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Abstract

In the current language dynamic of Ireland, the number of L1 speakers of Irish within the Gaeltacht areas is diminishing. The home language of the Gaeltacht is gradually shifting towards Irish-English bilingualism, and English only. This fact has been well documented in research (Ó Riagáin 1992; Ó Giollagáin, Mac Donnacha, Ní Chualáin, Ní Shéaghdha, O’Brien 2007).

The decline of the Irish language can be examined in an alternative mode to assessing the number of speakers, by examining the spoken Irish of those living in a Gaeltacht area. The insertion of words from another language, English, French or Latin, into Irish language discourse is by no means a new phenomenon. Today however, it is the English language that is the primary language inserted into Irish during spoken discourse and this mixed speech is the focus of this thesis. Using the Matrix Language Framework, an analytical tool developed by Myers-Scotton (1993, 1998, 2002, 2005), the stability of the coexisting languages can be ascertained.

This thesis focuses on data from an original speech sample: young adults speakers of Irish attending a newly-founded Gaeltacht high school and determines, by linguistic analysis whether a shift towards English is underway in their spoken Irish. The data is also located within the context of the language ideological debates in the region and a close examination of Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht is carried out to enhance the sociolinguistic factors that contribute to CM. The analysis findings combined with a contextual examination provide a method of understanding the Irish language status on a more individual, realistic basis rather than assessing the number of speakers.

The analysis confirms that the bilingual setting of the case study, despite local ideological language debates, is stable with the majority of the analysis adhering to the theoretical principles. The thesis also explores the idea of peak language usage and exposure, and posits that a lack of domains in which monolingual interaction occurs in Irish contributes to the use of code-mixing as a new language variation.
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Chapter One: Introduction

Irish society, north and south, is changing and the status of the Irish language is changing with it. (Mac Giolla Chriost 2012: 398)

1.1 Introduction to the Thesis

This thesis concentrates on the linguistic phