more time to get ready for Christmas ()
002 so Tesco Quinnsworth and Crazy Prices are open this Sunday [sʊndə]()
003 check your local store or Sunday [sʊndə] papers for details ()
004 Tesco Quinnsworth and Crazy Prices () open this Sunday [sʊndə]

While moderate Dublin English does have a ‘local Dublin’ quality which is absent from other non-local varieties, nevertheless, when compared against the SSBE form, its capacity to create solidarity with the listener is to some extent present in all Irish English varieties. Therefore, in a sense, all varieties of non-local Irish English have, to a greater or lesser extent, this dual capacity as markers of both status and solidarity, as illustrated by the above example. Notwithstanding the observation that the dissociative nature of these forms may compromise their authenticity, nevertheless when viewed against SSBE, they can reclaim a ‘relative’ authenticity. In this way, as discussed in section 6.2
above, non-local Irish English has the potential to reconcile, to some extent, nationalist and standard language ideologies as well as going some way towards resolving conflicting notions of authenticity.

Another ‘Comment only’ ad, Advert 6.2 Ref. 5/97 below for the Irish Kidney Association displays supraregional southern pronunciation in conjunction with Irish language lexical items, *Suaimhneas siorai dóibh* (‘May they rest in peace’). The use of the Irish language lexical items enhances the capacity of the supraregional southern pronunciation to express Irish identity. As with Advert 5.8 Ref. 23/77 for Ergas, discussed in chapter 5 (section 5.4.2), it illustrates the integration of Irish and English language as discussed by Tymoczko and Ireland (2003), based on what Anderson (1991, pp.13-9) refers to as a new type of nationalism, not dependent on linguistic uniformity. However, unlike the Ergas ad which displays a local Dublin accent, the non-local pronunciation, as a quasi-standard, has an added capacity as a marker of status. Again, it can be said to exploit status and solidarity dimensions in this way. We have discussed in chapter 3 (section 3.2.3) Piller’s (2003) observation of how advertisers mix English and local languages enabling them to ‘optimize the strength and appeal of their messages’ (Bhatia 2000, p.169, cited in Piller 2003, p.176) as opposed to creating conflict between local and global values. Although the Irish language as opposed to Irish English can no longer be considered as the ‘local’ language, nevertheless, the use of the Irish language in this ad illustrates this harmony between Irish and global identities.

*Advert 6.2 (Ref. 5/97) Irish Kidney Association*

1997: Comment only

001 MCV: season’s greetings from the Irish Kidney Association (.)
002 at this time of the year we acknowledge the lives
003 that were saved by organ donation (.)
While the Comment components of virtually all ads were classed as non-local, there was one notable exception. A ‘Comment only’ ad for Senior’s Money Lifetime Loans from the 2007 sub-corpus (Ref. 5/07, Table 4.1, Appendix B), is delivered in a rural west of Ireland accent. The authority of the speaker, however, stems from the fact that he is a well-known actor from an Irish TV rural drama. This is interesting in light of the findings of Ryan and Sebastian (cited in Giles and Coupland 1991 p.47) that information on social class reduces the evaluative effect of accent to a significant degree. This ad is unique in its exploitation of the local form in the Comment component. This finding is also interesting in light of Lee’s (1992) observation that local varieties were not excluded from the Comment components of the ads in his study; however, with the exception of the above ad, in this study there is an almost total exclusion of local varieties at the intra-varietal level.

The finding that non-local or quasi-standard varieties are favoured in the Comment components could be seen as indicative of the continued operation of standard language ideologies albeit based on a ‘standard’ variety of Irish English rather than British English; nevertheless the integration, even in the ‘Comment only’ ads, of Irish English and Irish language items rather than standard British English suggests that nationalist ideology and the conversationalization of discourse has tempered the rigidity of the standard in the Irish context and is thus allowing for a blending of Irish and English language culture as discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.3.4).

As we have seen, notwithstanding the tendency for local varieties to favour the Action
rather than the Comment components of both 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora, non-local accents, however, predominate in the Action components of both sub-corpora (see Table 6.1 and Figure 6.1 above). This phenomenon is explored below through an examination of the second research sub-question relating to the extent of the strategy of positioning local Irish English in the Action alongside non-local varieties in the Comment.

6.3 Action and Comment ads: Juxtaposition of ‘local’ and ‘non-local’ accent sub-varieties

The third research sub-question, designed to shed further light on the function of sub-variety within the ads, looks at the extent of the strategy of juxtaposing local Irish English in the Action and non-local Irish English in the Comment components of the ads. As discussed in chapter 3 (section 3.2.3), this analysis is based on Lee (1992) who found that the co-existence of ‘high’ and localised varieties was exploited in his corpus in order to achieve the dual aims of the ads, which relate to status and solidarity. While there is some evidence of this pattern in the sub-corpora, it is not widespread and the more common pattern is of categories of the ‘non-local’ voice occurring in both Action and Comment components, as illustrated in Table 6.2 and Figure 6.2, below. This is in contrast to Jaworski’s observation (2007, p.276) of a media bias in relation to AL6 (language indexing authentic cultural membership) (Coupland 2003), as referred to in chapter 2 (section 2.4.2).
Table 6.2: Fraction/Percentage of ‘Action and Comment’ (A&C) ads displaying particular accent sub-variety combination patterns: (local/non-local)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-corpus</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local: Action/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-local: Comment</td>
<td>Percentage 29%</td>
<td>Percentage 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fraction 2.33/8</td>
<td>Fraction 2.66/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-local: Action and Comment</td>
<td>Percentage 71%</td>
<td>Percentage 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fraction 5.66/8</td>
<td>Fraction 10.34/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local: Action and Comment</td>
<td>Percentage 0%</td>
<td>Percentage 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-local: Action/</td>
<td>Fraction 0/8</td>
<td>Fraction 0/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local: Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage 0%</td>
<td>Percentage 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.2: Percentage of ‘Action and Comment’ (A&C) ads displaying particular accent sub-variety combination patterns: (local/non-local)

NOTE: Figures represent fraction/percentage of total numbers of ‘Action and Comment’ type ads which display Irish English rhotic pronunciation in both components (see chapter 4, section 4.8.2 and Tables 3.2 and 4.2, Appendix B)

A focus on specific ‘Action and Comment’ ads allows us to explore more comprehensively the patterns revealed in the quantitative analysis of the strategy of juxtaposing local and non-local Irish English accent sub-varieties within ads of this type.
Furthermore, it provides important insights into how intra-varietal variation is exploited in both components of the ad. Such a focus is especially interesting given the finding that, in general, local or regional accents, although they favour the Action rather than the Comment component, do not predominate in the Action component, and also that categories of the non-local voice are found in both Action and Comment components of these ads. Also, given that Irish English dialectal items have an overall higher occurrence in the Action components of the later sub-corpora than in that of 1977 (see Table 5.2 and Figure 5.2 in chapter 5), it is important to look at how such features work with rhotic pronunciation in this component of the ads and contrast with the Comment voice. The following section looks at particular variety combinations within the ‘Action and Comment’ ads.

6.3.1 ‘Local’ Irish English-Action / ‘Non-local’ Irish English-Comment

While the pattern of local pronunciation in the Action and non-local in the Comment is not representative of the majority pattern overall, nevertheless it is interesting from a language ideological perspective to look at how the interplay of these varieties within the ad operates to exploit ‘the dialogic contrast of languages’ (Bakhtin 1981, p.364) in cases where it does occur.

An ‘Action and Comment’ ad for Cablelink, a cable antenna television system operator (Advert 6.3 Ref. 14/97 below), displays the pattern of local pronunciation in the Action and non-local in the Comment. In this ad, the setting is Christmas Day in an Irish kitchen where a middle-aged couple discuss the number of the traditional Christmas vegetable, Brussels sprouts, they will have for Christmas dinner. Their accents are those which, in folk-linguistic terms, might be described as ‘flat, undistinguished’ possibly Midlands (Hickey 2005, p.105) but obviously provincial. Although not obviously
identifiable with a specific county, the pronunciation of several words (for example, go as [ɡoː] Lines 005 and 006) are notably rural (Hickey 2005, p.57; Hickey 2013). Similarly, the dental plosive realisation of /ð/ in the as [d] and [ɡ] by speaker F1 and M1 respectively (highlighted in Lines 005 and 006) is distinctively Irish English, speaker F1 displaying a realisation associated with rural sub-varieties (Hickey 2013). At the dialectal level, the religious expletives, Lord (Line 004) and God (Line 008) and the use of there as in ‘Will I take the turkey out there?’ (Line 011) as pragmatic markers combine with the rhotic pronunciation to position the speakers as older, more traditional Irish characters. In addition, the Irish English usage of the preposition on (Line 008) to express a physical state (Filppula 1999, p.220), ‘...you've a great appetite on you’ and the vocative mammy’ (Line 022) (from the Irish word mamaí) (Dolan 2004 p.148) have a similar effect (see Table 4.1in chapter 4). As Amador-Moreno (2010, p.60) observes, such words for Irish listeners summon up cultural references that the standard English equivalent cannot. In this case, the nostalgia evoked by the word functions to highlight the dynamism of modern living, as against the dull but very familiar (to an Irish person) domestic situation. However, in this case, it is the pragmatic function of this feature that has most effect. It is not just the use of the Irish English address token mammy as opposed to its British equivalent that is exploited, but the fact that the female character refers to herself and to her husband as mammy and daddy respectively, despite the fact that their children are not party to the conversation. This situates the couple as the quintessential, old-fashioned Irish parents whose identity is embodied in their parenthood. Therefore, in this ad the Irish English features (phonological, lexical and pragmatic) are associated with the routine and mundane aspects of an Irish domestic situation. These features in themselves are not hyperbolised however, and combine with the overlaps in the conversation to give the conversation a ‘real’ and ‘authentic’ feel; the
‘authenticity’ of this scene resonates with early notions of authenticity as described by Bucholtz (2003) as residing in the speech of rural speakers, and traditional vernacular authenticities (Coupland 2003) as discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.4.2).

The Comment voice in this ad falls into the category described above as moderate Dublin but also displays features of advanced Dublin English such as retroflex /r/ in the realization of *sports* (Line 019) (Hickey 2005, p.72). The associations of this advanced Dublin English variant with the capital city and with contemporary youth subculture (Hickey 2005, p.73), together with its positioning side by side with the rural voices of the Action, function to accentuate the supposed dullness of life without the product. In addition, in contrast to the Action, Irish English dialectal items do not appear at all in the Comment. The pace of the speech in the Comment is also much faster than that of the Action, thereby associating the product with excitement, dynamism and energy as against the slow pace of life associated with the domestic situation. The Comment and Action are cleverly interwoven towards the end of the ad, thus exploiting the contrasting accents to the full. Therefore, although the Irish English rhotic pronunciation is used in both components of the ad, the more ‘neutral’ non-local rhotic voice of the Comment is differentiated from the provincial Action voices and is afforded prestige in its association with dynamic and modern living. In this ad the employment of the local Irish English sub-variety alongside the non-local, which is interspersed with advanced Dublin English features, situates the local variety as old-fashioned and dull. While the scenario and the variety associated with the voices of the characters can be said to create solidarity with the listener through their familiarity and the exploitation of more traditional conceptions of vernacular authenticity, nevertheless their associations with the mundane domestic scene renders the local Irish English unsuitable as the variety associated with the promotion of the product. The prestige of the non-local variety and
its status as a quasi-standard is strengthened through its associations with the contemporary and authoritative Comment voice. This echoes the claims of White (2006, p. 220) who refers to the notion of a ‘standard’ Irish English as having ‘a prestige which regional dialects lack’, as discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.3.7), again indicating that standard language ideologies are still at play.

**Advert 6.3 (Ref. 14/97) Cablelink**

**1997: Action and Comment**

001 M1: [(this) ()] -
002 F1: [Daddy () are nine] sprouts enough for you [jo]? the -
003 F1: [is it nine?]
004 M1: [ah Lord ] no that's -
005 F1: will you go [go:] the [da] twelve?
006 M1: I'd go [go:] the [da] twelve ()
007 [you know me () (the stuffing) ] -
008 F1: [oh God you've great you've a great appetite on you () we'll sleep]
009 the whole afternoon () [now Daddy]
010 M1: [yea]
011 will I take the the turkey out there?
012 F1: do but just [mind my handbag mind my handbag() don’t ] -
013 M1: [((ooooh/sound of strain of lifting heavy object))]  
014 M1: don’t worry
015 M1/F1: [((conversation continues in background))]  
016 MCV: [Christmas is great () >especially if you avail of ]
017 Cablelink’s special offer and get three months
018 free movie channels when you order a decoder
019 for Sky sports[sp ɔː t[s before December fifteenth () call Cablelink on<
020 M1: <one eight fifty>
021 MCV: >eighteen fifty two two two nine nine nine()not some day<
022 F1: now () pass Mammy’s handbag
The following section looks at the more prevalent pattern, that of non-local Irish English in both Action and Comment components of the ad.

6.3.2 ‘Non-local’ Irish English-Action/ ‘Non-local’ Irish English-Comment

Notwithstanding the ideological significance of the pattern discussed above, the more common pattern displayed overall is of non-local Irish English pronunciation in both components, although in some cases within the Action component, the non-local voice is situated alongside a local voice. Advert 6.4 Ref. 28/97, below, for example, displays rhotic pronunciation in both components, but with a mix of Irish English varieties in the Action. The context for this ad for Arnott’s Department Store is a set of ‘vox pop’ type interviews with shoppers in the new Dublin based store. The voice of the interviewer is classed as supraregional southern, as described above, while the interviewees’ accents are best described as moderate Dublin and regional. This can be interpreted as an attempt to illustrate a cross-section of the Irish population as potential customers; the moderate Dublin accent is exemplified in the vowel lengthening of Speaker F8’s (Line 014) realization of friendly as [frendli]. The voice of the first child (C1, Lines 003 and 004) is typical of the locally influenced moderate Dublin accent, discussed above, in that it has a blend of local Dublin (in the pronunciation of the word clothes and stuff) and advanced Dublin English as in T-flapped pronunciation of get (see also C2 in Line 007).

Interestingly, the cross-section does not include a non-rhotic speaker; this could be seen as indicative of a change in ideology from the earlier sub-corpora which had incidences of the use of non-rhotic pronunciation by particular characters in the Action component (for example Advert 5.6 ref 39/77 for Hedex in chapter 5, section 5.4.1). No Irish English dialectal items are evident, so the voices of the various sub-varieties are achieved solely through accent, as in Speaker M2’S (Line 006) realisation of shopping as in alveolar [ʃəʊpən] and Speaker F3’s (Line 009) ‘regional’ realization of Arnott’s as
which contrasts with the more careful non-local voice of the interviewer (M1, Line 001) and that of the Comment (MCV, Line 016), which is heard after the Action. The voice of the interviewer (M1) and the Comment voice are both rhotic and broadly supraregional southern (for example *shopping* as [ʃɑpɪŋ] in Line 001 (Hickey 2013), but their pronunciation of *Arnotts* as [ɑːrnɪts] is moving towards an SSBE realisation of the initial vowel sound. Additionally, speaker M1 retains yod as in *new* [rjʊː] (Line 001, as discussed in relation to (Advert 5.5 Ref. 28/77) in chapter 5 in contrast to the Irish English associated yod deletion. This, combined with the supraregional southern features, gives the pronunciations of these speakers a middle-class and all-encompassing quality which contrasts with the more varied accents in the Action in acting as the sanctioning voice. Notwithstanding these varied accents, however, they are predominantly non-local Irish English, consolidating the acceptability of non-local varieties in representing ‘the ordinary speech of ordinary people’ (Coupland 2007, p.181) and claiming authenticity as representing the opinions of ordinary people (Conboy 2003, p.47) as discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.3.2); furthermore, the absence of strongly vernacular Irish English in the Action indicates that such forms are unsuitable for the characterisation of shoppers at this store, and in representing ‘naturally occurring’ speech in this context (as in *AL2* (Coupland 2003) as described in chapter 2, section 2.4.2).

**Advert 6.4 (Ref. 28/97) Arnott’s**

**1997: Action and Comment**

001 M1: how did *you* find christmas shopping [ɑprɪŋ] in the new [rjʊː] Arnotts [ɑːrnɪts]?
002 ((Christmas music in background throughout remainder of ad))
003 C1: *em I usually get* [gɛɾ] *all my Christmas clothes* [klɒz] *in there*
004 F1: I think they’ve got really nice stuff [stʊf]
005 F1: there’s a huge selection all under one roof () very good
The ‘Action and Comment’ *Irish Cancer Initiative* ad (Advert 6.5 Ref. 7/07, below) is similar to the *Arnott’s* ad in that it simulates a sort of opinion survey in which the speakers voice their ‘genuine’ opinions or testimonials in relation to the product or service. This ad, promoting a prostate cancer information service, has a Comment component delivered in a supraregional southern accent by a well-known Irish health correspondent for the Irish radio and television broadcaster, RTÉ. This comes after an Action component in which three male speakers individually recount their experiences in relation to the information service. A supraregional southern accent (M1) comes before two local Irish English accents, local Dublin (M2) and regional (M3). The varied voices of the Action function in a somewhat similar way to that of the Arnott’s ad to denote a cross-section of society and thereby to communicate the indiscriminate nature of the illness in terms of background or class. The supraregional southern accent, as quasi-standard, suggest an educated, professional, middle class and mature speaker, the local Dublin is associated with working class Dublin speakers and the regional has associations with speakers from a rural background. Interestingly, as with the Arnott’s ad (Advert 6.4) above, there is no attempt to include a non-rhotic accent as part of this
representation of Irish society. The Comment voice is supraregional southern with no traces of the advanced Dublin form, suggesting that this longer-established variety is more appropriate than the new more explicitly dissociative form, as the expert or authoritative voice for the target audience of older males.

**Advert 6.5 (Ref. 7/07) Irish Cancer Initiative**

2007: Action and Comment

001 M1: I had no [nou] idea that at fifty my risk increased
002 M2: I found [foun] out[cut] how a lot of other [ado] men [me:n]
003 were in the same situation as myself
004 M3: fortunately [fa:rt] I discovered there is support [sapor:t] out there ()
005 MCV: to talk to a specialist nurse [nær:s] in confidence about prostate cancer
006 or for a free information pack call the prostate cancer information service
007 or freephone [foun] one eight hundred three [tri:] eighty [etli] three eighty ()
008 that's one eight hundred three eighty three eighty ()
009 lines open Monday to Thursday nine am to seven pm and Fridays till five pm ()
010 brought to you by Action Prostate Cancer (,) an Irish Cancer Society initiative

The success of this ad style, which attempts to represent a cross-section of the Irish population, is dependent to an extent on appearing ‘authentic’. As we have seen in chapter 5 (section 5.4.2), the employment of mainly non-local voices in such ads represents these non-local accents as ‘naturally occurring’ as in *AL2* (Coupland 2003) in that they are represented as the language of ‘ordinary people’ (Coupland 2007). The range of local and non-local Irish English accents in this representation also illustrates very effectively the notion of *AL5* (language indexing personal authenticity) in that the (more ‘prestigious’) supraregional southern speaker can claim ‘personal authenticity’ just as much as can the regional speaker or speaker of local Dublin English (Coupland 2003, p.424) based on establishment and vernacular authenticities (see chapter 2, section 2.4.2).
The Christmas ad for the Cork-based *Barry’s Tea* from the 2007 sub-corpus (Advert 6.6 Ref. 38/07) also illustrates the pattern of non-local Irish English accent in the Comment and both local and non-local in the Action. This ad also shows how Irish English dialectal items can operate with Irish English local and non-local pronunciation. The ad has achieved iconic status in Irish radio advertising and has been aired over several Christmas periods. It is now available on the popular video-sharing website, *Youtube*\(^{31}\) (Flurbyrock 2010).

The context for this ad is a father (the narrator, M1) recounting the story of his impulsive, nostalgia-driven purchase of a traditional train-set as a Christmas gift for his children, sparked by his reminiscences of receiving such a train-set from Santa Claus as a boy. The narrative (delivered in a supraregional southern accent) is interspersed with background contexts - the father’s memories of his boyhood Christmas and of running to tell his parents ‘what Santa brought’, his father’s reaction – ‘Doesn’t that beat Banagher’\(^{32}\) (Lines 032; 033). The Comment voice (Line 039) is supraregional southern and is positioned at the end of the reminiscence and before the return to the main narrative, in which the narrator’s wife reprimands him on his return home for buying the toy - ‘Sure that’s not what they wanted at all’ (Lines 042-044). In this case, the use of pragmatic marker *sure* combines with sentence tag *at all*, as it does in Advert 5.12 Ref. 6/87 for *Perrier*, as discussed in chapter 5, to imbue the character with Irishness and, in this instance, with the familiar pragmatism of the Irish wife and mother. The strength of these non-phonological features is visible here in that the accent of the mother comes under the non-local supraregional southern variety. The pragmatic reaction of the mother

\(^{31}\) [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ab0-T0KkJzY](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ab0-T0KkJzY)

\(^{32}\) ‘Banagher, is the name of a town in Co. Offaly. The saying ‘That beats [often pronounced /beːts/] (or bangs) Banagher’ is a common reaction to something extraordinary or absurd. Banagher was once a ‘pocket borough’, meaning that the local lord nominated its representatives in Parliament. The town became famous for this (once-common) undemocratic way of conducting politics, so if something was really anomalous it was said to ‘beat Banagher.’ (Dolan 2004, p.14)
serves to highlight the romanticism and traditional values of the father and in this way to situate the product as uniquely Irish and associated with Irish tradition and nostalgia.

The Irish English features, however, in contrast to the Perrier ads discussed in chapter 5 (section 5.4.3), are used sparingly (for example, the sentence tag at all (Line 043) is used with pragmatic marker sure in this instance rather than the vernacular at all at all) and in a far more subtle way, allowing the listener, not to see a stereotypical image of Irishness as discussed in relation to the Perrier ads, but rather to recognise him or herself as part of that context of Irish family life. The strategy whereby the voices of the family on that childhood Christmas morning are heard and repeated by the character of the father, as he remembers them, also adds a sense of reality (for example, Lines 029; 031 and Lines 032; 033); the character of the speaker’s father uses a more anachronistic pronunciation of the word beat as bate [bet] (Line 032) in the Irish saying Doesn’t that beat Banagher? which is in keeping with his age and a rural background. However, the standard pronunciation is used by the narrator in repeating the saying in the context of the narrative (Line 033). In this context, the pronunciations of the speakers sound natural and combine to make the characters and scenario more credible.

This integration of local accent and dialectal items with non-local accent in this ad again appears to go some way towards addressing status and solidarity values and indeed the reconciliation of traditional vernacular and establishment authenticities, as discussed in chapter 2; while local Irish English features are exploited, they are associated with the more prestigious supraregional southern pronunciation, either through being delivered in this accent (Lines 042-044) or through their repetition by the narrator in the supraregional southern accent (Lines 032-038). These strategies, similar to those seen in Advert 6.3 for Cablelink above, illustrate how local Irish English may act as a marker of
identity but is not considered suitable in contemporary contexts. In such contexts, however, the integration of the local and non-local features serves as a sort of merging of contemporary cosmopolitan and local identities. Given that, for Irish people, *Barry’s Tea* is synonymous with Ireland’s tea-drinking culture, this ad can be said to exploit the brand of ‘Irishness’ (McWilliams 2007) (see chapter 4 section 4.3.1) with regard to the Irish audience; despite the increased exploitation of rhotic as opposed to non-rhotic accents and, to a lesser degree, the increase in Irish English dialectal variety in the later sub-corpora, this exploitation, however, appears to be based on a rather muted use of Irish English markers, consolidating the notion, referred to above, of the fusion of global and local identities.

*Advert 6.6 (Ref. 38/07) Barry’s Tea*

**2007: Action & Comment**

001 M1: there's something about Christmas () there's something about it
002 that creeps inside and finds the child in you ()
003 ((sound of electronic toys and electric trainset continues up to Line 010))
004 I was having a look around the shops
005 to see what Santa might be bringing the boys [bɒɪz] ()
006 there was this trainset () old style black engine
007 with maroon striped green and black carriages () all set up like ()
008 ((sound of train whistle))
009 and the sound it made () soft () yet it cut right through
010 all the space agey screeches of the place [pleɪs] ()
011 [((sound of train whistle))] [(sound of train whistle)]
012 [and I remembered ] another Christmas morning () waking up ()
013 the windows frosted over with cold [kəʊld] ()
014 you could see your breath ()
015 [and the thing that woke me] [was that sound () ]
016 [((electric trainset sound))] [((sound of train whistle))] [(sound of train whistle)]
017 [and I didn't dare hope()] sliding out of bed cold to the floor]
I ran down
((sound of footsteps running downstairs))]

C1: [Dad Mam               ]
M1: [could barely speak ]
Mam and Dad were sitting there(.)
((background classical music playing)) ]
F1: [what is it?              ]
M1: the teapot covered in that knitted cosy and the smell of
hot milky tea and rashers]
C1: [Dad, you'll never       ] guess what Santa brought
M1: you'll never guess what Santa brought  broːt () I said
M2: well, doesn't that beat [bɛrt] [Banagher
M1: doesn' that beat [bɛt] Banagher}
M1: [said my father        ]
M2: [a trainset [treːnset] no less]
M1: a trainset  [trenset] no less
M2: isn't Santa the smart fellow.
M1: isn't Santa the smart fellow
MCV: turn the moment gold () with Barry’s gold blend tea(,)
M1: so last night when I came home with the trainset ()
M1: Mary couldn't believe it
F2: ah Martin sure that's not
M1: [what they wanted at all.................................]
M1: [sure that's not what they wanted at all she said]
M1: Santa will bring them what they want I said ()
M1: this () is from me () put the kettle on () we'll have a cuppa tea

Another example of a mix of local and non-local Irish English varieties in the Action component and non-local in the Comment is Advert 6.7 Ref. 15/07, below, from the 2007 sub-corpus, promoting gift vouchers for recreational Formula 1 motor racing at
Mondello Park motor-racing school in Dublin. This ad has an Action component featuring a grandson giving the gift of the voucher to his grandmother. The grandmother tells him that because of her ‘bad hip’, he can use it himself, whereupon the grandson feigns surprise and gratitude at her generosity. Again, the grandmother’s voice, although broadly supraregional southern, has distinctively Irish dialectal features as in the use of pragmatic marker sure (Line 006) which situates her as familiar, traditional and Irish (Amador-Moreno 2010, p.120). Irish politeness (see Farr 2005) is conveyed through the grandmother’s voice again in her response to receiving the gift- ‘Ah you shouldn’t have’ (Line 002). The more traditional features of the speech of the grandmother serve to create solidarity with an older audience whilst contrasting with the advanced features (for example /r/- retroflexion and /l/-velarisation (Hickey 2013)) in the voices of the grandson (Line 004) and the Comment voice (Line 008) to heighten the sense of excitement associated with the product. The voice of the grandson, which gives important information on the product, functions to support and complement the message of the Comment component, which interestingly, is a strategy noted in relation to non-rhotic pronunciation in the previous inter-varietal analysis (for example, Advert 5.6 Ref. 39/77 in chapter 5, section 5.4.1). The non-local accent, in particular, the use of advanced Dublin English features, in this case, as in the case of Advert 6.3 for Cablelink above, associates the product with a sense of the contemporary; it connotes a youthful vivacity and energy and a sense of ‘coolness’ (cf Kelly-Holmes 2005, p.73) which is not available from the localised forms.

Advert 6.7 (Ref.15/07) Mondello Park motor racing school

2007: Action and Comment

001 M1: happy christmas Gran (.)
002 F1: ah you shouldn’t have son.(.)
Advert 6.8 (Ref. 26/07) from the 2007 sub-corpus for *Global Home Improvements* displays supraregional southern pronunciation in both ad components. This ad provides an interesting comparison with the 1977 ad for Hedex (Advert 5.6, Ref. 39/77) and the 1987 ad (Ref. 3/87 Table 2.1, Appendix B), for Siúcra Irish sugar, as discussed in chapter 5 (section 5.4.1). In both these ads, the strategy is employed in the Action components, by which one speaker, displaying a supraregional southern accent, appears to be used for the purpose of consumer identification while a second character using SSBE non-rhotic pronunciation is used to consolidate the voice of authority in the Comment. The *Global Home Improvements* ad, however, differs from these earlier ads in that both speakers in the Action use a supraregional southern accent and this accent is also employed by the speaker in the Comment. Again, this indicates the versatility of this pronunciation form in acting as both an authoritative voice and that of informal discourse and supports the notion of the potential of this form in bringing together vernacular and establishment authenticities.

**Advert 6.8 (Ref. 26/07) Global Home Improvements**

**2007: Action and Comment**

001 ((phone ringing))

002 F1: Anne? ()

003 F2: Joan,(,) it’s been ages,(,)how are things?
Further examples of ads which feature exclusively non-local varieties are examined in relation to advanced Dublin English in Chapter 7.

While Advert 6.3 for Cablelink (section 6.3.1 above) illustrates the pattern of local Irish English accent in the Action as against non-local in the Comment, this is not the prevailing pattern in the later sub-corpora; however, the latter five ‘Action and Comment’ ads (Adverts 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 6.7 and 6.8) can be said to be representative of the overall most prevalent pattern, in that both components of these ads contain instances of non-local Irish English, indicating that, as with the earlier sub-corpora, the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora do not depend on local forms for creating solidarity with the listener.

This section has addressed the second main research question in terms of the first two sub-questions; firstly that of longitudinal variation in the choice and function of sub-varieties of Irish English, and secondly the question of the juxtaposition of sub-varieties in ‘Action and Comment’ ads. The following section moves on to an examination of the third research sub-question which relates to indexical values in the sub-corpora.
6.4 The indexical values of ‘local’ and ‘non-local’ Irish English accent sub-varieties

As we have seen in chapter 3, Kelly-Holmes (2005a, p.22) in investigating how languages as well as accent and dialect are used in advertising, observes that they can be used for their symbolic value (Kelly-Holmes 2005, pp.23-24). This is associated with the notion of indexicality (see Silverstein 1992, 2003; Milroy 2004; Gal and Irvine 1995) which relates to the social meaning which a particular form or variety stands for or represents. The following analysis focuses on the sub-varieties of Irish English displayed in the later two sub-corpora and the meanings with which they can be associated. In this analysis, we will revisit a number of ads from the previous intra-varietal analyses of Irish English in this chapter in order to highlight indexical values associated with Irish English sub-varieties in the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora.

As we have seen in chapter 5 (section 5.5), the indexical value is intensified through the strategy of juxtaposing SSBE in the Comment and Irish English in the Action within these ads, (for example, Advert 5.8 Ref.23/77 for Ergas, discussed in section 5.4.2), thus exploiting what Bakhtin (1981, p.364) refers to as ‘the dialogic contrast of languages’. The previous analysis in this chapter has shown that the corresponding strategy of juxtaposing non-local Irish English in the Comment against local Irish English in the Action components is not predominant in the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora (Table 6.2 and Figure 6.2 above). This would suggest that the indexical value of sub-varieties of Irish English does not depend on the exploitation of this strategy.

However, as discussed in the previous section, notwithstanding the fact that the juxtaposition of local and non-local sub-varieties of Irish English is not a predominant strategy in the two later sub-corpora, in a number of ads, local varieties of Irish English are used in some cases in conjunction with non-local; the contrasting sub-varieties
however, may be found not only in the distinct components of Action and Comment, but also within the Action component. The former pattern is visible in the ad for Cablelink (Advert 6.3 Ref. 14/97) and the latter in Mondello Park (Advert 6.7 Ref. 15/07). In these ads, the local variety indexes older speakers and in these contexts associates them with dullness and banality; its juxtaposition against the non-local, which contains features of advanced Dublin English, serves to heighten this association. Local varieties in the Barry’s Tea ad (Advert 6.6 Ref. 38/07), however, are associated with more romantic, traditional home and family values, based on traditional vernacular authenticities.

The qualitative analysis of the ads suggests that each of the subcategories coming under the umbrella of non-local Irish English can be said to have its own particular symbolic value, which is ideologically founded. The moderate Dublin accent, as employed in Advert 6.1 above for Tesco, Quinsworth and Crazy Prices, for example, although a ‘prestige’ sub-variety in that it is ‘non-local’, nevertheless exploits its retention of certain local Dublin features to index middle-class speakers who retain some connection with traditional conservative Dublin values and culture; furthermore, its associations with the capital distinguish it from the supraregional southern accent and afford it a status based on a sort of merging of the concepts of overt and covert prestige (the sophistication of the capital city combined with traditional local Dublin values), and thus exploits both status and solidarity dimensions.

By comparison, the supraregional southern accent loses out to some extent on the solidarity aspect, but can be said to have a more broad-based function as a prestige form in indexing ‘educated’, middle-class speakers throughout the Republic of Ireland, for example in Advert 6.5 above for the Irish Cancer Initiative. In addition, given that both these forms (moderate Dublin and supraregional southern) are derived from dissociation
with traditional and local varieties (Hickey 2005; 2013), they can be said to have a sophisticated and cosmopolitan quality. Viewing these forms as a quasi-standard, their exploitation as the authoritative voice, particularly visible in the 1997 sub-corpus, is indicative of the operation of standard language ideology, albeit in a less rigid sense than that demonstrated in the emulation of SSBE non-rhotic pronunciation in the earlier sub-corpora.

Moving to advanced Dublin English, however, this relatively new sub-variety appears to have a more heightened capacity to create such images and succeeds in combining with the contexts of the ads to imbue the urbane and sophisticated representations with an energy and dynamism not available in the case of the other non-local subcategories. This capacity could be said to stem from its origins in the active dissociation from and rejection of local forms brought about by a desire among young people for an ‘urban sophistication’ (Hickey 2004a, p.45) and its associations with contemporary youth subculture (Hickey 2005, p.73). Its employment in association with contexts of dynamism and youthful energy suggest that it is more closely aligned to these attributes than are the local forms; these local forms are therefore deemed unsuitable for contemporary contexts. In addition, where advanced Dublin English is juxtaposed against local varieties (as in Advert 6.3 ref.14/97 for Cablelink and Advert 6.7 Ref. 15/07 for Mondello Park above), for example, the indexical value of the advanced form is intensified. Interestingly, it is this variety which appears to match most closely the qualities identified by Piller (2003, p. 175) and Kelly-Holmes (2005, p. 104) in relation to ‘the special case of English’, for example, those of modernity, progress, globalization, cosmopolitanism and fashionableness. These qualities are resonant to some extent of the viewpoint, emergent in the nineteenth century, of the necessity to acquire the English language in order for Ireland to take its place in the modern world (Amador-Moreno
2010, p.22). The indexical value of this form will be explored more thoroughly in the next chapter.

6.5 Accommodation and audience and referee design strategies: 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora

This section addresses the fourth and final research sub-question in relation to research question 2 and investigates the existence of accommodation strategies relating to sub-varieties of Irish English in the later sub-corpora.

As discussed in chapter 3, Bell (1991b) emphasises that in mass communication, speakers can only accommodate to a stereotype of the speech of their audience. Therefore, audience design as well as referee design can be important in reflecting ideologies of language in that the models on which the audience and referee are based are necessarily influenced by such ideologies. The analysis is based on the examination of strategies of accommodation, particularly audience and referee design, as they apply in the ads examined above and looks at the implications of these strategies from a language ideological viewpoint.

The Irish language lexical items in Advert 6.2 Ref.5/97 (section 6.2.1 above) for the Irish Kidney Association can be interpreted as functioning as a type of outgroup referee design, given that Irish English has effectively replaced the Irish language as the first language of the majority of the population. Additionally, as discussed in chapter 2, Wright (2006, p. 223) claims that while the Irish language ‘may express some aspects of Irish identity’ nevertheless ‘[it] does not, unlike standard Irish English, easily permit users to link their local identity with a global one’. However, it is a useful outgroup referee design strategy in that it exploits nationalist ideologies of language and the integration of Irish language and English language culture, as discussed in section 6.2.1
above. It is notable, however, that with regard to the Irish language lexical items, as with Advert 1.8 Ref.23/77 for Ergas, discussed in chapter 5 (section 5.4.2), the Irish language items are not translated for the listener, indicating that, despite the fact that the Irish language is not an integral part of everyday communication, it is nevertheless a familiar part of Irish culture. Indeed, Amador-Moreno (2010, p.59) points out that the use of Irish (language) words in Irish English situates the speaker as a member of the Irish English speech community as well as appealing to shared cultural knowledge. Therefore, even though it may be interpreted at a practical level as outgroup referee design, nevertheless it may also serve a similar purpose to ingroup referee design in creating solidarity with the listener and in its capacity to ‘other’ (see Irvine and Gal 2009) those listeners who do not understand the Irish language reference.

The use of the Irish language as an accommodative strategy is interesting when compared with the use of local Irish English. While it is employed very infrequently as compared with local Irish English, nevertheless, where it is used, it is not associated in any way with contexts which could depict it in a pejorative light. While the ostensibly pejorative use of local Irish English is generally employed as stylisation (as in the Perrier ads discussed in chapter 5 and Advert 6.3 for Cablelink, which will be discussed in this regard below), a strategy which effectively negates the pejorative representation, it is notable that Irish language items are not exploited in such contexts. This suggests that the Irish language has achieved a status through its decline and no longer has the negative associations of the nineteenth century (Filppula 1999, p.9) which were instrumental in that decline. As we have seen in chapter 2, Woolard and Schieffelin (1994, p.64) discuss how purist principles of linguistic correctness can be selective in their exclusion of languages, often focusing on languages seen as threats. It may be that the Irish language is no longer seen as a threat to the English language and progress and
is therefore allowed to be exploited as a cultural icon.

With regard to Advert 6.3 Ref. 14/97 for Cablelink, (discussed above in section 6.3.1), the Action component of this ad, despite its ‘authentic’ feel, is nevertheless patently stylised in terms of the criteria for dialect stylisation as proposed by Coupland (2001; 2007), outlined in chapter 2, section 2.4.3). In contrast to the Perrier ads discussed in chapter 5, however, this particular ad does not depend so much on the ‘emphatic and hyperbolic realisations’ of its targeted style (Coupland 2007, p.154) but instead overplays the ‘authenticity’ of the contextual situation, in the performance of the stylisation. While Irish English vernacular features are exploited in this ad, it does not have the same proliferation of features as in the Perrier ad set; the features used are not as stereotypically Irish nor are they hyperbolised to the same extent. However, the ad employs more subtle means in achieving this stylised ‘authenticity’. The way in which the address tokens mammy and daddy are exploited, as described above, is very much an ‘ingroup’ feature and would require an acculturated audience to appreciate its connotations. Additionally, the use of ‘go’ to mean ‘take’ or ‘eat’, for example, ‘Would you go the twelve [Brussels sprouts]?’ in Lines 005 and 006, is common in Irish English but is not a well documented feature. Also, the topic of discussion by the couple is domestic and trivial. The scenario suggests an intimacy of sorts, and the ad achieves the effect of the listener eavesdropping on this intimate situation. The ad depends not on its use of accent and dialect alone, but also on the way in which this accent and dialect combine with the context which is mundane almost to the point of being bizarre.

The contrast between the Action and Comment components of the Cablelink ad afford it the ‘transparent knowingness’ associated with stylised performances (Coupland 2001, p.371). Interestingly, unlike the Perrier ads, the product is not mentioned at all in the
Action component and this accentuates the fact of its absence from this dull context. As we have seen in chapter 5 (section 5.6.3), Coupland (2001, p.350) refers to the socio-cultural and personal associations linked to dialectal variety, including the dimension of \textit{dynamic/dull}, rendering it suitable for stylisation. The ad suggests that in the Irish context, Christmas day is rather dull and boring (unlike the ‘traditional’ Christmases, often depicted in British and North American literature, film and television) but can be enlivened by a subscription to the product. The irony in Line 016, ‘Christmas is great’, makes it clear that the Action scenario is not to be taken seriously. It allows the Irish listeners to laugh at themselves and their identity as represented within the context of the Irish Christmas, namely Brussels sprouts, turkey, television and sleeping ‘the whole afternoon’. This representation, however, is accepted on the basis of a claim to ‘less than full ownership’ of this aspect of identity (Coupland 2003, p.428). As with the \textit{Perrier} ads, the fact that it is not represented as ‘fully owned’ in terms of \textit{AL4} (Coupland 2003) serves to de-authenticate this identity but the ‘knowingness’ of the representation re-authenticates and validates Irish identity. Again, it reinforces to the Irish listener that this is all part of what it means to be Irish but on the other hand is only one aspect of a more multi-dimensional global Irish identity.

As we have seen, stylised performances can be seen in terms of ingroup referee design and indeed the Action component of the \textit{Cablelink} ad can be interpreted as such. The referee in this case differs, however, from the caricatured representation in the \textit{Perrier} ads and is based on more muted accent and dialect as it is in the \textit{Barry’s Tea} ad from the 2007 sub-corpus (Advert 6.6 in section 6.3.2 above). However, it differs from the \textit{Barry’s Tea} ad in the more playfully stylised nature of the referee design, which as we have discussed in chapter 5 (section 5.6.3) enables self-reflexivity and reauthentication (Coupland 2001).
As described, the Comment voice in the *Cablelink* ad combines moderate Dublin features with those of advanced Dublin English such as retroflex /r/ in the realization of *sports* (Line 019) (Hickey 2005, p.72). This is particularly interesting in light of our observations regarding non-rhotic pronunciation in the earlier sub-corpora where in many cases, the SSBE variant of r-lessness was displayed alongside Irish English pronunciation features. As Bell (1991a) observes, successful referee design employs the strategy of repetition of a small number, or even just one variant, which is often enough to suggest the reference group. In this case, the use of advanced Dublin English could be seen in terms of outgroup referee design. If we take the supraregional southern variety as the audience-designed style, as discussed in chapter 3 (section 3.4.6), the use of advanced Dublin English, given its dissociative nature (Hickey 2004a; 2005) could be said to be a divergence from the ingroup speech patterns to the linguistic code and identity with which the speaker wishes to identify and which holds prestige for the speaker for the purpose at hand (Bell 1991a). The increase in use of advanced Dublin English in the 2007 sub-corpus, however, suggests that this form may be replacing supraregional southern pronunciation as the audience-designed style. This will be explored more fully in the next chapter.

The *Barry's Tea* ad (Advert 6.6, section 6.3.2 above) also employs a number of accommodative strategies. As compared with the *Perrier* ads, in this ad, the more restrained use of Irish English dialectal features is interesting and can be compared with the findings of Koslow et al (1994, p.577) in their study on the response of United States Hispanic consumers to the use of Spanish language in advertising. Highlighting the value of accommodation theory in looking at the perception of advertisers and the response to the advertiser’s message by consumers in particular cultures, they found that benefits accrued from even the lowest level of usage; they also found that no significant
benefit was found with an increase in Spanish language usage, a response attributed in part to linguistic inferiority complexes. Although not directly analogous, given that in Koslow et al’s study, a different language rather than sub-variety is in question, the analogy serves to highlight the policy of more subdued use of features of a minority language or variety in cases where the function of their use is to increase solidarity with the receiver of the ad.

This ad illustrates what Bell (2001) sees, in his re-evaluation of his audience design model, as the ‘complementary and coexistent’ initiative and responsive dimensions of style, as discussed in chapter 3 (section 3.4.5). While speakers design their talk in relation to their audience, they are simultaneously designing it in relation to other referee groups. Therefore, while the speech of the narrator and the Comment voice could be said to be an audience-designed style, the lexical and phonological Irish English items employed by the characters of the narrator’s wife and that of his father could be interpreted in terms of ingroup referee design. In contrast to the ingroup referee design seen in the Perrier ads, however, it is based on a more restrained use of Irish English dialectal features and could in no way be seen as caricatured. In addition, it is not exploited in the playful way in which it is used in the Cablelink ad. This referee design strategy is more direct and less complex than the ‘strategic inauthenticity’ of the Perrier and Cablelink ads. The audience designed style combines with that of referee design to create solidarity with the listener. The success of the strategy is illustrated in comments posted in relation to the Youtube video of this ad:

This makes my Christmas every year, and this year is so more meaningful as it's my first year spending Christmas abroad. Thank you so much for bringing me a taste of home for the festive season

(Flurbyrock 2010)

and in a response to this comment, ‘spread the word - there's something awesome about
just being Irish, at home or abroad” (ibid). The local features, as the ‘language of the heart and the emotions’ (Lee 1992, p.183), enhance the capacity for the creation of solidarity.

As with the ad for Barry’s Tea (Advert 6.6 Ref. 38/07), in Advert 6.4 Ref.28/97 for Arnotts, Advert 6.5 Ref.7/07 for the Irish Cancer Initiative and Advert 6.7 Ref. 15.07 for Mondello Park (section 6.3.2 above) we can see the co-occurrence of an audience and referee designed style in the mix of supraregional southern and other Irish English accent sub-varieties. As with the Cablelink ad, in these cases even single variants of the particular accent are powerful enough to suggest the identity associated with that accent, as in the t-flapping of C1 in Line 003 of the Arnotts ad.

Accommodation strategies in general in the 1997 sub-corpus are based on a general convergence to the Irish English speaker and involve both audience and ingroup referee design. In this sub-corpus, the quantitative findings indicate there is a greater reliance on non-local Irish English and convergent accommodative behaviour as opposed to the divergence associated with non-rhotic pronunciation in the earlier sub-corpora. Audience design or ingroup referee design are the more common accommodative strategies in this sub-corpus as opposed to outgroup referee design achieved through the use of SSBE pronunciation in the 1977 and 1987 sub-corpora. In this sub-corpus, outgroup referee design is rather based on advanced Dublin English, given its dissociative nature. The implied receiver of the ad falls generally into the non-local category as associated with a quasi standard Irish English. This concurs with White (2006, p. 220) who suggests that the use of ‘standard’ Irish English would appear to have a more significant role in representing Irish identity than vernacular forms.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AbO-T0KkJzY
While the 2007 sub-corpus also depends predominantly on Irish English as opposed to SSBE for both audience and referee models, it is notable that the use of advanced Dublin English increases in this sub-corpus. As discussed, the dissociative nature of this pronunciation form suggests its classification as outgroup referee design. However, its increasing prevalence in the 2007 sub-corpus together with Hickey’s (2013) claim that it is now the mainstream Irish English form, suggests that it may be more appropriate to view it as audience design in the 2007 sub-corpus. This will be explored in Chapter 7.

In general, the exploitation of local varieties as ingroup referee design in the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora does not appear to involve the denigration of these varieties; their more muted use is often exploited to associate with nostalgia (for example, Barry’s Tea (Advert 6.6 Ref.38/97 above) while more hyperbolised representations (for example, Perrier (Advert 5.11 Ref. 17/87 and Advert 5.12 Ref. 6/87 in chapter 5) and Cablelink (Advert 6.3 Ref. 14/97 above) succeed in avoiding denigration through playful stylisation and strategic inauthenticity.

6.6 Summary and conclusions

The chapter has analysed variety choice in the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora in terms of local and non-local accent sub-varieties of Irish English. It has examined the findings in relation to the second research question based on research sub-questions 2.1.1 to 2.1.4 (see chapter 1, section 1.3). The first research sub-question relates to longitudinal occurrence and location according to ad component of these accent sub-varieties. The Comment components are found to display non-local sub-varieties almost exclusively. While the Action components in both of these sub-corpora show more evidence of local accents than do their corresponding Comment components, these Action components show a notable decline from the earlier sub-corpora in the occurrence of Irish English.
local accents as a percentage of rhotic accents as a whole. These local accents are replaced by those of non-local including advanced Dublin English; this latter sub-variety shows a marked increase in both components from 1997 to 2007 and indeed dominates in the Comment components of the 2007 sub-corpus.

With regard to the ideological significance of these longitudinal changes, on the face of it the increase in rhotic Irish English pronunciation could be seen as indicative of a movement away from standard language ideology and as evidence of the conversationalization of discourse (Fairclough 1994). On the other hand, the overall dominance of non-local varieties as opposed to local suggests that standard language ideologies may still be prevalent, albeit based on a different model of what constitutes ‘standard’ in the Irish context. This finding may also suggest a reconciliation of standard and nationalist ideologies, in that the Irish English quasi-standard form as opposed to the standard British variety is seen as an acceptable authoritative voice. Additionally, the exploitation of Irish language lexical items combined with non-local pronunciation illustrates a reconciliation not only of Irish and English language culture, but also of local and global values. Overall the findings suggest a less rigid conception of ‘standard’ in the Irish advertising context influenced by nationalist ideologies and the informalisation process associated with the conversationalization of discourse, as discussed. In addition, the increased exploitation of non-local as opposed to local varieties in the Action indicate a decline in the use of local Irish English features as ‘marker[s] of specificity’ (Cronin 2011) and the pervasiveness of the more prestigious quasi-standard non-local varieties in what constitutes ‘everyday informal interaction’ (Lee 1992). This suggests that non-local Irish English is represented as having vernacular authenticity and thus claims authenticity in the ads as it is designed to simulate ‘the ordinary speech of ordinary people’ (Coupland 2007). This together with
its designation as a quasi-standard variety serves as a reconciliation of traditional establishment and vernacular authenticities.

The second research sub-question relating to the juxtaposition of local and non-local sub-varieties within ‘Action and Comment’ ads, was then addressed. While there is some evidence of this pattern in the sub-corpora, the occurrence of categories of the ‘non-local’ voice in both Action and Comment components is the more prevalent pattern. With regard to ads which display the former pattern, traditional vernacular authenticities are exploited in creating solidarity with the listener in the Action components which employ local Irish English. However, the fact that these local varieties are confined to the Action marks them as unsuitable as the authoritative voice; correspondingly, the prestige of the non-local variety is strengthened through its employment in the Comment voice and corroborates White’s (2006, p. 220) notion of a ‘standard’ Irish English as having a prestige not provided by regional dialects. Again, this suggests that standard language ideologies, although based on a different model of standard, are still prevalent.

As regards the more prevalent pattern of non-local accents in both components, the analysis of particular ads reveals particular ideologies. Accent sub-variety is used to represent cross-sections of the Irish population in a number of ads but unlike the earlier sub-corpora, non-rhotic accents are excluded from these representations and replaced by mainly non-local as opposed to local Irish English accents. This finding reinforces the movement away from SSBE to non-local as a conception of standard but also towards the dominance of non-local varieties as opposed to local Irish English in informal interaction and therefore in representing the ‘authentic’ speaker in the Irish context. Furthermore, the versatility of this pronunciation form, to the extent that it acts both as
an authoritative voice and that of informal interaction, is established.

In some ads, local accent and dialectal items are combined with non-local accent in the Action components; in this way they address status and solidarity values and attempt to bring together vernacular and establishment authenticities. However, the association of non-local varieties with more modern characters and contexts illustrate how vernacular Irish English may act as a marker of identity and solidarity but is not considered an appropriate form for conveying images of contemporary Irishness.

The third research sub-question examines the indexical values associated with the accent sub-varieties of Irish English in the two later sub-corpora. In some ads, regional Irish English forms index dullness and banality, heightened through their juxtaposition against the non-local (although this is not a common strategy). However, such varieties can also be associated with romantic, traditional, family values.

With regard to non-local varieties, moderate Dublin and supraregional southern index educated, middle-class speakers, but the moderate Dublin accent has an added value in its associations with the capital city. The dissociative nature of both these pronunciation forms indexes sophistication and cosmopolitanism. With regard to advanced Dublin English, this sub-variety, in addition to the sophistication and urbanity of the latter forms, has connotations of energy, dynamism and youth, probably due to its more active rejection of and dissociation from local forms together with its links with contemporary youth subculture (Hickey 2005, p. 73). The connotations of this form equate generally with those of modernity, progress, globalization, cosmopolitanism and fashionableness as identified by Piller (2003, p. 175) and Kelly-Holmes (2005, p. 104) in relation to ‘the special case of English’. The exploitation of all three non-local accent sub-varieties as the authoritative voice associate these accents with authority and expertise. The
establishment of non-local forms as quasi-standard is indicative of the operation of standard language ideology. However, this ideology is based on a less rigid conception of standard than that associated with SSBE in the earlier sub-corpora.

The final research sub-question investigates the existence of accommodation strategies relating to sub-varieties of Irish English in the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora. Audience design and referee design can be indicative of the operation of ideologies of language in that the models on which the audience and referee are based are influenced by such ideologies. The use of lexical items from the Irish language can be seen in terms of outgroup referee design but nevertheless demonstrates nationalist ideologies of language based on an integration of Irish language and English language culture as opposed to mono-culturally-based ideologies. Moreover, in contrast with strongly vernacular local Irish English sub-varieties, the Irish language is not trivialised or used in a pejorative way. Advanced Dublin English, to the extent that it is a dissociative strategy can also be classed as outgroup referee design; however, the fact that it is now classed as mainstream may mean that it is more appropriately viewed as audience design. This will be discussed in chapter 7.

Notwithstanding the findings in relation to outgroup referee design, these sub-corpora rely generally on convergent accommodation strategies in the form of audience design or ingroup referee design (often co-occurring within the ad) rather than divergent strategies of outgroup referee design as described above or in terms of the use of SSBE as seen in the earlier sub-corpora. The implied receiver of the ad is based generally on non-local Irish English speakers, thus corroborating White’s (2006, p. 220) claim that the use of ‘standard’ Irish English represents Irish identity more than vernacular forms.

Ingroup referee design is demonstrated through a strategy of playful stylisation as well
as though more realistic scenarios which employ a more muted use of Irish English. In general, the use of local varieties as ingroup referee design in the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora is not pejorative; this is accomplished through more subdued, subtle use of such varieties in some cases but also through the strategic reauthentication achieved by virtue of the stylised use of strongly vernacular, hyperbolised representations.

Overall, therefore, the analysis of local and non-local Irish English sub-varieties shows a movement away from the rigorous conception of standard as linked with SSBE to one associated with non-local sub-varieties of Irish English. The ‘authentic’ speaker appears to be represented by non-local as opposed to local forms. However, local forms, where exploited, avoid denigration through more muted use as well as through stylisation which allows for ‘strategic inauthenticity’. As advanced Dublin English is the non-local form which has now been established as mainstream (Hickey 2013), the following chapter will focus on the language ideologies associated with this form.
Chapter 7: Choice at the intra-varietal level [2]: Advanced Dublin English

7.1 Introduction

The previous chapter has shown how, in the two most recent sub-corpora (1997 and 2007), the increased presence of Irish English rhotic pronunciation in the corpus overall, is made up of predominantly non-local (the accent sub-varieties of moderate Dublin, supraregional southern and advanced Dublin English, which are derived from dissociation with local forms), as opposed to local (local Dublin and regional accents which identify with local culture and values) Irish English accents, as described in chapter 2 (section 2.3.8). In these sub-corpora, the Comment components which feature rhotic Irish English accents are almost exclusively made up of the non-local sub-varieties. While local accents are present to a greater degree in the Action as opposed to the Comment components, overall non-local accents dominate in both components. Additionally, the juxtaposing in ‘Action and Comment’ ads of non-rhotic accents in the Comment and rhotic in the Action, which is a predominant feature of the two earlier sub-corpora, falls off to a large extent in the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora, being replaced by rhotic pronunciation in both components. Various strategies are found to exist with regard to the exploitation of the sub-varieties of this pronunciation form in ‘Action and Comment’ ads but the strategy of juxtaposing local and non-local forms in the Action and Comment components of these ads respectively is not predominant in these sub-corpora.

As we have seen, this non-local Irish English pronunciation is comprised of the accent sub-varieties of moderate Dublin English, supraregional southern and advanced Dublin
English, as described in chapter 2. We have referred in chapter 1 (section 1.1) to the way in which the discourse of advertising is said to echo the discourse of the society in which it operates (Lee 1992, p.171). In the Irish context, southern Irish English has recently undergone what Hickey (2004a, p.46) views as unquestionably the most important case of language change in modern-day Ireland, the shift in pronunciation of Dublin English. This new form, as discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.4.4), has spread at a rapid pace throughout southern Ireland, and the fact that its salient features are readily classifiable and occur as a set of features which are appropriated by a younger group of speakers, prompted Hickey (2004a, p. 48) to give them the term *New Pronunciation*. In more recent discussions, as part of his project on variation and change in Dublin English, Hickey (2013) confirms his earlier speculation that this pronunciation form would ‘probably become the new supraregional variety’, given its influence on the speech of the rest of the Republic; he observes how this new form, which he now terms *advanced Dublin English*, has ‘established itself as the new mainstream form of Irish English’. In light of Lee’s observation of the relationship between advertisements and discourse in particular societies, the extent to which this innovative development in the linguistic environment of Ireland is reflected in the Irish advertising context and the language ideology associated with its origin and development is an interesting and important one to explore in the context of this study. As discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.4.4), the representation of this pronunciation form in media reports as ‘inauthentic’ (Moore 2011) demands an examination of the language ideologies associated with it. As we have seen in chapter 3 (section 3.4.2), Koslow et al (1994) point out that language choice, as a way of achieving social approval, is a key accommodation strategy in mass communication and fosters the creation of relationships with the audience. Therefore, the ideological dimension of this form is paramount; the potential of its dissociative nature to express a
more global Irish identity as against the potential of its perceived ‘inauthenticity’ to alienate the receivers of the ad are important aspects for analysis. As Coupland (2007, p. 89) points out, style shifting away from vernaculars to avoid associated stigmas is ‘a highly charged and risky business, subject to social monitoring and threatening further sanctions when it “goes wrong”’.

This focus on advanced Dublin English forms the second part of the intra-varietal analysis. The findings which are presented more generally in chapter 6 as part of the broader category of non-local Irish English accent sub-varieties, are presented again here (Figure 7.1 below) and are analysed and discussed with the focus on this relatively new pronunciation form.

This analysis follows broadly the analytical format of the previous two analysis chapters and is based on both quantitative and qualitative data.

This focus on the Irish English sub-variety of advanced Dublin English expands on and develops the analysis of the previous chapter in relation to research question 2, as regards the extent to which language ideologies are manifested in choice at the intra-varietal level in radio advertising in Ireland. The analysis is carried out with reference to the factors, as used in the previous analyses, through which we can identify the manifestation of language ideologies; the research sub-questions are again based on these factors (see chapter 1, section 1.3), but the focus of the second part of the intra-varietal analysis centres on advanced Dublin English.

The chapter revisits the findings in relation to the display of longitudinal changes in the occurrence and location of accent sub-varieties of Irish English according to advert component in the later sub-corpora, this time focusing on the occurrence and location of
advanced Dublin English and the language ideological significance thereof, with reference to specific adverts from the corpus. The second research sub-question, relating to the prevalence of the strategy of juxtaposing, in ‘Action and Comment’ type ads, advanced Dublin English in the Comment against local Irish English varieties in the Action is then addressed. Again, this analysis is bolstered by the examination of representative adverts from the corpus. This is followed by an analysis of particular ‘Action and Comment’ ads which display the advanced form in varying ad components and in varying combination patterns with regard to other varieties and sub-varieties. The analysis then addresses the third research sub-question in relation to the indexical value of advanced Dublin English. Finally, accommodation strategies (in particular audience and referee design) with regard to advanced Dublin English in the corpus are explored to address the fourth research sub-question. The analysis with regard to the final two sub-questions is based on the qualitative examination of specific ads analysed in relation to the first two research sub-questions.

7.2 Longitudinal occurrence and location according to ad component of advanced Dublin English

Unsurprisingly, given that the new pronunciation form only became established in the 1990’s, advanced Dublin English is not in evidence in either the 1977 or 1987 sub-corpus (see Figure 7.1 below). However, as illustrated in Figure 7.1 and more clearly in Figure 7.2 below, this form is visible in the 1997 sub-corpus, but it is by no means a dominant feature. Of the ads displaying rhoticity in their Comment component, 25% show advanced features in this component while the equivalent figure for the Action components is lower at 15%. In the 2007 sub-corpus, the presence of advanced Dublin English increases in both components and is again more prevalent in the Comment components than it is in the Action (47% in the Comment as against 33% in the Action
components). When compared with other non-local varieties (Figure 7.1), supraregional southern and moderate Dublin English are displayed to a greater degree than advanced Dublin English in the Comment components of the 1997 sub-corpus, while in the Action components of this sub-corpus, with regard to the non-local varieties, advanced Dublin English lies second to supraregional southern. In the 2007 sub-corpus, again advanced Dublin English is surpassed by supraregional southern in the Action components, although the gap between them narrows; however, in the Comment components, advanced Dublin English shows the highest overall usage.
Figure 7.1: Percentage of ad components displaying Irish English accent sub-variety 1997/2007

Figure 7.2: Percentage of ad components displaying advanced Dublin English 1997/2007

**NOTE:** Figures represent percentage of total numbers of the particular component which displays Irish English accent variety (see chapter 4, section 4.8.1)
The increased display of features of advanced Dublin English in both components of the ad in the 2007 sub-corpus suggest that this form is being increasingly exploited, not only as a feature of ‘the discourse of power’, but also as that of ‘everyday informal interaction’ (Lee 1992). However, it occurs more often in the Comment components than it does in the Action, thereby establishing it as the authoritative voice, particularly in the 2007 sub-corpus in which it is the variety which has the highest usage in the Comment. Its dissociation from local forms and parallels with RP34 (as observed by Hickey 2005; 2013), (termed SSBE for the purposes of this study), on the face of it, suggest the operation of standard language ideology and a compromising of vernacular authenticities (Coupland 2003). Its increased use in the Action in the 2007 sub-corpus (although it is still surpassed by supraregional southern in this component) suggests however, that it is a suitable form for informal contexts and may not be affected by its media representations as ‘inauthentic’ (Moore 2011; see chapter 2, section 2.4.4). As discussed in chapter 6 (section 6.2) in relation to non-local Irish English accent sub-varieties in general, its exploitation in the Action components represents it as having vernacular authenticity in that this component of the ad is designed to mirror the discourse of ‘ordinary people’ (Coupland 2007).

As we have seen in chapter 4 (section 4.2) advertisers are now tending towards voices targeting a younger age group (18 to 25 year olds). (Oram 2010). The increase in advanced Dublin English in the later sub-corpora suggests that this form in its association with contemporary ‘youth subculture’ Hickey (2005, p.73) may meet this demand.

In order to shed more light on how this form is exploited according to its position in the

34It is important to point out that Hickey (2005; 2013) sees the parallels between advanced Dublin English and British and American English as ‘coincidental’ and as not being in any way ‘systematic’. (see section 7.6.2 below for further discussion of this topic).
Action or Comment, we will examine a ‘Comment only’ and an ‘Action only’ ad, both from the 2007 sub-corpus and both displaying advanced Dublin English.

Advert 7.1 (Ref. 28/07) below is a ‘Comment only’ ad with safety advice from the Irish Electricity Supply Board (ESB) and the Age Action Ireland charity organisation (which promotes better policies and services for older people in Ireland). The Comment is delivered by a well-known, middle-aged Irish current affairs broadcaster, radio presenter, and chat-show host, whose ability, as the mother of a large family, to combine career and motherhood is often the subject of media comment. While retroflex /r/ (a key feature of advanced Dublin English, as described in chapter 2, section 2.4.4) is not an obvious feature of her speech in this ad (see Line 004), her vowel sounds have features indicative of the vowel shift, as described above, for example, the realisation of home (Line 003) and clothes (Line 006) as diphthongs and the raised realisation of avoid (Line 007). Indeed, Amador-Moreno (2010, p.81) alludes to this well-known personality, associating her with the ‘prototypical female speaker’ of this new form of pronunciation, which she points out is often the object of mockery. However, there is no hint of mockery in this ad; the advanced Dublin features rather operate as features of a serious and authoritative voice, conveying valuable advice for an older cohort of listeners.

The use of advanced features by this speaker may appear to contradict Hickey’s (2005, p.73) claim that this newer form is associated with younger speakers and with youth norms. However, its use here may be explained by Hickey’s (2013) remark that ‘The female presenters, and also some of the male presenters, on RTE television and radio have always been speakers of advanced Dublin English’. We will return to the notion of the associations of this form with youth culture in section 7.4 below.
Advert 7.1 (Ref. 28/07) ESB and Age Action

2007: Comment only

001 FCV: with electricity so much a part of our daily lives
002 Age Action and ESB customer supply
003 has some advice on its safe use in the home [haus] (.)
004 if you’re using a portable [pɔrtəbl] electric heater
005 make sure it’s positioned safely
006 keep it away from curtains [kərəntz] and don’t use it to dry clothes [klaʊz] (.)
007 in the kitchen avoid [əvərd] overloading sockets and using extension leads (.)
008 this safety advice is brought to you by ESB customer supply
009 in association [əsəusieʃən] with Age Action

The employment of advanced Dublin English features as part of the Action voice is explored in an ‘Action only’ ad for the chainstore, Homestore and More, (Advert 7.2 Ref. 25/07, below). This ad features a male voice musing on the gifts he will buy colleagues, friends, and family for Christmas. While the accent shows some moderate Dublin English features, when naming the store’s location, the pronunciation exhibits advanced features in its velarisation of /l/ and retroflex /r/ (Lines 012 and 013). The ad contains Irish English dialectal features in the form of the use of the definite article in reference to family members (the gran, the ma, the da (Lines 002, 005 and 007)) (Filppula1999, p.56, see also Table 4.1 in chapter 4). These features have the effect of situating the character’s identity as Irish but the use of moderate Dublin English and advanced features, together with the pace of the monologue, position it as a more modern, energetic, dynamic type of Irishness. The use of the Irish English dialectal features alongside the non-local Irish English accent, in turn, serves to reduce somewhat the dissociative effect of the non-local accent. It is also notable that the advanced features which have associations with RP (Hickey 2005) (now termed SSBE), for example, the raising of the diphthong /ɔɪ/ to [oɪ] and the extreme diphthongisation of [ɔː]
to [30] are not displayed in this ad. In this way, the ad reflects a move away from the ideology which renders these SSBE-associated features as appropriate, and towards a quest for authenticity based on both vernacular and establishment criteria (Coupland 2003) within this prestige variety.

Advert 7.2 (Ref.25/07) Homestore and More
2007: Action only

001 M1: .hh
002 >a massaging chair for the gran a hair straightener for the girlfriend
003 a juicer for all the family that'll keep 'em healthy
004 candles are always handy if a neighbour drops in
005 new towels for the loo a nice Dyson for the ma
006 and a new tin for her to roast the turkey in .hh
007 a nose trimmer for the da a lean mean grilling machine for fat cousin John .hh
008 and a mirror for his sister a basket to put all the presents I'll get in
009 and some glasses to indulge the Christmas spirit in .hh
010 what about a loo brush for the boss?
011 and a cushion for his wife to lay her head on .hh
012 Homestore 'n More new stores at City East Retail [ri:teʃt] Park [pɔːk]
013 Ballysimon Road Limerick and Blanchardstown Retail [ri:teʃt] Park [pɔːk]
014 as well as Belgard Road Tallaght and Airside Swords .hh
015 Homestore 'n More making the most out o' Christmas<

The following section looks at the second research sub-question which is designed to assess the extent of the strategy of juxtaposing advanced Dublin English, as a prestige form, against local varieties of Irish English in ‘Action and Comment’ ads, in order to exploit the contrasting forms and to enhance the indexical value.
7.3 ‘Action and Comment’ ads: Juxtaposition of advanced Dublin English and local accents

As the strategy of juxtaposing advanced Dublin English in the Comment against local Irish English forms in the Action was not at all common in the corpus, the ‘Action and Comment’ ads which displayed advanced features in either their Action or Comment components were analysed to establish the sub-varieties with which advanced Dublin English combined. Table 7.1 below displays the findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1997</th>
<th>Accent combination patterns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ad Ref.</td>
<td>2/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>SrS/LocD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>AdvD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007</th>
<th>Accent combination patterns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ad Ref.</td>
<td>1/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Reg/AdvD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1: ‘Action and Comment’ ads: Juxtaposition of AdvD and other IrE accent sub-varieties

KEY: ModD (Moderate Dublin); AdvD (Advanced Dublin); SrS (Supraregional southern) LocD (Local Dublin); Reg (Regional)

The strategy of positioning advanced Dublin English in the Comment alongside local Dublin or regional accents in the Action is found in only two ads in each sub-corpus, as indicated by the shaded cells. Of these ads, in each sub-corpus, only one ad displays exclusively regional pronunciation in the Action. These are the Cablelink ad from the 1997 sub-corpus (Advert 6.3 Ref. 14/97 transcribed in chapter 6 section 6.3.1), and an ad for Volkswagen commercial vehicles (Advert 7.3 Ref. 39/07) from the 2007 sub-corpus which is presented below. The other such ad in the 1997 sub-corpus features one speaker with a supraregional accent and a second with a local Dublin accent in the Action (Ad Ref. 2/97 for BT Phones (Table 3.1 Appendix B) ) while in the 2007 sub-corpus, the other ad of this type displays one speaker with a regional accent and a second with an advanced Dublin accent in the Action component (Advert 7.8 Ref. 1/07
for Spar, transcribed in section 7.4 below. This indicates that, as in the case of the broad non-local Irish English category as a whole, the policy of juxtaposing advanced Dublin English as the prestige variety in the Comment against more local varieties in the Action is not pervasive in the corpus. While the strategy of juxtaposing advanced and local within the Action is visible in a number of the ads, as illustrated in Table 4.1, again, this is not a consistently occurring pattern.

Notwithstanding this finding, it is interesting to look at how these contrasting varieties work together. As we have seen, only two ads in the corpus display advanced Dublin English in juxtaposition with local Irish English only, the ad for Cablelink (Advert 6.3 Ref. 14/97) which was examined in chapter 6, and the below ad for Volkswagen (Advert 3.3 Ref 39/07) from the 2007 sub-corpus. Both of these ads use the juxtaposition of the advanced and local pronunciation forms to highlight the contrast between traditional and contemporary contexts. While Irish English dialectal items are used in conjunction with phonological Irish English features in the Cablelink ad, in the Volkswagen ad, the local Irish English is achieved solely through accent; for example the alveolar, gettin’ (Line 001) as opposed to the nasal velar getting, together with dental plosive realisations such as the as [de] (Line 003) and this as [dɪs] (Line 005). The accent, in that it is associated with reminiscences and nostalgia, exploits traditional vernacular authenticities and contrasts sharply with the contemporary advanced Dublin English features of the Comment, for example the retroflex /ɾ/ in years [jɪɹ] (Line 007) and the velarised /ɹ/ in commercial (Line 008). In this way, it corroborates Hickey’s view of this form as ‘indicative of the current youth subculture which is recognizably different from that of contemporary parents’ (Hickey 2005, p.73). This ad exploits the contrasting forms in order to highlight the durability of the Volkswagen brand in its ability to span two generations. In contrast to the Cablelink ad, as discussed in chapter 6, the local Action voice in this ad is not
associated with dull and staid contests but rather has more positive connotations of
tradition and nostalgia, as in the Barry’s Tea ad (Advert 6.6 Ref. 38/07) transcribed in
chapter 6 (section 6.3.2). Also, unlike Cablelink, the voice of the Action is represented
as the nostalgic reminiscences of the narrator (as is the case with the Barry’s Tea ad) and
the accent and context are therefore not hyperbolised. However, as with the Cablelink
ad, the advanced Dublin English is considered more suitable for the contemporary
context of the professional seeking to improve his or her business through the purchase
of the product (Lines 010-011) and for the serious advertising message.

Advert 7.3 (Ref.39/07) Volkswagen

2007: Action and Comment

001 M1: I’ll never forget the excitement of gettin’ [getan] our first TV(.)
002 what was I (.) ten? (.) eleven at the most [most]
003 I waited all day till finally Gerry the [de] delivery man pulled into our house
004 I nearly broke the door down gettin’ outside
005 and there it was (.) this [dis] amazing machine sittin’ there in our driveway (.)
006 Gerry’s brand new Volkswagen van
007 MCV: for over sixty years [jɪɻz]
008 the Volkswagen range of commercial [kærəfa] vehicles
009 has been a fixture on the roads of Ireland (.) strong reliable and stylish
010 any van from the range of models would represent the perfect fit
011 for the professional [prəfeʃənəl] looking to enhance their business (.)
012 M1: ah the TV is long gone but I wouldn’t be surprised
013 if Gerry’s van is still makin’ deliveries (.)
014 MCV: Volkswagen commercial vehicles (.)
015 when you think vans (.) think us

As the juxtaposition of advanced Dublin English in the Comment against local varieties
in the Action is not a regularly occurring pattern in the sub-corpora, we will look again
at the patterns displayed by ‘Action and Comment’ ads in Table 7.1 and examine
specific ads representing these patterns in terms of their ideological significance.

7.4 Advanced Dublin English in ‘Action and Comment’ ads

The following analysis looks at particular ‘Action and Comment’ ads which display advanced Dublin English in either their Action or Comment component in order to examine how this newer form operates with other varieties and sub-varieties in the corpus.

An ‘Action and Comment’ ad from the 1997 sub-corpus for the Money Transfer company, Western Union, (Advert 7.4 Ref. 31/97 below), while its Comment component does not display advanced features, nevertheless shows advanced and regional features in juxtaposition within the Action component, while moderate Dublin English is used in the Comment. In the Action scenario, a young man phones his mother from the United States with a request for cash to enable him to attend a so called ‘Bachelor Party’. The son’s realisation of party (Line 004) and star (Line 008) exhibits the retroflex /r/, characteristic of advanced Dublin English. The word party (Line 004) also contains a further variable advanced feature, that of T-flapping, as referred to above. As we have discussed, Hickey observes that this advanced form is more prevalent among younger speakers and suggests that it is ‘indicative of the current youth subculture which is recognizably different from that of contemporary parents’ (Hickey 2005, p.73). The mother-son relationship, a theme which, interestingly, is a common one in Irish literature, is represented in part through the contrast in their characters, and this is accentuated through the juxtaposition of the pronunciation features of mother and son. The mother’s pronunciation appears somewhat anachronistic against the more contemporary advanced form of the son, as in her exaggerated realisation of the word today in Line 007, as the monophthong [e] rather than the standardised realisation with
the diphthong [əi]. Contrast is also achieved through the use of lexical items such as the mother’s reference to the *Stag night* (Line 005) in response to the son’s use of the North American term *Bachelor Party* (Line 004). The mother is depicted as the more comic and ridiculous character through her over-indulgence with regard to her son and her reaction to the news of his impending marriage (Line 011) and this effect is heightened through the more local pronunciation and lexical items. This has the effect of intensifying the associations of the son’s pronunciation form with a sense of the cosmopolitan and of sophistication and ‘urban modernity’ (Hickey 2005 p.72) and resonates with Hickey’s (2005, pp. 6-7) claim that this pronunciation form stems from ‘the group of those aspiring upwards- the socially ambitious’.

Interestingly, the Comment voice, although that of a young adult male, is delivered in what most closely approximates to a moderate Dublin accent, (as in the lengthening [eː] of /e/, for example in *send*, (Line 014) and does not display recognizable advanced features. This serves to differentiate it from the Action scenario, associating the moderate Dublin with a serious and authoritative voice.

*Advert 7.4 (Ref.31/97) Western Union*

1997: Action and Comment

001  ((telephone ringing))
002  M1: yeah Ma
003  F1: hi son how are the States?
004  M1: fine ah I've got a *bachelor party* [pəˈɾi] to go to
005  F1: you mean a *sta(h)g* [stəːɡ] *night* [næt]
006  M1: yeah so I need some cash
007  F1: I’ll send it *right* over with Western Union () it’ll be with you today [tədə]
008  M1: ah ma you’re a star [stəː] ()
009  F1: so son () who’s getting married? (heh)
010  M1: I am
An ad from the 1997 sub-corpus, promoting *Glad* Aluminium cooking foil, already examined in chapter 5 (Advert 5.1 Ref. 33/97 in section 5.2) with regard to the use of North American English is presented again for analysis as Advert 7.5 below. This ad has an Action component featuring the genre of situation comedy with a typical sitcom scenario, (complete with ‘canned’ audience laughter), of a conversation in North American accents between a male and female turkey ‘couple’. The Comment voice shows advanced features, most notably in the pronunciation of the word *foil* in which the /l/ is velarised (Line 017). The realisation of the diphthong in this word as [foɪ] is especially interesting here. Hickey (2005, p.58) observes how the vowel shift in New Pronunciation (now advanced Dublin English) ‘has gained a certain momentum, and is moving beyond height values which are found in southern British English for corresponding vowels’. This, he points out, is particularly noticeable with the diphthong /ɔɪ/ which is often raised to [ɔɪ] in the advanced form. This is revealing in light of Amador-Moreno’s (2010, p. 81) comment in relation to the new pronunciation form that it is ‘closer to RP, without being RP’. We will discuss this feature below with reference to referee design. In this ad, the advanced pronunciation of the Comment voice serves to interpret and make sense of the Action scenario. In contrast to the comic Action component, it is a credible voice and one to be taken seriously.
1997: Action and Comment

001 M1: at home [hoʊm] with the turkeys for Christmas (.)
002 M2: happy christmas honey
003 ((canned laughter))
004 F1: darling [dɑːrlɪŋ] () a coat [koʊt] () you shouldn't have ()
005 and silver is my colour
006 M2: go ahead () try it on
007 F1: it's so warm [wɔːrm] () and what is that material?
008 M2: it's Alufoil [foɪl] darling () aluminium foil
009 with a special thicker embossed surface
010 that makes it stronger [strɔːŋər] to last longer
011 it’s Alufoil from Glad () a special designer foil
012 F1: it's gorgeous [ɡɔːrəs] ()
013 goodness () did you turn the heating up darling?
014 M2: no why?
015 F1: because I'm roasting [rɔʊstɪŋ] in this thing
016 ((canned laughter)).
017 FCV: alufoil [foɪl] from glad () caring [keərɪŋ] for food

As we can see from Advert 7.4 and from Figure 7.2 (section 7.2) above, however, the newer pronunciation form is not always limited to the ‘serious’ voice of the Comment. However, the Action components in which it appears generally depict middle-class contexts, (as in Advert 7.4), thereby underpinning its status.

Moving on to the 2007 sub-corpus, the presence of advanced Dublin English shows a marked increase in both components, as illustrated in Figure 7.2 above). Again, in this sub-corpus, it is more prevalent as a feature of the Comment components than it is of the Action. As in the 1997 sub-corpus, the advanced form in the Action component is generally associated with middle class situations.
Such a context is associated with an ad for the ‘Talktime’ package of *Eircom* homephone and broadband (Advert 7.6 below). This ad features a mother commenting on how she is able to keep in touch with her family cheaply even though they have ‘gone global’. Interestingly, the accent of the mother has distinct advanced features including retroflex /r/ as in *New York* [joːk] (Line 001). In addition, the extreme diphthongisation of the first syllable of the word *global* leads to its realisation as [gləʊbəl] (Line 002), which is closer to the RP form rather than the more common southern Irish English realisation as a monophthong [ɡloːbəl] (Hickey, 2005, p.75). The Comment voice also has elements of the advanced form but these are less consistent than in the voice of the Action, occurring in some realisations but not in others (as in the velarisation of /l/ in the word *rental* in Line 008). The use of advanced Dublin English in this ad contrasts with its use in the *Western Union* ad (Advert 7.4) in that it is a feature of the speech of the parent character.

*Advert 7.6 (Ref. 3/07) Eircom Talktime*

**2007: Action and Comment**

001  F1: New York [joːk] Sydney and Donegal (.)
002  my family really has gone global [glæʊbəl]
003  but with great rates from Eircom Talktime international
004  we have lots of proper chats so it feels like they’re local again (.)
005  MCV: let Eircom Talktime International bring loved ones closer this Christmas
006  with one hundred minutes to over forty countries worldwide
007  and unlimited evening and weekend national calls
008  all for a fixed monthly fee of thirty five ninety nine including line *rental* [rentəl]
009  freefone one eight hundred three six nine three six nine
010  for a great value Eircom Talktime package that’s you (.)
010  terms and conditions apply.
The use of advanced features in this ad challenges Hickey’s (2005, p.73) earlier contention that this newer form is indicative of the speech of young people and delineated from that of their parents. Indeed Hickey observes that the speech of female speakers over the age of forty rarely shows advanced features, (although he does acknowledge that it may be evident in lexical words rather than on a more general basis (Hickey 2007, p.151). He claims that this pronunciation is found predominantly to be a feature of the speech of those females under the age of twenty five who appeared to have a self-image of ‘urban modernity’ (Hickey 2005, p.72). Its employment in this ad and in the ESB and Age Action ad (Advert 7.1), discussed in section 7.2 above, suggest that this dissociative form may now be linked with contemporary identity, not just within a youth subculture but for all those who wish to be associated with a new, more modern and ‘socially ambitious’ (Hickey 2005, pp. 6-7) Irish identity.

In an ad promoting Positive Options Crisis Pregnancy Services (Advert 7.7 below), three women individually declare their intentions to continue with their long-term plans despite their unplanned pregnancies. The speakers can be broadly categorised as having the longer established supraregional southern pronunciation, although Speaker F1 (Line 001) displays a less careful style than the other two speakers (F2 and F3), using the alveolar [go:n] rather than the nasal velar used by Speakers F2 and F3 (Lines 003 and 004). Wells (1982, p.135) reports that the former tends not to be a feature of more educated accents and particularly with regard to careful speech. However, as Kirk (2011, p.33) observes, informal styles of spoken language have features which are used to the same extent by educated as well as other speakers, and the context of returning to college indicates that the speaker is educated. In general, the contexts represent the speakers as being at different stages in their lives and careers. However, none of the three are depicted as teenagers, the age-group with which we would more
conventionally and stereotypically associate the notion of ‘crisis’ pregnancy. Additionally, the contexts represent the women as broadly middle-class, this being underpinned by the use of the supraregional southern accents. It is interesting that it is the Comment voice which displays advanced features, most notably in the use of retroflex /r/ (Line 006) and /l/ velarisation (Line 008), while the voices of the Action show no signs of this pronunciation. Again, it is associated with the serious, interpretative voice, the ‘purveyor of privileged information’ (Lee 1992, pp.172-3). This underpins the status of this form, which is based on a rejection of local forms, as authoritative and expert.

**Advert 7.7 (Ref. 22/07) Positive Options**

**2007: Action and Comment**

001 F1: I'm still goin’ [go:n] to go back to college
002 and do that course like I’ve always wanted (.)
003 F2: I’m still going [goun] to open my own business like I’ve always planned (.)
004 F3: I’m still going [goun] to visit my daughter in Australia (.)
005 FCV: an unplanned pregnancy is not the end of the world (.)
006 free-text list to five oh four four four [fɔu] or visit Positive Options dot ie
007 for a list of free nonjudgmental counselling agencies
008 that will help [hefp] you to pick up the pieces (.)
009 Positive Options (. ) crisis pregnancy services

The ad for the Spar grocery chain (Advert 7.8 Ref. 1/07 below) features the characters of Santa Claus (M2) and Rudolph his reindeer (M1), having a discussion about the refreshments provided for them at various homes as they make their Christmas gift deliveries. The ad depends predominantly on accent in the depiction of these characters, although the use of the term Santy for Santa in the final line of the ad is associated with Irish English usage (Sammon, 2002, p. 182) (see table 4.1 in chapter 4). The accents of
both characters are exaggerated, and in this way they characterise stereotypical images of both ‘posh’ Dublin and ‘straightforward’ provincial Irishness. Rudolph speaks with a hyperbolised version of the regional accent associated with the southern Irish county of Cork, (mainly achieved through the accent’s vast intonational range (Hickey 2004a, p.33) as in Lines 003 and 011, but also through such pronunciations as the dental plosive realisation of the as [de] and then as [den] (Line 008) and think as [təŋk] (Line 011), while Santa’s accent is an extreme form of advanced Dublin English. Notable advanced features of this accent in the ad include, for example, T-flapping (Line 002) and GOAT-diphthongisation (Lines 005 and 006). The word sparkly [spɑːkli] (Line 007) in particular is hyperbolised, the advanced form being closer to [spɑ:ktli] as in the realisation of Spar in the Comment (Line 010). Hickey (2004a, p.49) observes that the combination of retroflex /ɾ/ and vowel raising was a feature which was attracting comment around the time of his publication (2004), and the extreme form plays on and exploits this feature. This form is associated with the forerunner of advanced Dublin English, the Dublin 4 (D4) accent, later coined Dortspeak [dɔrtspi:k], which came to be the object of satire, as discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.4.4), but of which a number of features have survived in the newer form. This exaggerated form is accentuated by its positioning alongside the voice of the Comment, which although displaying some advanced features (as in retroflex /ɾ/ in Line 010), is far more muted than it is in the Action. This hyperbolised representation of advanced Dublin English is unique in this corpus but anecdotal evidence suggests that it has been a feature of Irish advertising in recent years.

While the Cork accented Rudolph is not depicted as such in a derogatory way and intelligently questions whether the carrot they have received is genetically modified, he is seen as the comic, albeit lovable, character, while Santa is the more serious figure and the one who imparts the important information, although in an embellished and
somewhat derisive form of advanced Dublin English. This strategy is similar to that
found in relation to the Mondello Park ad (Advert 6.7 Ref. 15/07), discussed in chapter 6
(section 6.3.2) and also in relation to non-rhotic pronunciation in the earlier sub-corpora
(for example Advert 5.6 for Hedex in chapter 5, section 5.4.1), in that the more
‘prestige’ form is used by a character in the Action to support and complement the
message of the Comment component.

The hyperbolised representations are particularly interesting in light of the
representation in media reports of advanced Dublin English as ‘inauthentic’ (Moore
2011, as discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.4.4). The extreme representations of both Cork
accent and advanced Dublin English in the Action are set apart from the voice of the
Comment which, interestingly, also employs advanced Dublin features to convey the
serious voice of authority. The ideological implications of this strategy are complex and
are better understood through an analysis of their indexical value and also how they
operate as referee design. The ad will be discussed in relation to these concepts in
sections 7.5 and 7.6 below.

Advert 7.8 (Ref.1/07) Spar

2007: Action and Comment

001 M1: ((panting)) () right () what’ve we got to eat?
002 M2: got [gor] a carrot at the last house Rudolph () looks nice
003 M1: nice? nice? how do I know it isn’t a genetically ↑ modified carrot?
004 we’ve no idea where it’s been () is it Fairtrade?
005 M2: ammm ok [auket] () well Spar now has reindeer food for just two euro [jųareu]
006 and all proceeds [prausidz] go [geu] to the Irish Hospice Foundation
007 and it’s all a bit sparkly [spaıkli] and magical too
008 M1: oh right () well let’s hope the [de] next family has some then [den] ()
009 MCV: always there [ðeȝ] for you with reindeer food at Christmas
010 under the tree at Spar [spɑːɹ] ()
In our analysis of the first research sub-question in this chapter in section 7.2, we have mentioned how advanced Dublin English is seen as having parallels with RP in some respects (Hickey 2005) (termed SSBE in this study) and how this can suggest the operation of standard language ideology with regard to the use of this form. Additionally, it was suggested that its increased use in the Action in the 2007 sub-corpus might be indicative of its acceptance for use in informal interaction, a development which appears to contradict its media representations as ‘put-on’ or not ‘authentic’ (Moore 2011, p.49). Overall, the representations of this form in the ads, with one notable exception, that of the Spar ad (Advert 7.8 above) cannot in any way be said to actively denigrate or mock this form in the sense represented by the media as discussed by Moore (ibid). In general it is represented as ‘naturally occurring’ and representing ‘ordinary people’ and achieves authenticity in this way. It is depicted positively, often associated with a serious or sophisticated and cosmopolitan voice, which, in some cases is heightened through its juxtaposition alongside speakers of local forms (for example, Cablelink (Advert 6.3 Ref. 14/97 in Chapter 6) and Western Union (Advert 7.4 Ref. 31/97 above) which are presented as being less sophisticated or even comic.

In order to explore the ideological dimension of advanced Dublin English more comprehensively, the next section will look at a number of the ads, transcribed above, in terms of the indexical values associated with the advanced form.

7.5 The indexical value of advanced Dublin English

The analysis in relation to the third research sub-question relates to the indexical value of advanced Dublin English. It is interesting to remind ourselves of Moore’s
observation, cited in chapter 2 (section 2.4.4) of how this ‘avoidance-driven “accent” has itself become stigmatized - imbued with strong indexicality’ and has itself become ‘worthy of avoidance’ (Moore 2011, p. 42). However, the indexicality of this form in the ad corpus does not appear to carry this stigma.

The association of advanced Dublin English with ‘urban modernity’ (Hickey 2005 p.72) and a sense of the cosmopolitan is heightened in the Western Union ad (Advert 7.4 Ref.31/97 above) through its use in conjunction with the North American term ‘bachelor party’ and its position alongside the more anachronistic pronunciation of the mother character. The theme of the Irish mother-son relationship, commonly exploited in Irish literature and drama, involving the over-indulgent mother and her son is exploited here. The values associated with the Celtic Tiger economy (see chapter 4 section 4.3.1) are encapsulated well by Robert Flavin, Consumer Insights and Planning Manager of the alcoholic drinks company Diageo; he speaks of the ‘indulgence’ stage of consumer mindset and decision making ‘where at the height of the Celtic Tiger pleasure, me-time, instant gratification were core values’ (Archive.ie 2013). The association of the son with these values is strong here and the contrast of the son’s advanced Dublin English features with the accent of the mother heightens the way in which this accent dissociates itself from the regional accent and also reflects the way in which these Celtic Tiger values dissociate themselves from more traditional ones. As referred to in Chapter 4 (section 4.3.1), in the words of the Irish historian, Diarmaid Ferriter (2004, p.662), ‘A new middle-class generation, on the cusp of adulthood in the late 1990s, had never known anything but economic prosperity’. The way in which this accent is employed in this ad underpins its position as part of the ‘Celtic tiger’ culture. In this way, advanced Dublin English could be said to index a culture of ‘instant gratification’, tied in with sophistication and cosmopolitanism.
Advanced Dublin English, as it is used in the corpus, particularly in its role as the Comment voice, also connotes the serious and authoritative interpretative voice. This is visible in the Glad Aluminium Foil ad (Advert 7.5 Ref. 32/97) but also in the ad for Positive Options Crisis Pregnancy Services (Advert 7.7 Ref. 22/07). Its function here (as with Advert 7.1 Ref. 28/07 from the ESB and Age Action) is less transparent than in some of the other ads, in which the need to convey a contemporary image is more obvious. Its use in the Positive Options ad, however, would seem to associate it, not only with a serious and authoritative voice, but also with the characteristics of the advisor in the Comment component as modern in the sense of being open-minded, forward-thinking and non-judgmental in relation to this subject, traditionally a taboo issue in the Irish context. This underpins it dissociation with the more traditional values associated with older or local forms.

In the case of ESB and Age Action (Advert 7.1 Ref.28/07, above) and Eircom Talktime (Advert 7.6 Ref.3/07, above), the use of advanced Dublin English functions to give the parent characters a very contemporary and cosmopolitan quality, quite removed from that of the traditional Irish parent as featured in Advert 6.3 Ref.14/97 for Cablelink in chapter 6 and Advert 7.4 Ref. 31/97 (above) for Western Union. It situates these speakers as part of a sophisticated, modern global culture and is suggestive of a movement away from traditional Irish parental identity as represented in the Cablelink and Western Union ads by the more local features.

The qualities of energy and dynamism discussed in chapter 6 (section 6.3.1) in relation to the Cablelink ad is visible also in Advert 7.2 Ref. 25/07, above for Homestore and More. In this case, however, the advanced Dublin English is combined with the use of Irish English associated grammatical features, as described (i.e. the use of the definite
article in reference to family members (Filppula 1999)), which as discussed, offsets to some extent, the dissociative connotations. This serves to imbue the Irish English features with a more contemporary quality also, and in turn lends vernacular authenticity to the more prestigious advanced features, bringing together both vernacular and establishment authenticities.

In Advert 7.8 Ref.1/07 for Spar, both the Cork accent and advanced Dublin English accents are strongly indexical; Santa’s advanced Dublin accent has connotations of seriousness, sophistication and expertise while Rudolph’s Cork accent indexes candour and straightforwardness, together with a quick-wittedness and independent-mindedness. The juxtaposition of these accents intensifies their indexical values; the advanced Dublin English having connotations of pretentiousness and ‘poshnesss’ when set against Rudolph’s more ‘authentic’ Cork accent. It is interesting that the hyperbolised ‘posh’ representation of this accent appears in the most recent sub-corpus indicating, perhaps, the onset of a self-reflexivity in relation to this form. This will be discussed more fully in relation to stylisation in section 7.6.1, below.

The highlighting of different indexical values for this accent sub-variety illustrates Woolard’s (2006, p.88) observation (as discussed in chapter 3, section 3.3) of how the indexical value of a linguistic form can be ‘transferred ideologically’ between different contexts and speakers and can be transformed in this transfer process.

The following section addresses the fourth and final research sub-question, which relates to strategies of accommodation in relation to advanced Dublin English.
7.6 Accommodation and audience and referee design strategies: Advanced Dublin English

A range of accommodation strategies are evident in the ads described above from the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora and can provide important information as to the operation of language ideologies through variety choice in the corpus. These are explored below with reference to particular ads in the preceding analyses.

7.6.1 Ingroup referee design through ‘strategic inauthenticity’

Advert 7.8 Ref.1/07 for Spar, discussed in section 7.4 above, is particularly interesting for the examination of Coupland’s (2001a) notion of ‘strategic inauthenticity’ through stylisation which can be seen in terms of referee design. We have referred to Moore’s (2011, p.49) observation of media discussions in relation to the D4 or advanced Dublin English accent which represent the accent as an ‘imitation’, not ‘real’ or ‘authentic’ and ‘put on’ (see chapter 2, section 2.4.4). Amador-Moreno (2010, p.81) also refers to the mockery of this accent due to its image as ‘pretentious and socially condescending’. The representation of this accent in the Spar ad is remarkable in that it is an exaggerated and therefore artificial representation of the accent, which even in its ‘natural’ form is seen as artificial and contrived. This representation could thus conceivably be seen as a parody of the accent.

However, like the dialects employed in the Perrier ads (as discussed in chapter 5, section 5.6.3), I would argue that this accent, together with that of the Cork accent, can be seen as stylisation rather than parody when examined in terms of Coupland’s defining criteria (Coupland 2001; 2007). As we have seen (chapter 2, section 2.4.3), Coupland (2001, p.372) argues that the stylisation of dialect is best interpreted as a way of ‘deploying normative community speech forms at one remove, without overtly
subscribing to the norms of tradition and cultural continuity, but also without discrediting their cultural value’. While the advanced Dublin English, in contrast to the Cork accent, may not be seen in terms of ‘tradition’ or traditional conceptions of ‘cultural value’, nevertheless, Coupland’s criteria are relevant to the representation of these accents in the ad. This representation projects personae external to the speech event; it is metaphorical; it is reflexive and knowing; it needs an audience from within the speech community to interpret it; it prompts processes of social comparison and reassessment in and with receivers of the ad; it introduces another level of social context into the situation and thus allows re-evaluation of existing norms; it is creative and performed and involves a hyperbolic realisation of the targeted styles.

Both accents are culturally familiar to Irish English speakers and their hyperbolised depiction side by side in the ad could be said to be representative of the ‘moral panic’ in relation to this accent as discussed by Moore (2011, p.57). In the Irish sociolinguistic environment, the Cork accent is perceived as having vernacular authenticity in the traditional sense; like the local Dublin accent, it is associated with those who identify with traditional conservative values. The advanced Dublin English is, however, seen as ‘inauthentic’ in these terms. As Moore (2011, pp.42,49) observes, as an ideological construct in the Irish sociolinguistic context, advanced Dublin English (or D4) is ‘denaturalized’; it is ‘not authentically linked to any particular place’, an invention of the Celtic Tiger economy without ‘connections to a shared past’.

This ideological situation is effectively replicated in the ad, by highlighting the contrast in these varieties and the authenticities (or inauthenticities) associated with them. Hickey (2005, p.106) refers to the ‘phonetic gulf’ between what he then referred to as ‘new’ Dublin English and conservative Cork English. Through the stylised representation,
however, the overall monologic ‘voice’ of the ad distances itself somewhat from full ownership of both these voices. The patent artificiality of both accents contributes to the ‘knowingness’ and positions the ad as ‘laughing with’ rather than ‘laughing at’ the speakers of both local and non-local varieties of Irish English, and indeed at what has become a mild hysteria around the putative contradictory values of these accents. In effect, this ‘inauthenticity’ and the ‘moral panic’ surrounding it is ‘reflected back’ in Coupland’s (ibid) words, to the Irish speech community and becomes a part of Irish identity. Irish people know that this accent is new, that it moves away from the romanticised links with the Irish language and Irish English vernacular; however, in a sense it is as Celtic as the Celtic Tiger and can no more be denied than can this period in the economic and social history of Ireland in moulding a new type of Irish identity. Through the exaggerated representations, the receivers of the ad are allowed to laugh ‘with’ both the ‘authentic’ Cork speaker and the ‘inauthentic’ D4 speaker and in a sense to face up to this ‘moral panic’ and to reconcile it as part of a new Irish identity through its ‘cultural reassessment’ (ibid). The ad effectively acknowledges that the advanced Dublin English accent is seen as contrived, but in addition, that the strongly vernacular Cork accent is also contrived and that neither variety and both encapsulate Irish identity. The ‘inauthenticity’ of the advanced Dublin English accent, is placed at a remove from the monologic voice of the ad through the playful nature of the stylisation. This serves to ‘deauthenticate’ the inauthenticity of this form and in turn to validate or reauthenticate it in a similar way to the dialect stylisation of the Perrier ads. The vernacular authenticity of the Cork accent is also deauthenticated through its exaggerated representation but is also reauthenticated through the ‘knowingness’ of the stylisation. In this way vernacular authenticities and inauthenticities are exploited to create solidarity with the receiver of the ad. Again, as in the Perrier ads, it could be said that the democratic strategy of
employing distinguishing features from the two, often seen as rival, counties (Cork people often jokingly referring to their city as the ‘real capital’) functions to support the effect of self-reflexivity and that of ‘laughing with’ Irish English speakers as a speech community rather than ‘laughing at’ the speakers of particular varieties.

However, while it is represented in a stylised way, the advanced Dublin form is nevertheless associated with the more serious, sophisticated authoritative voice of the ad. It is the voice of Santa, as opposed to his helper, Rudolph. This corroborates its use in the other ads as a prestigious form. Therefore, despite the self-reflexivity in the stylising of this voice, the prestige status of this form, which dissociates itself from vernacular forms, is still maintained.

Advert 7.4 Ref. 31/97, above, for Western Union employs a similar strategy, not only through the local features of the speech of the mother character, but also through the stylised nature of the Action scenario as a whole. The scenario depicted in this ad can be said to be stylised according to Coupland’s (2007, p.154) schematic summary as outlined in chapter 2 (section 2.4.3). The scenario and characters are derived from a well known identity repertoire (ibid), that of the Irish mother/son relationship, often exploited in Irish literature. As in other ads employing this stylisation strategy (for example, the ads for Perrier (Advert 5.11 Ref.17/87 and Advert 5.12 Ref. 6/87) in chapter 5, Cablelink (Advert 6.3 Ref. 14/97 in Chapter 6) and Spar (Advert 7.8 Ref. 1/07, above), the pejorative associations of the local features of the speech of the mother are offset by the ‘transparent knowingness’ (Coupland 2001, p.371) of the representations, and in this way the ad exploits ‘strategic inauthenticity’. As Coupland (ibid) puts it, it enables presenters of stylised discourse to ‘repackage’ more traditional speech forms and allows for a ‘cultural reassessment’ and the reflection of these forms back to their associated
speech community. While the advanced Dublin features of the son are not overplayed as in the Spar ad, nevertheless these features are highlighted through their contrast with the local features of the speech of the mother character and, together with the context, help to establish the ‘well-known identity repertoire’ (Coupland 2007, p. 154) of the ‘Celtic Tiger’ generation.

As we have seen, stylisation can be seen in terms of the initiative dimension of language use and therefore in terms of referee design (Bell 2001). Although, at one level, the use of the advanced Dublin English accent, particularly in its hyperbolised form as ‘posh’, can be seen as outgroup referee design, on the other hand, the self-reflexivity, enabled through the playful stylisation of the ad, situates the advanced form as well as the regional accent as encapsulating the ‘multiple identities’ (Koslow et al 1994) of the Irish as discussed in chapter 5 (section 5.6.3) and therefore, in this context, represents a newer conception of ingroup referee design in the Irish context.

Rickford (2001 p.230) in a response to Coupland’s (2001b) paper on dialect style as a marker of identity, puts forward a caveat in relation to generalizing between broadcasting and ‘everyday’ styles. As Rickford points out, the opportunities for stylisation such as in Coupland’s example of the Cardiff disc-jockey, increases with audience size. In such situations, speakers are trying ‘more consciously’ to project different characters and personas. In the context of broadcast ads, it is precisely this ‘opportunity’ for stylising forms which may be viewed pejoratively, which makes it so powerful in the reauthentication of these forms and therefore in its ability to exploit their prestige value while avoiding their denigration.
7.6.2 Outgroup referee design

In chapter 6 (section 6.4), advanced Dublin English in the corpus has been interpreted as outgroup referee design. Advert 7.5 Ref. 32/97 (see section 7.4 above) above, for *Glad Aluminium Foil* is interesting in terms of its illustration of outgroup referee design in relation to the advanced form. We have referred to the example in this ad (Line 017) in which the diphthong /ɔɪ/ is raised to [oɪ]; this is remarkable in light of Hickey’s (2005, p.58) observation of how the vowel shift of advanced Dublin English ‘is moving beyond height values which are found in southern British English for corresponding vowels’. As referred to above, Amador-Moreno (2010, p. 81) claims that the new pronunciation form is ‘closer to RP, without being RP’. The raising of the diphthong in the advanced form could thus be seen in terms of a hyperconvergence or an overshooting of the mark with respect to this vowel. However, as we have observed, the advanced form does not converge with respect to other salient markers of SSBE (or RP) pronunciation, for example, it has a retroflex /r/ which is a feature of American English, rather than an SSBE non-rhotic /r/. Indeed, as we have seen, Hickey (2005; 2013) sees the similarities between advanced Dublin English and British and American English as coincidental parallels and as not being in any way ‘systematic’. However, in so far as in referee design, according to Bell (1991a p.143), the strategy is to repeat a small number, or even just one important variant, the accent sub-variety of advanced Dublin English could be said to be based on the outgroups of both British and North American English. It differs from Nrh-IrE pronunciation (see chapter 4, section 4.6), however, in that it has a more broad-based function and is a mainstream form.

Outgroup referee design is also evident in the ads for *ESB and Age Action* (Advert 7.1 Ref. 28/07 above) and *Eircom Talktime* (Advert 7.6 Ref. 3/07 above). As discussed, advanced Dublin English is associated with ‘the current youth subculture which is
recognizably different from that of contemporary parents’ (Hickey 2005, p.73). However, in this ad, it is associated with parent characters. In this way, it is being used to identify with a contemporary, modern and youthful image which dissociates itself from traditional ‘local’ values.

As we have seen in chapter 3 (section 3.4.5), regular patterns of language use are more likely to be interpreted as audience design while movements away from these patterns may be interpreted as referee design (Bell 2001). As the supraregional southern variety is the most common variety used in the 1997 sub-corpus, we can take it as generally indicative of the employment of an audience designed style in this sub-corpus. As discussed in chapter 3 (section 3.4.6), given that the supraregional southern variety is the more traditional conservative mainstream variety, it is a style associated with the radio station on which these ads are aired. This effectively corroborates this variety as audience design in this sub-corpus. On the other hand, advanced Dublin English may be seen in terms of referee design in this sub-corpus. Given that this variety was not mainstream at this time, the use of this form could be said to involve a shift in style for the speaker which moves away from the ingroup style. However, its establishment as mainstream may necessitate a change in this paradigm as discussed below.

7.6.3 Audience design

The role of the media in general in the spread of advanced Dublin English pronunciation has been acknowledged. Indeed, Hickey contends that
individuals who did not have direct contact with Dubliners is difficult to explain otherwise.

(Hickey 2013)

Although Hickey’s contention relates to radio and television presenters, it is not unreasonable to assume that the linguistic profile of these presenters would have parallels with the presenters of ads on radio in Ireland. Indeed, these ads are, in some cases, delivered by such presenters (as in the Comment component of the ad for the *Irish Cancer Initiative* (Advert 2.5 Ref.7/07 in chapter 6), which is delivered by a health correspondent for RTE). However, the findings of this study indicate that it is the supraregional southern accent rather than advanced Dublin English, which dominates overall in the two later sub-corpora. However, the increase in the use of advanced Dublin English in both Action and Comment components in the 2007 sub-corpus and its overall dominance in the Comment components of this sub-corpus suggest that what was initially a style based on referee design is now becoming an audience designed style. It is becoming the regular rather than the exceptional pattern. This corroborates Bell’s (1991a) claim, as discussed in chapter 3, section 3.4.4, that referee design may impact the speaker’s repertoire. Furthermore, the association of this form with more mature speakers as in for example, *ESB and Age Action* (Advert 7.1 Ref. 28/07, above) and *Eircom Talktime* (Advert 7.6 Ref. 3/07, above), suggests that it is developing a wider age-range and is moving away from its delineation of younger and older speakers and its association with ‘youth norms’ (Hickey 2005, p.73) only.

This resonates with Piller’s (2001, p.155) observation, as discussed in chapter 3 (section 3.4.5), of the role of advertising discourse and mass communication in the construction of contemporary cultural identities. Piller (2001, p.4) cites research which claims that the existing social order is represented in genres such as advertising, but is also in turn
influenced by and recreated by such discourses. In a similar vein, Johnson and Ensslin (2007, p. 7) suggest that the media ‘mirror’ and by implication ‘promote’ ideological frameworks. Advertising in Ireland could be said, therefore, to have had an ‘initiative’ role in the construction of the identity of the receivers of the ad as modern, sophisticated and cosmopolitan through the employment of this accent. Having helped to construct such identities, it then responds to them using this same accent, but this time as an audience designed rather than a referee designed style. However, the fact that in many of the ads, relatively few variants associated with the new form are present indicates that this process is still in the transitional phase.

7.7 Summary and conclusions

This chapter has extended the intra-varietal analysis of chapter 6 in relation to research question 2 by focusing on the now mainstream non-local sub-variety of advanced Dublin English. With regard to longitudinal variation and function of this accent sub-variety (see research sub-question 2.2.1), advanced Dublin English is visible only in the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora. It favours the Comment components of both sub-corpora over the Action but increases in both components in the 2007 sub-corpus and is the predominant sub-variety in the Comment component of this sub-corpus. Its parallels with SSBE and dissociation from local forms could be said to stem from the pervasiveness of standard language ideology. However, its presence in both components is indicative of a reconciliation in this pronunciation form, of establishment (to the extent that it has parallels with SSBE and actively dissociates itself with local forms) and vernacular authenticities (in that it is used in representing ‘ordinary’ speech and is sometimes used in conjunction with more local Irish English features).

While the juxtaposition of local accent sub-categories in the Action component against
advanced Dublin English in the Comment (relating to research sub-question 2.2.2) is not pervasive in the sub-corpora, where this strategy is employed, it serves to highlight the contrast between traditional and contemporary contexts. This contrast is heightened through the traditional vernacular authenticity of the local forms. This pattern, however, is not common and advanced Dublin English frequently appears in both ad components as well as combining with other varieties (such as North American English) and non-local Irish English accent sub-varieties. In some cases, it is contrasted with such varieties to represent the more serious voice. Where it appears in the Action components, it is generally associated with middle-class contexts and this association serves to underpin its prestige value.

In terms of the indexical values of this form (research sub-question 2.2.3), advanced Dublin English indexes not only ‘urban modernity’ (Hickey 2005) but also evokes self-indulgence and ‘instant gratification’ values (Archive.ie 2013). It is associated, particularly where it is employed in the Comment, with a serious, authoritative or expert voice. It has associations with the contemporary and cosmopolitan as well as an energy and dynamism not associated with other non-local forms. In ads where it is juxtaposed against local sub-varieties, the indexical value is heightened. In its hyperbolised form, it can index pretentiousness and ‘poshnesss’. In this way, it highlights Woolard’s (2006) observation of how the indexical value of a form may be transferred between different contexts and speakers and change in the transfer process.

The use of this form by older speakers and ‘parent’ characters suggest that it is not limited to young people’s speech but is associated with a contemporary and ‘socially ambitious’ (Hickey 2005, pp. 6-7) Irish identity. In general, it is not represented as being ‘inauthentic’ in the sense in which it is represented by media commentary on this accent.
(Moore 2011, p.49) and is generally not the object of mockery or derision. Its employment in the Action components of the ad as part of the repertoire of the characters in these scenarios can be said to give it authenticity in the sense that it represents the language of everyday interactions.

With regard to accommodation strategies and audience and referee design (research sub-question 2.2.4), advanced Dublin English is exploited in a number of ways. In one ad, an extreme form of this accent is used alongside a similarly hyperbolised local Irish English (Cork) accent. While this Cork accent could be said to have vernacular authenticity in the traditional sense, nevertheless this vernacular authenticity is compromised through the hyperbolic representation of the ad. However, the playful stylisation of both these forms affords them a ‘strategic inauthenticity’ and effectively reauthenticates them through the ‘knowingness’ of the stylisation. In this way traditional authenticities and inauthenticities are exploited to create solidarity with the receiver of the ad. The stylisation of the advanced Dublin English in this ad, through its acknowledgement of this facet of a less traditional Irish identity as part of a more multi-faceted identity (cf Koslow et al 1994), can be seen in terms of ingroup referee design. Notwithstanding the stylised representations, however, the advanced Dublin form is still associated with the more serious and expert voice, thereby underpinning its status.

Although in cases where it is exploited in a stylised hyperbolic way, as in the Spar example, advanced Dublin English can be seen as ingroup referee design in a similar way to strongly vernacular Irish English forms, the parallels of advanced Dublin English with SSBE and North American English and its dissociative nature (Hickey 2005; 2013) mean that it can also be seen in terms of outgroup referee design. The increase in the use of advanced Dublin English in both Action and Comment components in the 2007 sub-
corpus, however, suggests that it is now becoming an audience designed style. In this way, advertising in Ireland has an ‘initiative’ role in the construction of the identity of the receivers of the ad through the employment of advanced Dublin English as outgroup referee design but it also has a ‘responsive’ dimension in that having constructed such identities, it then responds to them using advanced Dublin English as audience design.

This chapter concludes our analysis of the findings of the study. The final chapter concludes the study, bringing together the findings in relation to the specific research questions and sub-questions, and consolidating these findings by relating them explicitly to the relevant language ideologies.
Chapter 8: Conclusion

8.1 Summary and the research questions revisited

As outlined in the introductory chapter, the aim of this research is to examine language ideological change in the Irish context through an analysis of variety choice at both inter-varietal and intra-varietal levels in a corpus of radio ads broadcast in Ireland in the thirty year period from 1977 to 2007.

Chapter 1 provided the context and background information for the research, defined the objectives and research questions and sub-questions, pointed out limitations of the study and, finally, outlined the broad structure of the thesis. In chapter 2, Irish English was examined in a sociolinguistic and language ideological context, both in relation to Standard British English (inter-varietal variation) and with regard to the accent sub-varieties of Irish English (intra-varietal variation) with reference to the related literature. Chapter 3 examined factors which were identified in the introductory chapter as indicative of the operation of language ideologies and situated these factors within the context of the relevant literature and theoretical frameworks. The methodology for the study was described in chapter 4, including a description of the corpus of advertisements on which the study is based and the basis and processes for the analysis. Chapter 5, the first of three chapters which deal with the analysis of the findings of the study, focused on the findings at the inter-varietal level, looking firstly at inter-varietal features in broad terms, in relation to the range of varieties found in the corpus, and then narrowing to focus on the two main varieties of Standard British English and Irish English. Chapter 6 centred on the findings at the intra-varietal level, in relation to accent sub-varieties of Irish English. The final analysis chapter, chapter 7, developed the intra-
varietal analysis by focusing on the relatively new mainstream accent sub-variety of Irish English, that of advanced Dublin English.

This final chapter revisits the research questions which direct the study and brings together the findings relating to these questions. It goes on to consolidate these findings by relating them explicitly to the language ideologies described in chapter 2. The chapter concludes with a number of suggestions for future research in the area of variety choice in Irish broadcast advertising.

8.1.1 Research question 1: Inter-varietal choice

The first research question and its component sub-questions are as follows:

To what extent are language ideologies and changes in such ideologies manifested through variety choice at the inter-varietal level in radio advertising in Ireland?

Research sub-questions:

1.1 Are there longitudinal changes in (a) the occurrence of varieties in their broad sense and (b) in the functions of such varieties within the ads, as indicated by their location according to the advert components of ‘Action’ and ‘Comment’ (Sussex 1989)?

1.2 Are there longitudinal changes in (a) the occurrence of Standard Southern British English (SSBE) and Irish English (accent and dialectal variety) and (b) in the functions of Standard Southern British English (SSBE) and Irish English (accent and dialectal variety) within the ads as indicated by location of these varieties according to advert component?

1.3 To what extent is the strategy exploited in the corpus of juxtaposing, in
‘Action and Comment’ type ads, Irish English accent in the Action component against that of SSBE in the Comment, thus appealing to the ‘contrasting values’ associated with status and solidarity (Lee 1992, pp. 179-180)?

1.4 What are the indexical values associated with SSBE and Irish English (accent and dialectal variety) in the ad corpus?

1.5 What accommodation strategies, particularly audience and referee design strategies, relating to SSBE and Irish English (accent and dialectal variety) are visible in the corpus?

These questions are addressed primarily in Chapter 5.

With regard to research sub-question 1.1, features of varieties outside of SSBE and Irish English are not common in the corpus, nor is there evidence of a consistent pattern of change with regard to such features over time in the sub-corpora. This suggests that in the Irish radio advertising context, the increase in diversity with regard to accents and dialects and varieties in recent years (Kelly-Holmes 2005, p.108) relating to the conversationalization of discourse (Fairclough 1994) is not manifested through increased use of features relating to varieties outside of SSBE and Irish English, despite Ireland’s increasing cosmopolitanism (as discussed in chapter 5, section 5.2). Furthermore, such multilingual features, where they occur, are confined mainly to the Action components. This includes North American English features and indicates that notwithstanding the notion that Ireland has become ‘more American’ (McWilliams 2007, p. 97) as discussed in chapter 4 (section 4.3.1), North American English does not play a major role in representing the voice of ‘ordinary people’ or in representing an authoritative voice in the corpus. This ‘Americanisation’ appears to be manifested rather
in the increased use of advanced Dublin English, which has parallels with North American English (Hickey 2013) in the later sub-corpora. Additionally, the low occurrence of Irish language items in the corpus overall, supports the contention put forward in chapter 2 that the nationalist language ideology model in Ireland situates Irish English rather than Irish in the role of a national ‘language’ (White 2006). Furthermore, the democratization and conversationalization of discourse (Fairclough 1992; 1994) is manifested in the form of increased acceptability of Irish English features rather than features associated with other varieties.

The second research sub-question focuses on longitudinal change in relation to SSBE and Irish English. As we have seen, SSBE dominates in the two earlier sub-corpora while the two later sub-corpora show a dramatic increase in the use of rhotic Irish English sub-varieties at the expense of the non-rhotic SSBE. Irish English is displayed largely through accent variety as opposed to dialectal variety in the corpus. The occurrence of dialectal Irish English variety shows an increase in the three most recent sub-corpora, although not in as dramatic a fashion as the Irish English phonological feature, and is displayed predominantly in the Action components. The dominance of SSBE in the Comment components of the two earlier sub-corpora clearly reflects the operation of standard language ideology and variety choice based on traditional establishment authenticities, which place SSBE as ‘correct’ (Milroy 2001) and a suitable form for conveying the authoritative message of the ad and Irish English as unsuitable and ‘deviant’ (Croghan 1986). This is reinforced through the apparently conscious emulation of the standard pronunciation form. In addition, the fact that the non-rhotic form dominates the Action components of the 1977 subcorpus as well as those of the Comment, appears to exploit establishment as opposed to vernacular authenticities in the traditional sense in representing ‘everyday informal interaction’
Where rhotic accents are displayed in these earlier sub-corpora, their use in the Comment components are in the form of non-local or quasi-standard varieties of Irish English, indicating again the pervasiveness of an ideology of standardisation. With regard to the use of rhotic Irish English accents in the Action components, the 1977 and 1987 sub-corpora show a slightly higher percentage of local as against non-local Irish English accents, with little change between the decades. This suggests that while traditional vernacular authenticities, as related to local sub-varieties, were exploited to some extent in representing informal interaction in the Irish context, the sub-corpora did not show a total dependence, even in the earlier decades, on such authenticities in representing the ‘ordinary’ speaker.

Research sub-question 1.3 looks at the extent of the strategy in ‘Action and Comment’ type ads of juxtaposing SSBE in the Comment against Irish English in the Action, based on the appeal of such a strategy to the conflicting values associated with status and solidarity (Lee 1992). This strategy is most prevalent in the 1987 subcorpus, whereas in the 1977 subcorpus, non-rhotic accents in both components of the ad is the more common pattern. In the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora, however, the pattern is mainly that of rhotic pronunciation in both components. Where non-rhotic accents are employed in the Action components, they are sometimes used to consolidate the ‘expert’ voice of the Comment. The juxtaposition of SSBE in the Comment against Irish English in the Action can, at one level, be seen as indicative of the operation of nationalist ideologies of language in that it highlights the notion of a distinct Irish identity. However, its location in the Action as opposed to the Comment components, and its association in some instances with comic characters and contexts can, at another level, indicate the
dominance of a standard ideology which trivialises the non-standard form, as in the language subordination process (Lippi-Green 1997, p.68).

Research subquestion 1.4 relates to the indexical values of SSBE and Irish English in the corpus. The predominance of SSBE in the Comment component of the earlier sub-corpora index it with authority, expertise and seriousness, as well as a ‘clarity’ and ‘transparency’ associated with speakers of this form (Coupland 2003, p.424). In the Action components it is associated with sophistication and upward social mobility values. This is in line with Woolard’s (1998, p.19) notion of a speaker of RP (or SSBE) being categorised as socially privileged as well as superior in terms of intellectual and personal worth. However, the decline of SSBE in both components in the later sub-corpora is indicative of changing orders of indexicality as referred to by Coupland (2009) in which the SSBE form may be seen as ‘posh’ and ‘inauthentic’.

The juxtaposition of SSBE in the Comment and Irish English in the Action components of ‘Action and Comment’ ads accentuates the indexical value of both forms. With regard to Irish English sub-varieties, while the supraregional southern Irish English sub-variety has associations of privilege and education, the dearth of occurrences of this form in the Comment components of these sub-corpora reduces its authority value. Local Dublin English has values associated with traditional Dublin culture and based on traditional vernacular authenticities. However, strongly vernacular representations of regional and local Dublin sub-varieties of Irish English in some instances connote vulgarity and lack of sophistication. These negative connotations are, however, generally offset through the concept of ‘strategic inauthenticity’ achieved through stylisation.

With regard to the final sub-question relating to the first main research question,
research sub-question 1.5, the dependence in the earlier sub-corpora on outgroup referee design and the construction of the referee as a speaker of SSBE indicates again, the prevalence of standard ideologies; the authenticity of the authoritative speakers is based on traditional establishment authenticities. The fact that this strategy is exploited and that the addressee is not alienated suggests that there exists a consensus between advertiser and advertisee on the appropriateness of the standard variety for the particular context (Bell 1991a). The existence of such consensus evokes the notions of ‘common sense’ attitudes in relation to correct and incorrect forms and the concept of the ‘legitimacy’ of a language (Milroy 2001). The speech community (Spolsky 1998) shares norms for the use of particular varieties. Bourdieu’s (1991) concept of ‘the institutional circle of collective misrecognition’, as discussed in Chapter 2, is visible here and suggests that speakers of Irish English accept and support discrimination in relation to this variety, adopting ‘the political culture of language from England’ (Croghan 1986, cited in White 2006, p.222) and in this way actually promote standard language ideology (Lippi-Green 1997, p.66).

In terms of convergent accommodation strategies, audience and ingroup referee design across the corpus as a whole do not exploit extreme vernacular Irish English features. This is in line with Oram’s (2010) observation of the trend towards ‘safe’ voices in Irish advertising, as discussed in chapter 4, section 4.2. In the earlier sub-corpora, local accent sub-varieties are exploited to a greater extent than in the later ones but are generally not strongly vernacular. This could be viewed as reflecting the influence of both nationalist and standard language ideologies in that solidarity with the listener is appealed to through the use of Irish English as marking Irishness, while at the same time the use of this variety is tempered by standard ideologies which see extreme forms as inappropriate with regard to the habitus (Bourdieu 1991) in representing Irish identity.
Furthermore, in cases where an extreme vernacular form is exploited, it is reauthenticated through the ‘strategic inauthenticity’ achieved through stylisation (Coupland 2001a; 2003; 2007). This indicates the advent of an ideological process in which the notion of authenticity is re-evaluated and which allows for the exploitation of vernacular authenticities associated with these extreme forms but in more complex and creative ways (Coupland 2007), as discussed in chapter 2. This strategy helps to offset the potential negative effects of the ‘junking’ (see Hill 1995) of minority accents and dialects although it has the potential for misinterpretation where the audience is not ‘acculturated’ (Coupland 2007).

Audience design is seen in the earlier sub-corpora in terms of supraregional southern Irish English. The linking of this sub-variety with the quasi-standard in Ireland could at one level be interpreted as indicating a reconciliation of standard and nationalist ideologies and of establishment and vernacular authenticities. However, the dominance of outgroup referee design based on SSBE speakers indicates the prevalence of standard ideology and speech based on traditional establishment authenticities.

Overall, therefore, the two earlier sub-corpora show the prevalence of standard language ideology. However, while Irish English (local and non-local) is relegated predominantly to the Action components in representing the ‘ordinary speech of ordinary people’ (Coupland 2007, p.181), it is not actively denigrated. The use of local forms in the Action are more prevalent than in the later sub-corpora but are in themselves positive, suggesting that the vernacular authenticities associated with Irish English may be exploited to some extent in representing national identity. It is rather the exclusion of Irish English from the serious message of the ads than any direct negative representation of this form that highlights the standard ideology.
8.1.2 Research question 2: Intra-varietal choice (1)

The second research question is as follows:

To what extent are language ideologies and changes in such ideologies manifested through variety choice at the intra-varietal level in radio advertising in Ireland?

This question is addressed through the research sub-questions below, which are addressed in chapter 6:

Research sub-questions:

2.1.1 Are there longitudinal changes in (a) the occurrence of ‘local’ and ‘non-local’ accent sub-varieties of Irish English and (b) in the functions of ‘local’ and ‘non-local’ accent sub-varieties of Irish English within the ads as indicated by location of these accent sub-varieties according to advert component?

2.1.2 To what extent is the strategy exploited in the corpus of juxtaposing, in ‘Action and Comment’ type ads, local accent sub-variety in the Action component against non-local in the Comment, thus appealing to the ‘contrasting values’ associated with status and solidarity (Lee 1992, p. 179-180)?

2.1.3 What are the indexical values associated with different accent sub-varieties of Irish English in the ad corpus?

2.1.4 What accommodation strategies, particularly audience and referee design strategies, relating to accent sub-varieties of Irish English are visible in the corpus?

With regard to sub-question 2.1.1, the dramatic increase in rhotic Irish English accents in the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora, on the face of it, indicates the decline of standard
language ideology and an increase in the prevalence of nationalist ideologies which see Irish English as most appropriate in not only representing ‘ordinary people’ but also in transmitting the serious advertising message. As in Bell’s (1984; 1991a) observation with regard to the use of RP in Zealand broadcasting, the realisation appears to have come about that RTÉ, Ireland’s main broadcaster, ‘isn’t the BBC’. This finding also suggests that the democratization and conversationalization of discourse (Fairclough 1992; 1994) is manifested through an increasing use of Irish English but not as regards other multilingual features. However, the finding that non-local Irish English sub-varieties, which align broadly with the quasi-standard Irish English, dominate in the Comment components of both these later sub-corpora, suggests that standard ideologies are still at play, albeit based on a less rigorous model of ‘standard’ which allows for the use of Irish English sub-varieties. This more flexible approach to the notion of standard can be interpreted in terms of a reconciliation of standard and nationalist ideology and the notion of authenticity as a compromise between establishment and vernacular criteria, bringing together local and global values (White 2006).

Similarly, the exploitation of Irish language lexical items in combination with non-local Irish English accents, together with the exploitation of Irish cultural representations through intertextuality in relation to Irish literature and film, illustrates a blending of Irish and English language culture, based on a ‘new’ type of nationalism, which exists independently of linguistic uniformity as discussed by Anderson (1991) and Tymoczko and Ireland (2003a).

Non-local as opposed to local Irish English accent sub-varieties are exploited in the Action components of the later sub-corpora to a greater extent than in those of 1977 and 1987, indicating a decline in the use of the features of local Irish English accent sub-
varieties as ‘marker[s] of specificity’ (Cronin 2010), with the quasi-standard non-local varieties dominating representations of ‘everyday informal interaction’ (Lee 1992). Therefore, Oram’s (2010) observation of an increasing demand for regional accents in advertising in Ireland is not borne out for the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora, although admittedly the ads which comprise these sub-corpora pre-date Oram’s remark. This has the effect of representing these non-local forms as ‘the ordinary speech of ordinary people’ (Coupland 2007) and bringing together traditional establishment and vernacular authenticities and suggests the onset of an Irish identity which links local and global identities. It is also indicative of a tendency towards the ‘safe voice’ in the Irish advertising context (Oram 2010) as opposed to hyperbolic representations often associated with local varieties. However, Irish English dialectal variety increases in the sub-corpora of 1987, 1997 and 2007 and remains quite consistent in these sub-corpora, a finding which may be indicative of the effect of the democratization and conversationalization of discourse (Fairclough 1992; 1994).

Research sub-question 2.1.2 relates to the juxtaposition of local and non-local sub-varieties within ‘Action and Comment’ ads. In a number of ads, this pattern is visible; in these cases, the strategy exploits traditional vernacular authenticities to create solidarity with the listener, while reserving the non-local sub-varieties to associate with status in the Comment. This supports White’s (2006, p. 220) notion of a ‘standard’ Irish English as having a prestige not provided by regional dialects and suggests a revised conception of ‘standard’ in the Irish context.

However, the more common pattern is that of categories of the ‘non-local’ voice in both Action and Comment. This again suggests a merging of establishment and vernacular authenticities and the acceptability of the non-local forms of Irish English as the
authoritative voice as well as that of informal interaction. This finding also reflects Fairclough’s (1994) conversationalization process, in which public and private modes of speaking are merging. The exclusion of non-rhotic accents in these later sub-corpora, not only from the Comment components but also from the Action in representing ‘ordinary’ people and informal interactive contexts, underpins the movement away from SSBE to non-local Irish English as a conception of standard, but also in the representation of informal everyday interaction in the Irish context.

Research sub-question 2.1.3 relates to the indexicality of Irish English accent sub-varieties in the two later sub-corpora. Regional Irish English in some instances connotes dullness and banality but can also be associated more positively with traditional family values. With regard to non-local varieties, moderate Dublin English avails of the indexicality of traditional local Dublin values and culture associated with local Dublin forms, while the supraregional southern accent has associations of education and middle-class values. Advanced Dublin English has an additional quality of youth, energy and dynamism. All three non-local accent sub-varieties, in that they dissociate from local forms, are indexical of sophistication and cosmopolitanism. However, in contrast to the earlier sub-corpora, they have an additional authoritative quality by virtue of their increased exploitation in the Comment component.

Research sub-question 2.1.4 is concerned with accommodation strategies in the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora in relation to Irish English accent sub-varieties. Although not a common strategy in the corpus as a whole, the operation of nationalist ideologies based on a merging of Irish language and English language culture is apparent in the use of Irish language lexical items, although this strategy is interpreted as outgroup rather than ingroup referee design. In contrast with strongly vernacular local Irish English sub-
varieties, which are sometimes used in a pejorative way or are denigrated, the Irish language is represented positively. Outgroup referee design is also visible in the use of advanced Dublin English in that its origins are based on dissociative strategies.

In general, however, in the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora, convergent strategies in the form of audience design or ingroup referee design (convergent being understood here in the sense that such referee design is based on the ingroup rather than the outgroup referee) are more common; divergent strategies of outgroup referee design in terms of the use of SSBE as seen in the earlier sub-corpora are less visible. This is particularly interesting in terms of Bell’s (1991a) discussion of the use of foreign languages in advertising and of how consensus between advertiser and advertisee on the prestige of such languages means that the advertisee is not alienated, nor is his or her identity threatened. While SSBE is visible in the Comment components of the later sub-corpora, albeit to a far lesser extent than the earlier ones, it disappears completely from the Action components of the 2007 sub-corpora. This suggests that while there may be consensus on the retention of SSBE as the authoritative voice to a limited extent in the Irish context, nevertheless its retention as part of the ‘ordinary speech of ordinary [Irish] people’ may constitute a threat to Irish identity and is therefore unsustainable. Furthermore, it indicates the operation of the conversationalization process in which, as Coupland puts it, the notion of ‘posh’ undermines the authenticity of the ‘Establishment voice’ Coupland (2009, p.37).

Notwithstanding the rejection of ‘posh’, the ‘rise of the regional’ (Mugglestone 2003), while it is manifested to the extent of the movement away from SSBE, is nevertheless counteracted by the increasing movement towards non-local Irish English forms for both the authoritative voice and that of ‘everyday language’ (Coupland 2009a, p.45).
This corroborates the use of ‘standard’ Irish English rather than local forms as representing Irish identity (White 2006, p.220). It also has resonance with Faircough’s (1992 p.201) and Coupland’s (2009a, p.40) observation that despite the advent of the democratization of discourse, an imbalance still exists, and regional accents are limited to certain media contexts.

In general, the use of local varieties as ingroup referee design in the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora does not involve the denigration of these forms; they avoid such pejorative associations in some cases through more muted use but also in some instances, through the ‘strategic inauthenticity’ (Coupland 2001), achieved through stylisation, as illustrated in the 1987 subcorpus.

Overall, the findings from this section of the analysis indicate a movement away from the rigorous conception of standard as linked to SSBE to one associated with non-local sub-varieties of Irish English, which are seen as quasi-standard. As discussed in chapter 2, such a standard variety has a ‘dual nature’ reflecting the standardisation process but also the effects of its Celticisation (Kirk and Kallen 2004, p.88) thus facilitating a type of reconciliation of nationalist and standard ideologies.

8.1.3 Research question 2: Intra-varietal choice (2)

The second research question in relation to the intra-varietal analysis is further developed by focusing on advanced Dublin English and is directed by the following sub-questions relating to this sub-variety. These sub-questions are addressed in chapter 7.

2.2.1 Are there longitudinal changes in (a) the occurrence of advanced Dublin English and (b) in the functions of advanced Dublin English within the ads as indicated by its
location according to advert component?

2.2.2 To what extent is the strategy exploited in the corpus, of juxtaposing, in ‘Action and Comment’ type ads, local Irish English accent sub-variety in the Action component against advanced Dublin English in the Comment, thus appealing to the ‘contrasting values’ associated with status and solidarity (Lee 1992, p. 179-180)?

2.2.3 What are the indexical values associated with advanced Dublin English in the corpus?

2.2.4 What accommodation strategies, particularly audience and referee design strategies, relating to advanced Dublin English are visible in the corpus?

Research subquestion 2.2.1 relates to longitudinal variation and function of advanced Dublin English in the corpus. This sub-variety is confined to the 1997 and 2007 sub-corpora and predominates in the Comment rather than in the Action components of both sub-corpora; however, it shows increased presence in both components in the 2007 subcorpus and is the dominant sub-variety in the Comment component of this subcorpus. Its dissociative nature and its parallels with SSBE (Hickey 2013) suggest the influence of standard language ideology. However, its use in the Action components also indicates that it is increasingly coming to represent ‘everyday language’ and reinforces the new conception of standard as a compromise between vernacular and establishment authenticities in the Irish context.

With regard to subquestion 2.2.2, the juxtaposition of local accent sub-categories in the Action component against advanced Dublin English in the Comment, where it occurs, has the effect of emphasising the contrast between traditional and contemporary contexts. However, this is not a common pattern in the sub-corpora; the pattern of
advanced Dublin English in both ad components (in some cases combining with other varieties such as North American English and other non-local Irish English accent sub-varieties) is more common. In the Action components, it is generally associated with middle-class characters and situations, thereby consolidating its prestige status.

Advanced Dublin English, by virtue of its employment in the Action components in representing ‘everyday language’ in a sense, claims a type of vernacular authenticity. It is generally not represented as ‘inauthentic’ or the object of mockery or derision in the sense in which Moore (2011, p.49) describes; however, in one ad, a hyperbolised representation of this accent occurs but avoids denigration through the ‘strategic inauthenticity’ achieved through a playful form of stylisation.

In terms of the research subquestion 2.2.3, relating to the indexical values of advanced Dublin English, this dissociative form can be said to be index a sort of ‘urban modernity’ (Hickey 2005); it also has connotations of self-indulgence and ‘instant gratification’ associated with Celtic Tiger values (Archive.ie 2013). Its employment in the Comment components affords it qualities of seriousness, authority and expertise. Its contemporary and cosmopolitan associations are accentuated, however, by an energy and dynamism not associated with other non-local forms and can be understood as meeting the demand in Irish broadcast advertising for voices which target a younger audience (Oram 2010). In hyperbolised representations, it can be said to index pretentiousness and ‘poshness’. In general, the attributes associated with this form equate generally with those identified by Piller (2003, p.175) and Kelly-Holmes (2005, p.104) in relation to ‘the special case of English’ namely, modernity, progress, globalization, cosmopolitanism and fashionableness.

The employment of particular features of advanced Dublin English, for example the
retroflex /r/, illustrates how indexical relationships are not always static and how speakers can ‘creatively forge a new association between a linguistic form and an individual or group not previously linked to it’ (Coupland 2007, p.23, see also Woolard 2006, p.88). In addition, the way in which advanced Dublin English can have different indexical values depending on the context (for example, authoritative as opposed to pretentious) illustrates Woolard’s (2006) observation of how the indexical value of a form may be transferred between different contexts and speakers and change in the process.

With regard to research sub-question 2.2.4 relating to accommodation strategies, the increase in the use of advanced Dublin English in both Action and Comment components in the 2007 subcorpus suggests that referee design may no longer be an appropriate classification for this accent sub-variety and justifies its categorisation as an audience designed style. This corroborates the observation by Piller (2001, p.155), as discussed in chapter 3, of the role of advertising discourse in the construction of contemporary cultural identities. In the context of this study, the use of advanced Dublin English could be said to have an ‘initiative’ role in the construction of the identity of the receivers of the ad as modern, sophisticated and cosmopolitan, and a responsive dimension in responding to these newly constructed identities using this same form but as an audience designed rather than a referee designed style. However, stylised hyperbolic representations of this form can be interpreted as ingroup referee design in a similar way to stylised vernacular Irish English forms, and allow for a reassessment of this form in relation to Irish identity.
8.2 Concluding interpretations vis-à-vis the manifestation of language ideologies in the corpus

In order to consolidate and clarify the way in which the findings in relation to these sub-questions answer the main research questions, this section revisits each of the ideologies of language discussed in chapter 2 in turn, relating the findings to these particular ideologies. The operation of these ideologies is linked to Bourdieu’s (1991) concept of linguistic ‘value’ and that of language valuation and evaluation (Spitulnik 1998), as discussed in chapter 2, by which different social values are associated with varieties and styles of speaking (Spitulnik, 1998). Therefore, standard language ideology will assign value to standard forms, whereas nationalist ideology may reject these forms and place more value on the vernacular. More recent ideological shifts in the form of the conversationalization of discourse and new constructions of the ‘authentic’ speaker will further impact on these values.

8.2.1 Standard language ideology

The dominance of standard language ideologies are clearly visible in the conscious emulation of the SSBE accent in the earlier sub-corpora and its association with the voice of authority. The language subordination process (Lippi-Green 1997, p.68) is evident in these sub-corpora in the relegation of Irish English to the Action components. This also suggests that both advertiser and advertisee agree on the appropriateness of the standard variety as the voice of authority and highlights the notions of ‘common sense’ attitudes in relation to correct and incorrect forms (Milroy 2001) and the existence of Bourdieu’s (1991) concept of ‘the institutional circle of collective misrecognition’, as discussed in chapter 2. This suggests that speakers of Irish English accept and support discrimination in relation to this variety, and have adopted ‘the political culture of language from England’ (Croghan 1986); such acceptance reinforces
the dominance of standard.

Irish English is not actively denigrated in these sub-corpora, however, but rather has compromised status by virtue of its marginalised role in expressing the authoritative voice. In cases where Irish English is trivialised, it avoids denigration through strategic inauthenticity achieved through stylisation.

Notwithstanding the increase in Irish English in the later sub-corpora, standard ideologies can also be detected in the use of non-local Irish English in these sub-corpora, particularly where it is used as the authoritative voice of the Comment. As discussed in chapter 2, standard ideologies of language can manifest themselves, not only in the choice of Standard British English as opposed to Irish English, but also through the rejection of ‘local’ forms of Irish English and the exploitation of ‘non-accented’ (Lippi-Green 1997) non-local forms in terms of phonology. We have seen in chapter 2 how Ireland’s integration into the ‘turbomarket’ of the English language has resulted in ‘more global, less distinct forms of English’ (Cronin 2011, p.56). This resonates with Blommaert and Verschueren’s (1998 p.208) claim that social mobility can play a significant role in language choice, thereby eschewing nationalist doctrines. This is illustrated by the notion of advanced Dublin English being adopted as ‘a badge of progressiveness’ (Dolan 1994) in the Irish context. However, the acceptability of a standard Irish English as opposed to standard British English nevertheless indicates a movement away from the rigorous notion of standard as based on a single correct form.

8.2.2 Nationalist language ideology

Nationalist language ideologies are visible to an extent through vernacular language use but moreso through the employment of quasi-standard non-local Irish English and the rejection of standard British English forms and the consequent avoidance of the
‘colonial taint of standard British English’ (White 2006, p.223). As Lee points out, such rejection ‘is in itself an ideological statement, a crucial marker of local affiliation and local identity’ (Lee 1992, p.182). Irish language items are not exploited to any great extent but where exploited they demonstrate the coming together of Irish and English language culture. This, together with the exploitation of cultural representations in the form of intertextual references to Irish literature and film, indicates the prevalence of a ‘cultural confidence’ (Tymockzo and Ireland 2003) based on a ‘new’ type of nationalism (Anderson 1991) existing independently of linguistic uniformity. This corroborates White’s (2006, pp. 220-221) claim that it is standard Irish English which is the predominant means of communicating Irish identity internationally.

Moore (2011, p.57) equates the ‘moral panic’, which was observable in media reports in relation to the ‘inauthenticity’ of advanced Dublin English with nationalist reaction to the spread of the English language in the late nineteenth century. However, this inauthenticity, for the most part, is not associated with the ads in the corpus, indicating that nationalist ideology in relation to the denigration of this accent sub-variety has not transferred to the advertising context.

8.2.3 The conversationalization and democratization of discourse

The concept of the conversationalization of discourse (Fairclough 1994) involves the blurring of the boundaries between public and private discourse. The increasing tendency to employ non-local Irish English accent sub-varieties in both Action and Comment components of the ads can be said to illustrate this concept in the two later sub-corpora. The concept is also linked to the notion that advertisements are designed to reflect the discursive practices of the society in which they operate (Lee 1992) and also the requirement that ads speak to people ‘in their own language’ (Kelly Holmes 2005,
p.107) and a consequent increase in the range of accents and dialects in recent decades. This is illustrated in the corpus through increased use of Irish English accent sub-varieties and the demise of the ‘posh’ (Mugglestone 2003). This corroborates the notion of ‘changing orders of indexicality’ (Coupland 2009) and of how indexical relationships can change over time.

In relation to the conversationalization of discourse, we have referred in chapter 2 to the importance of identifying the social stratum on which the model for conversational practices is based and how close this model is to anyone’s actual conversational language (Fairclough 1994). This is also linked to notions of authenticity which will be discussed below. The identification of the model for conversational practices is relevant to this study at one level from the point of view of audience design. As the radio channel on which the ads were aired is viewed as a rather serious and conservative one, as discussed in chapter 3, audience design is based on the conservative supraregional southern form but appears to be moving towards the newer advanced Dublin English form. Fairclough’s claim that in spite of the ‘democratization’ of discourse in recent decades, imbalances are still present (Fairclough’s 1992 p.201) is corroborated in the predominance of non-local Irish English forms in the corpus and the confinement of local Irish English forms to the Action components. Mugglestone’s (2003) notion of the ‘rise of the regional’ is visible to the extent that Irish English has replaced SSBE; however, the more homogenous non-local sub-varieties dominate as opposed to regional local varieties.

**8.2.4 Authenticity**

The notion of conversationalization as involving a simulation of more ‘authentic’ representations of discourse leads to the consideration of authenticity as an ideological
construct. Due to the ‘synthetic personalisation of discourse’ (Fairclough 1989), ‘authentic talk’ can be an important factor in listener engagement (Montgomery 2001, p.401) and as discussed in the previous section, it is important to establish the model on which conversational practices are based. Montgomery (2001, p.403) observes that media communication is increasingly designed to simulate ‘fresh’ or ‘naturally occurring’ talk. The advent of new orders of indexicality in which standard language indexes ‘poshness’ effectively breaks its links with ‘authenticity’ (Coupland 2009, p.37). This may account for the movement away from SSBE which can be said to have authenticity in terms of traditional establishment criteria but not in terms of vernacular authenticities. The fact that this form, as displayed in the corpus, is for the most part a simulated one also detracts further from its authenticity.

While local Irish English accent sub-varieties can be said to have authenticity in relation to traditional vernacular values, they are not exploited to the same extent as non-local in the later sub-corpora (contradicting Jaworski’s (2007, p. 276) observation of the media bias to AL6 which indexes authentic cultural membership). However, notwithstanding this, the exploitation of Irish English dialectal variety increases in the later sub-corpora. Dialectal variety combines with local accent sub-varieties in some ads to produce hyperbolic representations of Irish characters. These extreme representations can potentially deauthenticate themselves by virtue of their artificiality. However, they can be reauthenticated by means of the ‘strategic deauthentication’ (Coupland 2001) of the stylisation of such ingroup markers. On the other hand, non-local Irish English varieties as quasi-standard may, like standard British forms, have associations with ‘posh’ and their ‘authenticity’ may be compromised in this way. This is particularly relevant to the new mainstream variety of advanced Dublin English which is represented in media reports as inauthentic (Moore 2011).
However, for the most part, this ‘inauthenticity’ is not reflected in the ads in the corpus and this accent sub-variety is increasingly used to represent both the voice of authority and that of ‘everyday’ interaction. In addition, all non-local Irish English forms, in that they move away from standard British forms yet are based on a quasi-standard, can be said to achieve ‘relative’ vernacular authenticity and furthermore, to reconcile to some extent conflicting establishment and vernacular authenticities. With regard to advanced Dublin English, as the emerging mainstream variety, it can be seen as ‘real language use in the present, as opposed to a myth of current language use based on reference to the past’ (White 2006, p.20) . As discussed in chapter 2, the important issue here is how it is represented in the media and how this affects its exploitation in advertising in Ireland. Therefore, while media reports deem this variety inauthentic, in the advertising context it appears to be increasingly establishing itself as the form on which conversational practices are modelled and is represented as a variety which can be used in both formal and informal contexts, thus resolving to some extent the conflict between establishment and vernacular authenticities. While the inauthenticity of this accent is addressed in one ad, it is reauthenticated through the strategy of strategic inauthenticity, as referred to above. This illustrates the advent of new conceptions of authenticity and a movement away from traditional criteria.

8.3 Future directions for research

The study has examined the manifestation of changing language ideologies in the Irish context based on a corpus of radio ads broadcast on an Irish radio station spanning three decades. The most recent subcorpus is comprised of ads from 2007, the year which heralded the demise of the ‘Celtic Tiger’ following the collapse of the property market in Ireland. The effects of this change in the economic situation of Ireland on variety
choice in advertising in the Irish context would form an interesting development and expansion of the present study. This development might take the form of the compilation of a new sub-corpus in 2017, thus allowing for the ten-year interval of the existing sub-corpora to be maintained. Such a corpus could develop the present research by adopting the same factors and frameworks for the manifestation of language ideologies as those employed in this study and thus facilitating the analysis of comparative data.

Additionally, given that advanced Dublin English has been cited as the most important case of language change in contemporary Ireland (Hickey 2004a p.46), further research on the role of this accent sub-variety in broadcast advertising could form the locus of a more immediate study. This study might be based on a contemporary corpus of ads, spanning a shorter time period. Such a study could involve an examination of the contexts and discursive range in which advanced Dublin English is associated and the ideological implications of the findings.

The analysis of the component of ‘Chorus’ or ‘Song’ in the ads as identified by Sussex (1989) was outside of the scope of the present research as discussed in chapter 3. Bell (1991a, p.138), in his sample of ads on New Zealand television, found that all singing had ‘traces of American accent’ and was therefore seen in terms of long-term outgroup referee design. This would therefore be interesting to examine in the context of the Irish advertisement corpus in view of the putative North American influence in Ireland.

While this study focuses on ideologies of language, the field of language attitudes in the Irish context could be developed through an attitudinal analysis based on the existing corpus. Hickey (2005, p.92) describes his study of evaluative notions in relation to accents of English based on a controlled questionnaire survey which required
respondents to rate different accents on the value judgements of ‘important/intelligent’, ‘pleasant/friendly’ and ‘well educated’. Such a survey could be adapted in relation to the advertisement corpus and would allow for the expansion of Hickey’s research in the context of broadcast advertising in Ireland. Language attitudes research and methodologies can show how ideological forces operate in a particular context and around particular patterns of speaking (Garrett, Coupland and Williams 2006, p.11). Therefore, a study of attitudes to accents employed in the ads could further the establishment of connections between ideological changes in relation to ways of speaking in the world of ‘everyday language’ and media language, the importance of which has been highlighted by Coupland (2009a, p.45).
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APPENDIX A: Corpus advertisements description

Table 1.1 Corpus advertisements: description

*Larry Gogan, an Irish radio presenter and Bill Golding, an Irish actor, are cited as ‘voiceover veterans’ by Oram (2010) (see chapter 4, section 4.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advert No.</th>
<th>Ref. No.</th>
<th>Company/Brand</th>
<th>Origin/Association</th>
<th>Product/Service</th>
<th>Sub-corpus</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/77</td>
<td>Flahavan’s Progress Oatlets</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Porridge oats</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Promotion of ‘Gift’ offer of reduced price on sheets with purchase of product. Background music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2/77</td>
<td>Dunne’s Stores</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Irish supermarket chain</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Emphasis on quality and value at store. Voice of Larry Gogan*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3/77</td>
<td>Erin Hotcup</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Cup of soup</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Song followed by naming of product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4/77</td>
<td>Kleenex</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Kitchen towels</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Scenario of kitchen breakages featuring the character of accident-prone Frank Spencer from BBC sitcom Some Mothers Do ’Ave ’Em.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5/77</td>
<td>Image magazine</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Irish published ‘glossy’magazine, aimed at female readership</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Description of magazine. Voice of Larry Gogan*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6/77</td>
<td>Makem and Clancy album and concert</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Music album and concerts featuring Irish folk-singers</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Promotion of album and live concerts via dialogue between singers Makem and Clancy with background music from album followed by details of concerts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7/77</td>
<td>Oxo</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Stock cube</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Song/jingle followed by naming of product ‘O for Oxo’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8/77</td>
<td>Superquinn</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Irish supermarket chain</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Reference to how Superquinn like their customers to be ‘fussy’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9/77</td>
<td>Global Travel</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Travel agency</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Promotion of travel agency including special offers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10/77</td>
<td>‘Shout at the Devil’ film</td>
<td>Irish (cinema)</td>
<td>Film</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Information on film and times and locations of screenings. Voice of Larry Gogan*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11/77</td>
<td>Nescafé Coffee</td>
<td>Swiss/International</td>
<td>Instant coffee</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Song/jingle plus promotion of ‘Nescafé taste’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12/77</td>
<td>Procol</td>
<td>US/International</td>
<td>Remedy for cold symptoms</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Irish broadcaster, Terry Wogan (who worked for most of his career with BBC) feigns cold symptoms and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advert No.</td>
<td>Ref. No.</td>
<td>Company/Brand</td>
<td>Origin/Association</td>
<td>Product/Service</td>
<td>Sub-corpus</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13/77</td>
<td>Lucan House Furniture</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Promotion of sale at furniture store. Voice of Larry Gogan*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14/77</td>
<td>“Survive” film</td>
<td>Irish (cinema)</td>
<td>Film</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Information on film and times and locations of screenings. Voice of Larry Gogan*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15/77</td>
<td>Kellog’s</td>
<td>US/International</td>
<td>Bran-based breakfast cereals</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Advice on benefits of product for older people, citing medical research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16/77</td>
<td>Sheepskin Shop</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Leather, suede, fur and sheepskin garments</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Promotion of sale of sheepskin coats and other garments from store. Voice of Larry Gogan*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17/77</td>
<td>Saxa Salt</td>
<td>UK/International</td>
<td>Table salt</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Song/jingle and naming of product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18/77</td>
<td>Crannach Furniture</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Information on sale at store and opening hours. Voice of Larry Gogan*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19/77</td>
<td>Irish TV Renters’ Association</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>TV rental</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Scenario featuring distressed mother whose TV is being taken away for repair followed by advice on benefits of TV rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20/77</td>
<td>Switzer’s</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Dublin department Store</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Actress, Eileen Colgan, promotes Switzer’s ‘wisebuys’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21/77</td>
<td>ACC (Agriculture Credit Corporation)</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Information on benefits of investing with ACC to help farming industry in Ireland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22/77</td>
<td>Irel</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Coffee/chicory drink</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Promotion of product as a cheaper alternative to coffee. Background cash register sounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23/77</td>
<td>Ergas</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Gas suppliers</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Scenario in which a Dublinman, on his bus journey home from work, muses about his Ergas heater and its benefits, followed by recommendation to change to Ergas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25/777</td>
<td>Polycell</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>DIY double glazing</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Tongue in cheek scenario in which a wife exhorts her reluctant husband to replace their windows with Polycell double glazing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advert No.</td>
<td>Ref. No.</td>
<td>Company/Brand</td>
<td>Origin/Association</td>
<td>Product/Service</td>
<td>Sub-corpus</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26/77</td>
<td>RTV rentals</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>TV rental</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Information on RTV rentals ‘super offer’ followed by song/jingle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>27/77</td>
<td>Campbells</td>
<td>US/International</td>
<td>Condensed soup</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Product contrasted with powdered soups with background scenario of family making appreciative comments as they taste the soup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>28/77</td>
<td>Glorney’s</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Building providers</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Scenario in which a ‘housewife’ tells about building a new house and of how her husband ‘is off to Glorney’s’ for all the requirements, followed by information on store locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29/77</td>
<td>Donaghmede Shopping Centre</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Shopping Centre in Dublin’s northside</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Song/jingle followed by naming of shops and their products in shopping centre. Voice of Larry Gogan*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30/77</td>
<td>Switzer’s</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Department store</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Irish actress, Eileen Colgan, promotes opening of Christmas season at Switzer’s by Irish singers, Duane family, and Santa Claus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>31/77</td>
<td>Philips’</td>
<td>Dutch/International</td>
<td>Consumer electronics-microwave ovens</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Explanation of how the product makes life easier for the consumer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>32/77</td>
<td>Philips’</td>
<td>Dutch/International</td>
<td>Consumer electronics-tumbler drier</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Sound of wind and rain followed by voice exhorting customers to make the Philips’ tumbler drier the ‘sunshine of your life this winter’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>33/77</td>
<td>Polydor record label</td>
<td>Irish (showband)</td>
<td>Record single of song ‘Stranger in my place’ by Hi-Lows showband</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Lines of song playing in background with voiceover of Irish country and western show broadcaster, Paschal Mooney, naming product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34/77</td>
<td>RTV rentals</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>TV rental</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Scenario in which Rudolph the reindeer exhorts Santa Claus to rent colour TV with RTV rentals. Followed by song/jingle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35/77</td>
<td>Switzer’s</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Department store</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Information on toyfair at Switzer’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36/77</td>
<td>Nina Rici</td>
<td>French/International</td>
<td>Perfume</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Scenario with dialogue between a male customer asking a ‘French’ shop assistant for assistance in buying a gift for ‘an enchanting woman’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>37/77</td>
<td>Tayto</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>‘Hillbilly bacon’</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>North American ‘hillbilly’ introducing new potato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advert No.</td>
<td>Ref. No.</td>
<td>Company/Brand</td>
<td>Origin/Association</td>
<td>Product/Service</td>
<td>Sub-corpus</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>38/77</td>
<td>Cotton Mill Boys showband album</td>
<td>Irish (showband)</td>
<td>Music album</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Album introduced with track from album playing in background. Voice of Larry Gogan*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>39/77</td>
<td>Hedex</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Pain-relief tablets</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Dialogue between two ‘housewives’ in which one recommends the product to the other, followed by naming and endorsing of the product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>40/77</td>
<td>Arnott’s</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>G-plan furniture range</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>‘Limerick’ verse competition promotion in which first lines of a Limerick are read and listener is asked to complete them in order to win furniture from the G-plan range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1/87</td>
<td>Switzer’s, Todd’s, Cash’s, Moon’s</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Department stores forming Switzer’s group</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Information on Christmas offers on lingerie followed by ‘Dubliner’ exhorting shoppers to go to the store.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2/87</td>
<td>Leonard’s TV and HiFi</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>TV and HiFi Store</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Scenario with dialogue between mother and newly-married son in which son justifies acquiring his new TV under the Leonard’s ‘multi-option’ scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>3/87</td>
<td>Siúcra</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Irish sugar</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Dialogue between two ‘housewives’ shopping for Christmas baking ingredients in which one reprimands the other for not referring to product as Irish sugar, followed by listing of range of sugar products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>4/87</td>
<td>Arnott’s Bargain Shop</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Department Store</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Offers at Bargain Shop are listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>5/87</td>
<td>National Dairy Council</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Cheese</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Song/jingle and ideas of how food can be enhanced by adding cheese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>7/87</td>
<td>Dunlaoghaire Shopping Centre</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Shopping Centre</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>A mother talks about the convenience of shopping at the centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>8/87</td>
<td>Magic cooking bags</td>
<td>US/International</td>
<td>Heat-resistant cooking bags</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Irish broadcaster, Terry Wogan (who worked for most of his career with BBC), encourages listeners to try cooking bags for Christmas turkey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>9/87</td>
<td>Supervalu</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Supermarket chain</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Offers listed followed by Christmas greetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advert No.</td>
<td>Ref. No.</td>
<td>Company/Brand</td>
<td>Origin/Association</td>
<td>Product/Service</td>
<td>Sub-corpus</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>10/87</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Fabric conditioner</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Irish musician and wife of renowned broadcaster, Gay Byrne (see chapter 4, section 4.3.2), advises listeners to use the product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>11/87</td>
<td>Electricity Supply Board (ESB)</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Storage heaters</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Information on storage heaters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>12/87</td>
<td>Seven Seas Health Care</td>
<td>UK/International</td>
<td>Cod liver oil capsules</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Information on the benefits and naturalness of the product with sound of sea and music in background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>13/87</td>
<td>Swan Shopping Centre</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Shopping Centre in Dublin’s southside</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Information about Christmas shopping at the centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>14/87</td>
<td>St Vincent de Paul Society</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Charitable organisation</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Scenario in which elderly homeless man seeks shelter from the cold in a Dublin cafe followed by information on the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>15/87</td>
<td>Batchelor’s</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Tinned peas</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Conversation between Batchelor characters ‘Barney’ and ‘Beany’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>16/87</td>
<td>Stillorgan Shopping Centre</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Shopping Centre in Dublin’s southside</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>English born actor, Alan Stanford, recommends Stillorgan shopping centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>18/87</td>
<td>Atlantic Homecare</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Homeware store</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Information on Christmas gifts and bargains from Atlantic Homecare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>19/87</td>
<td>Kodak</td>
<td>US/International</td>
<td>Batteries</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Promotion of lithium batteries, emphasising Kodak’s reputation wrt photography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>20/87</td>
<td>An Post</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Irish postal service</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Song/jingle followed by information on savings certificates from An Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>21/87</td>
<td>Fire Safety</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Fire safety</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>‘Firehound’ gives fire safety advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>22/87</td>
<td>Galtee</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Cheese ‘singles’ slices</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Irish international cyclist, Stephen Roche, is asked about his secret for making a delicious sandwich. Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>23/87</td>
<td>Berger</td>
<td>India/Uk/International</td>
<td>Paints</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Santa encourages listeners to paint a room for Christmas. Festive background music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>24/87</td>
<td>Dunne’s Stores</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Toys at department store</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Song/jingle and promotion of ‘toyfair’ at store. Voice of Larry Gogan*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>25/87</td>
<td>Superquinn</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Irish supermarket</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Scenario in which Santa and Mrs Claus celebrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advert No.</td>
<td>Ref. No.</td>
<td>Company/Brand</td>
<td>Origin/Association</td>
<td>Product/Service</td>
<td>Sub-corpus</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>26/87</td>
<td>Dundrum Shopping Centre</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Suburban Dublin shopping centre</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Promotion of shopping centre with background Christmas carol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>27/87</td>
<td>Arnott's</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Department store</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Information on Christmas opening hours at the store.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>28/87</td>
<td>Irish Electricity Supply Board (ESB)</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Win Electric competition</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Promotion of car competition in conjunction with ESB. Background song/jingle. Voice of Larry Gogan*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>29/87</td>
<td>RTE Guide</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>‘Lifestyle and entertainment’ weekly magazine with radio and TV programme listings</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Information on magazine features. Background song/jingle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>30/87</td>
<td>Shaw’s</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Irish department store chain</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Information on fashion and cosmetics at Shaw’s with background Christmas music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>31/87</td>
<td>Dunne’s Stores</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Family fashion at department store</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Promotion of family fashion at store. Background song/jingle. Voice of Larry Gogan*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>32/87</td>
<td>Andrews Liver salts/ Sterling health</td>
<td>US/International</td>
<td>Medication for upset stomach</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Background noises of powder dissolving in water, with information on product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>33/87</td>
<td>Quinnsworth</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Irish supermarket chain</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Maurice Pratt, marketing manager of the supermarket chain and well-known media figure, encourages listeners to order Christmas turkey at Quinnsworth. Background jingle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>34/87</td>
<td>Chivers</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Canned vegetables</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Fanfare precedes announcement of the addition of canned vegetables to Chivers range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>35/87</td>
<td>Cross</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Pens</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Scenario in which son writes to his father, hoping that his gift of a Cross pen might encourage his father to give him some financial help in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>36/87</td>
<td>Curtain Centre</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Curtains</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Rhyme promoting Curtain Centre price, quality and service. Background jingle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>37/87</td>
<td>Kodak</td>
<td>US/International</td>
<td>Batteries</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Promotion of life-span of batteries with background clicking camera sounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>38/87</td>
<td>Londis off-licence</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Wines</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Wines listed with prices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>39/87</td>
<td>Western Highway</td>
<td>Irish (singer)</td>
<td>Music album</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Songs from album, plus endorsement of album</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advert No.</td>
<td>Ref. No.</td>
<td>Company/Brand</td>
<td>Origin/Association</td>
<td>Product/Service</td>
<td>Sub-corpus</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>40/87</td>
<td>Philips’</td>
<td>Dutch/International</td>
<td>Hostess trolley</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Whispered information on the product with background party sounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>1/97</td>
<td>Garda band album</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Music album</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Songs from album, plus endorsement of album</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>2/97</td>
<td>British Telecom</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Landline phones</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Promotion of phones interrupted by voices with typical Irish English greetings and farewells. Background jingle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>3/97</td>
<td>Charlie Landsborough album (Ritz label)</td>
<td>Irish (singer)</td>
<td>Irish singer/songwriter album and video</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Songs from album, plus endorsement of album</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>4/97</td>
<td>Glad Alufoil</td>
<td>Australian/International</td>
<td>Aluminium foil</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Scenario in which a husband presents a roll of aluminium foil as a Christmas gift to his wife who uses it to strike him, showing its strength.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>5/97</td>
<td>Irish Kidney Association</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Organ donation</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Seasonal greetings in which lives of organ donors are acknowledged. Background music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>6/97</td>
<td>Londis</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Supermarket chain</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Christmas greetings and drink-drive safety warning from owners and staff of Londis. Background jingle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>7/97</td>
<td>Campbell’s soup</td>
<td>US/International</td>
<td>Condensed soup</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Advice on how to unwind with Campbell’s soup with product information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>8/97</td>
<td>B&amp;G Wines</td>
<td>French/International</td>
<td>Wine</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Historical information on founder of B&amp;G wines, Thomas Barton, the first of the ‘wine-geese’ who emigrated from Ireland to France. Background music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>9/97</td>
<td>Domestos</td>
<td>UK/International</td>
<td>Kitchen disinfectant</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Conversation between a child preparing a sandwich and her mother, followed by advice on keeping kitchen germ-free with Domestos power-spray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>10/97</td>
<td>Dunne’s Stores</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>‘Value club ‘ loyalty vouchers</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Seasonal greetings and thanks to customers, plus promotion of goods and offers at Dunne’s Stores with background seasonal music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>11/97</td>
<td>Cockburn’s Port</td>
<td>Portuguese/International</td>
<td>Port Wine</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Presenter lists metaphors from ‘tasting notes’ for Cockburn’s Port, but advises that listeners should not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advert No.</td>
<td>Ref. No.</td>
<td>Company/Brand</td>
<td>Origin/Association</td>
<td>Product/Service</td>
<td>Sub-corpus</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>12/97</td>
<td>Ryan Holiday vouchers</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Travel agent</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Advice to listeners on buying Ryan holiday vouchers as Christmas gifts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>13/97</td>
<td>RTE Guide</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>‘Lifestyle and entertainment’ weekly magazine with radio and TV programme listings</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Information on features of RTE guide with contextual clips from sporting, fashion and other events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>14/97</td>
<td>Cablelink</td>
<td>Phillipines/International</td>
<td>Cable antenna television system operator</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Scenario in which middle-aged Irish couple are preparing Christmas dinner, followed by information on Cablelink offers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>15/97</td>
<td>Liveline against drink-driving</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Road safety</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Simulation of popular RTE radio phone-in program in which caller tells presenter of how he caused a fatal accident when driving while drunk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>16/97</td>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>‘Homestyle’ soups</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Information on nutritional value and delicious taste of soup. Background roller-coaster sounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>17/97</td>
<td>Warmer for the Spark album</td>
<td>Irish (songwriter)</td>
<td>Album of songs form Irish songwriter Jimmy McCarthy</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Songs from album with voice promoting album.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>18/97</td>
<td>Coca Cola</td>
<td>US/International</td>
<td>Cola drink</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Seasonal song with Christmas greetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>19/97</td>
<td>Persil non-bio</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Washing detergent</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Conversation between babies in which they discuss their annoyance at not being allowed to get dirty, followed by information on Persil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>20/97</td>
<td>Tesco, Quinnsworth and Crazy Prices</td>
<td>UK/Irish</td>
<td>Supermarket chain</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Maurice Pratt, marketing manager of the supermarket chain and well-known media figure, gives information on extra opening hours to facilitate customers’ Christmas needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>21/97</td>
<td>Tesco, Quinnsworth and Crazy Prices</td>
<td>UK/Irish</td>
<td>Supermarket chain</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Maurice Pratt, marketing manager of the supermarket chain and well-known media figure, gives information on Christmas party food offers. Background music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>22/97</td>
<td>Glen Ellen Wine</td>
<td>US/International</td>
<td>Wine</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Advice telling listeners not to worry about saving good wine for special occasions and to relax and enjoy Christmas with Glen Ellen wine. Background music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advert No.</td>
<td>Ref. No.</td>
<td>Company/Brand</td>
<td>Origin/Association</td>
<td>Product/Service</td>
<td>Sub-corpus</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>23/97</td>
<td>Quality Street</td>
<td>UK/International</td>
<td>Chocolates</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Scenario in which a mother makes a <em>fauxpas</em> when her daughter introduces her new boyfriend. Background jingle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>24/97</td>
<td>Trócaire</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Irish charitable organisation</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Appeal for support for Trócaire ‘women around the world’ campaign followed by South American female voice promoting achievements of the ‘world’s’ women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>25/97</td>
<td>Le Piat d’Or</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Wine</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>French accented voice reading excerpt from ‘Tales from Provence’ which simulates a passionate romance in which the wine bottle narrates the story, followed by a second French accented voice promoting the wine as ‘the other great French passion’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>26/97</td>
<td>Ritz label</td>
<td>Irish (singer)</td>
<td>Irish country and folk singer, Daniel O’Donnell album</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Songs from album with voice promoting album</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>27/97</td>
<td>Roche’s Stores Christmas vouchers</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Irish department store</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Promotion of gift vouchers and store opening hours followed by ‘ho ho ho’ of Santa Claus and Christmas greetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>28/97</td>
<td>Arnott’s department store</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Irish department store</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Vox – pop scenario fo Christmas shoppers at the new Arnotts store.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>29/97</td>
<td>Aurelio Montes</td>
<td>Chilean/International</td>
<td>Wine</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Information on production of wine from vineyard-owner plus voice listing awards received for product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>30/97</td>
<td>Trócaire</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Irish charitable organisation</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>South American accented female voice gives information on projects funded by organisation in village in El Salvador followed by information on how to donate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>31/97</td>
<td>Western Union</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Money transfer</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Scenario in which son phones mother from the US requesting her to send him money for his ‘bachelor-party’ followed by information on the money transfer service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>32/97</td>
<td>Glad Alufoil</td>
<td>Australian/International</td>
<td>Aluminium foil</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Sitcom scenario with canned laughter in which female turkey receives an aluminium foil ‘coat’ from her husband.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>33/97</td>
<td>St Vincent de Paul</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Irish charitable</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Listeners asked to close their eyes in order to see the...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advert No.</td>
<td>Ref. No.</td>
<td>Company/Brand</td>
<td>Origin/Association</td>
<td>Product/Service</td>
<td>Sub-corpus</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>34/97</td>
<td>Barry’s Tea</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Irish blended tea (Classic blend)</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Reminiscence of childhood Christmas. Listeners invited to celebrate a ‘classic’ Christmas with Barry’s Tea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>35/97</td>
<td>Alka Seltzer</td>
<td>US/International</td>
<td>Painkiller</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Scenario based on US detective genre in which special agent insists that his client take Alka Seltzer to relieve the effects of over-indulgence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>36/97</td>
<td>Cadbury’s Roses</td>
<td>UK/International</td>
<td>Chocolates</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Child recites rhyme in which she recounts how she gave her mother a gift of Cadbury’s Roses to thank her for making her Christmas pantomime costume. Background jingle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>37/97</td>
<td>Kleenex</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Facial tissues</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Scenario in which women, one with a muffled voice due to a heavy cold, discuss free ‘winter survival kit’ offer from Kleenex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>38/97</td>
<td>Hibernian</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Insurance company</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Reminiscence of childhood Christmases. Listeners asked to remember older people at Christmas and to have a happy and safe Christmas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>39/97</td>
<td>Barry’s Tea</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Irish blended tea (Classic blend)</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Extract from novel by Irish novelist, Thomas Kilmoby. Listeners invited to celebrate ‘classic Christmas’ with Barry’s Tea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>40/97</td>
<td>Barry’s Tea</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Irish blended tea</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Mother reads over her letter to her daughter responding to the daughter’s request to find out what Christmas gifts family members would like, interrupted by contextual clips.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>1/07</td>
<td>Spar and the Irish Hospice Foundation</td>
<td>Dutch/International/Irish</td>
<td>Supermarket/ Irish charitable organisation</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Scenario in which Santa Claus and Rudolph make their Christmas deliveries and discuss ‘reindeer food’ available from Spar to raise funds for the Irish Hospice Foundation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>2/07</td>
<td>RTÉ Cór na nÓg</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Choir concerts</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Information on Cór na nÓg performance with choir singing in background.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 123       | 3/07     | Eircom        | Irish             | Home phone ‘Talktime’ package | 2007 | Mother talks about how ‘talktime’ package makes it easier for her to keep in touch with family members at
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advert No.</th>
<th>Ref. No.</th>
<th>Company/Brand</th>
<th>Origin/Association</th>
<th>Product/Service</th>
<th>Sub-corpus</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>4/07</td>
<td>Oxfam</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Charitable organisation/Charity Christmas gifts</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Song in which listeners are encouraged to give Oxfam charity gifts instead of ‘junk’, followed by information on how to purchase gifts from Oxfam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>5/07</td>
<td>Seniors’ Money Lifetime Loans</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Equity release schemes</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Irish actor, Mick Lally, gives information on equity release schemes for older property owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>6/07</td>
<td>11890 Directory enquiries</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Directory enquiries</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Background jingle giving information on Directory enquiries and cost comparison with competitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>7/07</td>
<td>Irish Cancer Initiative</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Health advice</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Three male speakers individually recount their experiences in relation to the information service followed by the voice of RTÉ health correspondent, Fergal Bowers, providing information on the service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>8/07</td>
<td>Arnott’s</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Department store/gift cards</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Promotion of gift cards with background music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>9/07</td>
<td>RTE</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>TV licence</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Scenario in which TV licence inspector rejects excuses from young man for not having licence followed by warning and information on how to get licence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>10/07</td>
<td>An Post Prize bonds</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Lottery bonds</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Scenario in which young boy on visit to Santa Claus asks Santa for a gift of prize bonds, followed by information on how to purchase prize bonds. Background seasonal music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>12/07</td>
<td>Women’s Aid Helpline</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Telephone helpline for victims of domestic violence</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Scenario in which young boy and girl simulate domestic dispute followed by information on helpline for domestic violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>13/07</td>
<td>SuperValu</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Irish supermarket chain</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Promotion of how Super Valu provides all you need for Christmas ‘under one roof’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>14/07</td>
<td>IPA (Institute of Public Administration)</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Yearbook and diary</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Promotion on yearbook and diary as ‘ideal’ Christmas gift with information on how to acquire them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>15/07</td>
<td>Mondello Park</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Gift vouchers for</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Scenario in which grandmother is given a gift of a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advert No.</td>
<td>Ref. No.</td>
<td>Company/Brand</td>
<td>Origin/Association</td>
<td>Product/Service</td>
<td>Sub-corpus</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Formula 1 Racing park)</td>
<td></td>
<td>motor racing school</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mondello Park gift voucher by her grandson, followed by information on where to get vouchers. Background music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>16/07</td>
<td>ILAC Shopping Centre</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Shopping centre in Dublin city centre</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Promotion of ‘stress-free’ shopping at shopping centre, listing stores in shopping centre. Background music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>17/07</td>
<td>Irish Blood Transfusion Service</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Blood donations</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Listeners encouraged to give blood rather than Christmas gifts, with information on how to donate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>18/07</td>
<td>HSE (Health Services Executive)</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Winter Information line</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Tips for elderly people on how to stay well and warm in winter plus information on helpline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>19/07</td>
<td>Dolphin label</td>
<td>Irish (singer)</td>
<td>DVD box-set of Irish tenor, John McCormack ‘Icon of an Age’</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Promotion of DVD with songs from DVD in background.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>20/07</td>
<td>National Council for the Blind</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Irish charitable organisation</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Information on services of NCB and how to donate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>21/07</td>
<td>Audi</td>
<td>German/International</td>
<td>A6 ‘limited edition’ car model</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Presentation of ‘philosophy’ of Audi A6 ‘limited edition’ with information on features of the model, followed by slogan, ‘Vorsprung Durch Technik’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>22/07</td>
<td>Positive Options</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Crisis pregnancy service</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Three women, individually declare their intentions to continue with their long-term plans despite their unplanned pregnancies, followed by information on service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>23/07</td>
<td>Eircom</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Phonewatch security systems</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Practical home-security tips plus promotion of Eircom alarm system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>24/07</td>
<td>Rennie</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Indigestion tablets</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Individuals speculate as to what causes heartburn followed by information on how Rennie can reduce stomach acid and relieve heartburn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>25/07</td>
<td>Homestore and More</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Homewares store</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Man muses on the gifts from Homestore and More which he will buy colleagues, friends, and family for Christmas followed by information on location of stores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>26/07</td>
<td>Global Home Improvements</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Home improvement product providers</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Scenario of telephone conversation in which two women discuss the benefits of new windows provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advert No.</td>
<td>Ref. No.</td>
<td>Company/Brand</td>
<td>Origin/Association</td>
<td>Product/Service</td>
<td>Sub-corpus</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>27/07</td>
<td>Butler’s Chocolates</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Irish-made chocolates</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>‘Perfect’ Christmas eve scene, enhanced by Butler’s chocolates is described. Background music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>28/07</td>
<td>ESB (Electricity Supply Board) and Age Action positive ageing charity organisation</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Safety advice</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Safety advice on electricity use from RTE presenter, Miriam O’Callaghan with background jingle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>29/07</td>
<td>Peat’s World of Electronics</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Electronics goods store</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Scenario in which a man asks his brother what he wants for Christmas. When his brother lists numerous products from Peat’s store, the man decides to give him a gift voucher for the store so he can choose what he wants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>30/07</td>
<td>Taxi Regulator</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Taxi service</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Christmas jingle with ‘seasonal reminder’ to book taxi or hackneys early to avoid stress during the Christmas period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>31/07</td>
<td>Trócaire</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Irish charitable organisation / Charity gifts</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Information on how to give global charity gifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>32/07</td>
<td>Eircom</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Homephone ‘Talktime package’</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Mother talks about how her teenage children are ‘talkers’ but talktime package keeps phone-bills down, followed by information on package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>33/07</td>
<td>Tesco</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>British multinational supermarket chain</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Information on half-price offers on Christmas desserts at store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>34/07</td>
<td>Superquinn</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Irish supermarket chain</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Promotion of meats for Christmas from butcher counter at store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>35/07</td>
<td>Menopause the Musical</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Musical show</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Song from musical performed by Irish entertainer ‘Twink’ play in background with promotional information on show.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>37/07</td>
<td>Irish Red Cross</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Irish charitable</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Appeal for donations for children conscripted as child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advert No.</td>
<td>Ref. No.</td>
<td>Company/Brand</td>
<td>Origin/Association</td>
<td>Product/Service</td>
<td>Sub-corpus</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>38/07</td>
<td>Barry’s Tea</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Irish blended tea</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Scenario in which a father recounts the story of his impulsive purchase of a traditional train-set as a Christmas gift for his children, sparked by his reminiscences of receiving such a train-set from Santa Claus as a boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>39/07</td>
<td>Volkswagen</td>
<td>German/International</td>
<td>German manufactured commercial vehicles</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>A man reminisces about the delivery of his family’s first TV set in a Volkswagen van plus information on features of van</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>40/07</td>
<td>Leopardstown Christmas horseracing festival</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Horseracing event</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Scenario in which Irish media personality, Hector O’hEochagáin, is found by friends to be cheating with regard to the consistent selection of Leopardstown racing festival as the venue for their Christmas outing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: Advertisement sub-corpora variety features analysis

Table 1.1 Advertisement sub-corpus 1977

**KEY:** Nrh (Non-Rhotic); Nrh-IrE (Non-Rhotic with Irish English features); Rhotic (Rh); ModD (Moderate Dublin); AdvD (Advanced Dublin); SrS (Supraregional southern); LocD (Local Dublin); Reg (Regional) Ir (Irish); Fr (French); NthAm (North American); SthAm (South American); Ger (German);

Ad Type: C (Comment only); A (Action only); A&C (Action and Comment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Ref. No.</th>
<th>Ad Type</th>
<th>Irish English variety features</th>
<th>Other variety features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accent</td>
<td>Dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flahavans Progress Oatlets 1/77</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunnes Stores 2/77</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Hotcup 3/77</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kleenex 4/77</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image magazine 5/77</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makem and Clancy album 6/77</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh (Reg) [læt] lot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxo 7/77</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Ref. No.</th>
<th>Ad Type</th>
<th>Irish English variety features</th>
<th>Other variety features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accent</td>
<td>Dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name/Ref. No.</td>
<td>Ad Type</td>
<td>Irish English variety features</td>
<td>Other variety features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accent</td>
<td>Dialect</td>
<td>Accent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dialect</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superquinn 8/77</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Travel 9/77</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Shout at the Devil' film 10/77</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nescafe Coffee 11/77</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procol 12/77</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucan House Furniture 13/77</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Survive' film 14/77</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellogs 15/77</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheepskin Shop 16/77</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxa salt 17/77</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name/Ref. No.</td>
<td>Ad Type</td>
<td>Irish English variety features</td>
<td>Other variety features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accent</td>
<td>Dialect</td>
<td>Accent</td>
<td>Dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crannach Furniture 18/77</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>NbrhIrE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Television Renters' Association 19/77</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Nbrh-IrE ([ʃətʃɪə] furniture)</td>
<td>Nbrh-IrE ([ʃə] go)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzer's 20/77</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Nbrh-IrE ([ʃə] your)</td>
<td>Nbrh-IrE ([ʃə] go)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC 21/77</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Nbrh-IrE ([ʃə] depositor)</td>
<td>Nbrh-IrE ([ʃə] go)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irel coffee 22/77</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Nbrh-IrE ([ʃə] market)</td>
<td>Nbrh-IrE ([ʃə] go)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ergas 23/77</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>R(E) (LocD) [nɔz] nice</td>
<td>Nbrh-IrE ([ʃəntə] winter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ergas is yer only man</td>
<td>Nbrh-IrE ([ʃəntə] think)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Nil aon tinteán mar do thinteán fein.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philips 24/77</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nbrh [ʃəntə] centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polycell 25/77</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Nbrh-IrE ([ʃəntə] dear)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ʃəntə] then</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name/Ref. No.</td>
<td>Ad Type</td>
<td>Irish English variety features</td>
<td>Other variety features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTV Rentals</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>[ofə]IrE offer</td>
<td>NthAm (pseudo) contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/77</td>
<td></td>
<td>[gou] go</td>
<td>NthAm Say, Santa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell's</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>[fleɪvə]IrE flavour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soups</td>
<td></td>
<td>[bjuː]IrE beautiful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/77</td>
<td></td>
<td>[stɪ]IrE served</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glorney's</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>[ɡbəˈniːz]IrE Glorney's</td>
<td>Nth-Am (pseudo) contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/77</td>
<td></td>
<td>[nuː]IrE new</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donaghmede</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>[fɑː.mə.ɹi]IrE pharmacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td></td>
<td>[pʊst] post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>29/77</td>
<td>[oʊr]IrE Orla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzer's</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>[ɔrə]IrE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/77</td>
<td></td>
<td>[njuː]IrE new</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philips</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>[mɔr]IrE more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microwave</td>
<td></td>
<td>[hi ɪ]IrE heat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ovens</td>
<td>31/77</td>
<td>[wɪntə]IrE winter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philips</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>[mɑːrgreɪt] Margaret</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumbler drier</td>
<td>32/77</td>
<td>[mɑːrgreɪt] Margaret</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polydor</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>[mɑːrgreɪt] Margaret</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilows Showband album</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>[mɑːrgreɪt] Margaret</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33/77</td>
<td></td>
<td>[njuː]IrE new</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name/Ref. No.</td>
<td>Ad Type</td>
<td>Irish English variety features</td>
<td>Other variety features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accent</td>
<td>Dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzer’s 35/77</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rh (SrS)</td>
<td>[ræ.ðər]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina Ricci perfume 36/77</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh (SrS)</td>
<td>[ræ.ðər]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayto crisps 37/77</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Rh (SrS)</td>
<td>[rɪ.və]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton Mill Boys album 38/77</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rh (SrS)</td>
<td>[kwəsət]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedex 39/77</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh (SrS)</td>
<td>[kwəsət]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnott’s 40/77</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 1.2  Advert exclusions according to analyses criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1977 sub-corpus</th>
<th>Excl. A* Ad Ref. No.</th>
<th>Broad variety analysis: Total ads (see chapter 5, Table 5.1)</th>
<th>Excl. B** Ad Ref. No.</th>
<th>SSBE Irish English analysis: Total ads (see Chapter 5, Table 5.2; 5.6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Action components: 11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(37/77) (-1)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Comment components: 36</td>
<td>(7/77) (-1)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Action and Comment ads: 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excl. A: Indicates ads excluded on basis of inability to distinguish between rhotic and non-rhotic accents (see chapter 4, section 4.7.1)

**Excl. B: Indicates ads excluded on basis of displaying accents other than Irish English or SSBE (see chapter 4, section 4.7.2)

For figures on which intra-varietal accent sub-variety analysis is based, see Table 5.3: Fraction/percentage of ad components displaying rhotic (IrE) and non-rhotic (SSBE) accent.
Table 2.1 Advertisement sub-corpus 1987

**KEY:** Nh (Non-Rhotic); Nh-IrE (Non-Rhotic with Irish English features); Rhotic (Rh); ModD (Moderate Dublin); AdvD (Advanced Dublin); SrS (Supra-regional southern); LocD (Local Dublin); Reg (Regional); Ir (Irish); Fr (French); NthAm (North American); SthAm (South American); Ger (German);

Ad Type: C (Comment only); A (Action only); A&C (Action and Comment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Ref. No.</th>
<th>Ad Type</th>
<th>Irish English variety features</th>
<th>Other variety features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Accent</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dialect</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzer’s, Todd’s, Cash’s, Moone’s 1/87</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh (LocD)</td>
<td>[hʌr] hurry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard’s TV&amp;HiFi 2/87</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh (SrS)</td>
<td>[fruː] fruit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siucra 3/87</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh (SrS)</td>
<td>[fɾu.t] fruit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perrier 6/87</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh (Reg)</td>
<td>[bəˈləʊ] below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Ref. No.</th>
<th>Ad Type</th>
<th>Irish English variety features</th>
<th>Other variety features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dun-laoghaire Shopping Centre 7/87</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Rh (SrS) [mɪn tʃ] minute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magic Cooking bags 8/87</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervalu 9/87</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend Fabric Conditioner 10/87</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rh (SrS) [mæsts] whites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESB Storage heaters 11/87</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Seas capsules 12/87</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Shopping Centre, 13/87</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rh (SrS) [væraɪə] variety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Vincent de Paul 14/87</td>
<td>A &amp; C</td>
<td>Rh (LocD) [piː.jæ] please</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batchelor's Peas 15/87</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Rh (Reg) [ɡroʊz]</td>
<td>Nrh [bɑ. ni] Barney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name/Ref. No.</td>
<td>Ad Type</td>
<td>Irish English variety features</td>
<td>Other variety features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accent</td>
<td>Dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillorgan Shopping Centre 16/87</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perrier 17/87</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh (LocD)</td>
<td>[ŋ] hot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic Homecare 18/87</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodak 19/87</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Post Christmas stamps 20/87</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Safety 21/87</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galtee Singles 22/87</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berger paints 23/87</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunnes Stores 24/87</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Stillorgan Shopping Centre 16/87: Action - Accent, Dialect
- Perrier 17/87: Accent - Dialect, Accent
- Atlantic Homecare 18/87: Accent
- Kodak 19/87: Accent
- An Post Christmas stamps 20/87: Accent
- Fire Safety 21/87: Accent
- Galtee Singles 22/87: Accent
- Berger paints 23/87: Accent
- Dunnes Stores 24/87: Accent

- Stillorgan Shopping Centre 16/87: Comment - Fr (pseudo) [ed] head
- Perrier 17/87: Comment - Plaisir d'amour
- Atlantic Homecare 18/87: Comment
- Kodak 19/87: Comment
- An Post Christmas stamps 20/87: Comment
- Fire Safety 21/87: Comment
- Galtee Singles 22/87: Comment
- Berger paints 23/87: Comment
- Dunnes Stores 24/87: Comment

- Stillorgan Shopping Centre 16/87: Other Variety Features - Nrh [ɪmpɔːtʃant] important
- Perrier 17/87: Other Variety Features - Nrh-IrE [ŋrɪʃ] healer [həʊm] home
- Atlantic Homecare 18/87: Other Variety Features - Nrh-IrE [ŋrɪʃ] air [ɡreɪt] great
- Kodak 19/87: Other Variety Features - Nrh-IrE [ŋrɪʃ] card [lʊkəl] local
- Fire Safety 21/87: Other Variety Features - NthAm [fɑːr] fire
- Galtee Singles 22/87: Other Variety Features - Nrh-IrE [ŋrɪʃ] star [ðeɪ] the
- Dunnes Stores 24/87: Other Variety Features - Nrh-IrE [ŋrɪʃ] more [ðəm] them
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Ref. No.</th>
<th>Ad Type</th>
<th>Irish English variety features</th>
<th>Other variety features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accent</td>
<td>Dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accent</td>
<td>Dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accent</td>
<td>Dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accent</td>
<td>Dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superquinn</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>[dər] dear</td>
<td>Nrh-IrE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[hju:mə] humour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[dərnə] dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundrum</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nrh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[sentə] centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre 26/87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnott’s</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nrh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ærnts] Arnott’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Win Electric</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nrh-IrE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[æ:ə]are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[tʃəns] chance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTE Guide</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nrh-IrE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ɪntəvju] interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[njuːz] news</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw’s</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nrh-IrE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[spɑ:klɪŋ] sparkling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[trəzər] trousers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunnes Stores</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nrh-IrE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[stɔ:zə] stores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[kəʊst] cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews’s liver salts</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nrh-IrE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32/87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[spə:k]sparkle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[wen] when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinnsworth</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>[bʊ dʒət] budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33/87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chivers</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nrh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34/87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[prɪzə:vətiv] preservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name/Ref. No.</td>
<td>Ad Type</td>
<td>Irish English variety features</td>
<td>Other variety features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Pen 35/87</td>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>Rh (SrS) [dɪs] this</td>
<td>Nrh-IrE [keə] care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtain Centre 36/87</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rh (SrS) [dɪs] this</td>
<td>Nrh-IrE [sə:vɪs] service, [a.ˈfɑːr] after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodak batteries 37/87</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rh (SrS) [dɪs] this</td>
<td>Nrh-IrE [pəˈcaʊə] power, [lɑːstrɪŋ] lasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Londis (wines) 38/87</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rh (SrS) [fɔːrtiːn] fourteen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Highway Album 39/87</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rh (SrS) [dɪs] this</td>
<td>Nrh [westən] western</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philips Hostess Trolley 40/87</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Rh (SrS) [advəns] advance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.2 Advert exclusions according to analyses criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1987 sub-corpus</th>
<th>Excl. A* Ad Ref. No.</th>
<th>Broad variety analysis: Total ads (see chapter 5, Table 5.1)</th>
<th>Excl. B** Ad Ref. No.</th>
<th>SSBE Irish English analysis: Total ads (see Chapter 5, Table 5.2; 5.6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Action components: 14</td>
<td>(22/87) (-1)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(21/87) (-1)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Comment components: 35</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Action and Comment ads: 9</td>
<td>(22/87) (-1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excl. A: Indicates ads excluded on basis of inability to distinguish between rhotic and non-rhotic accents (see chapter 4, section 4.7.1)

**Excl. B: Indicates ads excluded on basis of displaying accents other than Irish English or SSBE (see chapter 4, section 4.7.2)

For figures on which intra-varietal accent sub-variety analysis is based, see Table 5.3: Fraction/percentage of ad components displaying rhotic (IrE) and non-rhotic (SSBE) accent.
Table 3.1 Advertisement sub-corpus 1997

**KEY:** Nrh (Non-Rhotic); Nrh-IrE (Non-Rhotic with Irish English features); Rhotic (Rh); ModD (Moderate Dublin); AdvD (Advanced Dublin; SrS (Supraregional southern) LocD (Local Dublin); Reg (Regional) Ir (Irish); Fr (French); NthAm (North American); SthAm (South American); Ger (German); Ad Type: C (Comment only); A (Action only); A&C (Action and Comment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Ref.</th>
<th>Ad Type</th>
<th>Irish English variety features</th>
<th>Other variety features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accent</td>
<td>Dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garda Band album 1/97</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rh (SrS) [stə:rt] start</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT Phones 2/97</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh(LocD) [kət] cuttin</td>
<td>Rh(SrS) [slɔn] slán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glad Alufoil 4/97</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh(AdvD) [fɔst] foil</td>
<td>Rh (SrS) [betə] better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Kidney Association 5/97</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rh (SrS) [lɛt] lit [haʊmz] homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Londis 6/97</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rh (ModD) [stæf] staff</td>
<td>Londis [loʊndis] Londis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name/Ref. No.</td>
<td>Ad Type</td>
<td>Irish English variety features</td>
<td>Other variety features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irish English variety features</strong></td>
<td><strong>Other variety features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accent</td>
<td>Dialect</td>
<td>Accent</td>
<td>Dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campbell’s Soup 7/97</strong></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rh(SrS)</td>
<td>[æʊ] out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B&amp;G Wines 8/97</strong></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domestos Power spray 9/97</strong></td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh (SrS)</td>
<td>[dæt] that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rh (SrS)</td>
<td>[næstɪ] nasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dunnes Stores 10/97</strong></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cockburn’s Port 11/97</strong></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rh (SrS)</td>
<td>[nəʊz] nose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ryan Hotel Holiday voucher 12/97</strong></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rh (SrS)</td>
<td>[læst] last</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RTE Guide 13/97</strong></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cablelink 14/97</strong></td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh (Reg)</td>
<td>[goʊ] go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>appetite on you</td>
<td>Rh(AdvD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liveline against Drink Driving 15/97</strong></td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh (SrS)</td>
<td>[roʊʊnəʊ] phoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>drink on me</td>
<td>Rh (SrS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Erin Homestyle Soups 16/97</strong></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rh(AdvD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rh** (Reg) / **Rh** (SrS) / **Rh** (AdvD) / **Nrh** (IrE)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Ref. No.</th>
<th>Ad Type</th>
<th>Irish English variety features</th>
<th>Other variety features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accent</td>
<td>Dialect</td>
<td>Accent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy McCarthy album</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rh (SrS)</td>
<td>[mæst] while</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coca Cola 18/97</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rh (ModD)</td>
<td>[kaʊka] coca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persil non-bio 19/97</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh(LocD)</td>
<td>[le.hər] later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesco-Quinns-worth-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rh (ModD)</td>
<td>[sændes] Sunday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crazy Prices 20/97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesco-Quinns-worth-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rh (ModD)</td>
<td>[næu] now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crazy Prices 21/97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Ellen Wine 22/97</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh (SrS)</td>
<td>[hɔ] boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Street 23/97</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh (SrS)</td>
<td>[mou] moments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trócaire 24/97</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh (ModD)</td>
<td>[sænd] send</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Piat d’Or Wine 25/97</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh (ModD)</td>
<td>[sænd] send</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel O’Donnell album</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rh (SrS)</td>
<td>[hɔu] hope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name/Ref. No.</td>
<td>Ad Type</td>
<td>Irish English variety features</td>
<td>Other variety features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accent</td>
<td>Dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accent</td>
<td>Dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/97</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accent Rh (AdvD) [stəʊ] stores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roches Stores 27/97</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnotts 28/97</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh (Reg) [ærnəts] Arnotts Rh (ModD) [klɒz] clothes Rh(AdvD) [ɡeɪt] get</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rh (SrS) [ærnəts] Arnotts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelio Montes Wines 29/97</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trocaire (El Salvador) 30/97</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh (Reg) [tæˈdɛ] today Rh(AdvD) [pəʊ.ɡi] party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Union 31/97</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh (ModD) [seŋd] send</td>
<td>SthAm [wɪmən] women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glad Alu-foil 32/97</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh(AdvD) [fɔɪl] foil</td>
<td>NthAm [ɡɔːrdʒəs] gorgeous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Vincent de Paul 33/97</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry’s Tea 34/97</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alka Seltzer 35/97</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadbury’s Rose 36/97</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh(AdvD) [pæntəʊ] panto Rh (ModD) [ræzəz] roses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NthAm [stəʊmark] stomach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NthAm [ɡɔːrdʒəs] gorgeous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NthAm [ɡɔːrdʒəs] gorgeous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Irish English variety features**
- **Other variety features**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Ref. No.</th>
<th>Ad Type</th>
<th>Irish English variety features</th>
<th>Other variety features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accent</td>
<td>Dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kleenex 37/97</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibernian 38/97</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh(Reg)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry’s Tea 39/97</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry’s Tea 40/97</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh (SrS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.2 Advert exclusions according to analyses criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1997 subcorpus</th>
<th>Excl. A*</th>
<th>Broad variety analysis: Total ads (see chapter 5, Table 5.1)</th>
<th>Excl. B***</th>
<th>SSBE Irish English analysis: Total ads (see Chapter 5, Table 5.2; 5.6)</th>
<th>Excl. C***</th>
<th>Accent sub-variety analysis: Total ads (see Chapter 6, Table 6.2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997 subcorpus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excl. A*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad Ref. No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Action components: 22</td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>22'97; 24/97; 25/97; 29/97; 30/97; 32/97; 35/97 (-7)</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>34/97; 37/97; 39/97 (-3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Comment components: 40</td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>22/97; 25/97 (-2)</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>3/97; 8/97; 10/97; 13/97; 19/97; 29/97; 33/97; 34/97; 35/97; 37/97; 38/97; 40/97 (-12)</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Action and Comment ads: 22</td>
<td><strong>36/97; 39/97 (-2)</strong></td>
<td><strong>22'97; 24/97; 25/97; 29/97; 30/97; 32/97; 35/97 (-7)</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>19/97; 34/97; 37/97; 38/97; 40/97 (-5)</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excl. A: Indicates ads excluded on basis of inability to distinguish between rhotic and non-rhotic accents (see chapter 4, section 4.7.1)

**Excl. B: Indicates ads excluded on basis of displaying accents other than Irish English or SSBE (see chapter 4, section 4.7.2)

***Excl. C: Indicates ads excluded on basis of displaying accents other than Irish English in ‘Action and Comment’ ads (see chapter 4, section 4.8.2)
Table 4.1: Advertisement subcorpus 2007

**KEY:** Nrh (Non-Rhotic); Nrh-IrE (Non-Rhotic with Irish English features); Rhotic (Rh); ModD (Moderate Dublin); AdvD (Advanced Dublin); SrS (Supraregional southern); LocD (Local Dublin); Reg (Regional); Ir (Irish); Fr (French); NthAm (North American); SthAm (South American); Ger (German);

Ad Type: C (Comment only); A (Action only); A&C (Action and Comment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Ref.No.</th>
<th>Ad. Type</th>
<th>Irish English variety features</th>
<th>Other variety features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accent</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dialect</strong></td>
<td><strong>Accent</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dialect</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spar Hospital 1/07</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh(Reg) den then</td>
<td>Rh(AdvD) sparkly Santy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTE Cór na nÓg 2/07</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rh(AdvD)</td>
<td>more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eircom Talktime 3/07</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh(AdvD) YorK</td>
<td>Rh(AdvD) rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam 4/07</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rh(AdvD) org</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors Money Lifetime Loan 5/07</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rh(Reg) record</td>
<td>penalties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11890 Directory enquiries 6/07</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rh (SrS) forty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Cancer Initiative 7/07</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh (SrS) no</td>
<td>Rh(Reg) 1rt support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnott's 8/07</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rh (SrS) limit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Licence 9/07</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh(AdvD) deleted</td>
<td>Rh (SrS) eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name/Ref.No.</td>
<td>Ad. Type</td>
<td>Irish English variety features</td>
<td>Other variety features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prize Bonds 10/07</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Accent Rh (SrS) [bændz] bonds Dialect Rh(AdvD) [kə:ɾ] call</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bord Bia Quality Mark 11/07 C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Action Rh(AdvD) [næz] not</td>
<td>Other Variety features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Aid Helpline 12/07 A&amp;C Rh (SrS)</td>
<td>Rh(AdvD)</td>
<td>Accent Rh(AdvD) [næz] not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super Valu 13/07 C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Action Rh (SrS) [kloʊsə] closer</td>
<td>Other Variety features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPA Year Book 14/07 C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Action Rh (SrS) [jʊərə] euro</td>
<td>Other Variety features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mondello Park Gift Voucher 15/07 A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh(AdvD)</td>
<td>Accent Rh(AdvD) [əvər tʃət] available</td>
<td>Other Variety features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILAC Shopping Centre 16/07 C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Action Rh(AdvD) [spəʊld] spoiled</td>
<td>Other Variety features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Blood Transfusion Service 17/07 C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Action Rh(AdvD) [wel] well</td>
<td>Other Variety features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSE (Health Services Executive) 18/07 C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Action Rh (SrS) [wɜ əm] warm</td>
<td>Other Variety features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McCormack Icon of an Age CD 19/07 C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Action Rh(AdvD) [məkərə] McCormack [greɪt] great</td>
<td>Other Variety features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council for the Blind 20/07 C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Action Rh [sɑpə:t] support</td>
<td>Other Variety features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name/Ref/No.</td>
<td>Ad. Type</td>
<td>Irish English variety features</td>
<td>Other variety features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audi A6 21/07</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Accent: Rh (SrS) [douz] those</td>
<td>Dialect:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive options 22/07</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Accent: Rh (SrS) [kɔldʒ] college</td>
<td>Dialect: Rh(AdvD) [fɔː] four [heIp] help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eircum Phonewatch 23/07</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Accent: Rh(ModD) [kərɪz] curries</td>
<td>Dialect: Rh(SrS) [æsəd]acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homestore &amp; More 25/07</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Accent: Rh(AdvD) [rɪ.ter] retail [paŋk] park</td>
<td>Dialect: the ma/the gran etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Home Improvements 26/07</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Accent: Rh (SrS) [həʊm] home</td>
<td>Dialect: Rh (SrS) [həʊm] home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler’s Chocolates 27/07</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Accent: Rh (SrS) [wɜːld] world</td>
<td>Dialect:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESB Age Action 28/07</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Accent: Rh(AdvD) [həʊm] home</td>
<td>Dialect:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pear’s World of Electronics 29/07</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Accent: Rh(AdvD) [vɔː] voucher [oː] or</td>
<td>Dialect: NthAm bro’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi Regulator 30/07</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Accent: Rh(ModD) [dʒust] just</td>
<td>Dialect: just like yourself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trocaire Global Gifts 31/07</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Accent: Rh (SrS) [regjʊələr] regulator</td>
<td>Dialect:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name/Ref.No.</td>
<td>Ad. Type</td>
<td>Irish English variety features</td>
<td>Other variety features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accent</td>
<td>Dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesco Half price offer 33/07</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rh (SrS) [weɪn] waiting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superquinn 34/07</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rh(AdvD) meal [kəʊntə] counter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menopause the Musical 35/07</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rh (SrS) [juːro] euro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Diamond album 36/07</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross – 37/07</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rh (ModD) cross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry’s Tea 38/07</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh (SrS) [kould] cold</td>
<td>Rh(Reg) beat [bɛt]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mam/that beat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volkswagen 39/07</td>
<td>A&amp;C</td>
<td>Rh(Reg) [dɪs] this</td>
<td>Rh(AdvD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leopardstown Christmas Festival 40/07</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Rh(Reg) [nɔ] know [dær] there</td>
<td>Sure (PM) [lads]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 4.2 Advert exclusions according to analyses criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007 subcorpus</th>
<th>Broad variety analysis: Total ads (see chapter 5, Table 5.1)</th>
<th>SSBE Irish English analysis: Total ads (see Chapter 5, Table 5.2; .5.6)</th>
<th>Accent sub-variety analysis: Total ads (see Chapter 6, Table 6.2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Action components: 18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Comment components: 36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36; 12/97; 19/97; 20/97; 36/97 (-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Action and Comment ads: 14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12/07 (-1)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excl. A*: Indicates ads excluded on basis of inability to distinguish between rhotic and non-rhotic accents (see chapter 4, section 4.7.1)

**Excl. B**: Indicates ads excluded on basis of displaying accents other than Irish English or SSBE (see chapter 4, section 4.7.2)

***Excl. C***: Indicates ads excluded on basis of displaying accents other than Irish English in ‘Action and Comment’ ads (see chapter 4, section 4.8.2)
APPENDIX C: Transcription conventions*

( ) pause

((sound)) sound which is difficult to represent phonetically e.g.((clatter))

word emphasis

_WORD_ increased emphasis

? question intonation

word:: elongation of the sound

↑word(s) rising intonation

°word(s)° fall in pitch

heh heh laughter

(word) unclear: an approximation of the word

( ) unclear: not possible to decipher the word

[word(s)]

Square brackets in bold text aligned across adjacent lines denote overlapping talk. In order to distinguish these square brackets from those used in phonetic representations of words, the square brackets used for overlaps are in bold text.

In the example below, the beginning of overlapping talk of speakers M1 and F1 is indicated by the aligned opening brackets, [ , and the end of the overlap is indicated by the aligned closing brackets, ], in Lines 001 and 002. Similarly, in Lines 003 and 004, overlapping talk is shown between the aligned (bold) square brackets.
Example from Advert 6.3 (Ref. 14/97) Cablelink

001 M1: [(this) (                )] -

002 F1: [Daddy (.) are nine] sprouts enough for you [ja] the ?

003 F1: [is it nine]

004 M1: [ah Lord ] no that’s –

>word(s)< faster speech

<word(s)> slower speech

word – ‘cut-off’ sound

w(h)ord laughter particles embedded in word

.hh in-breath
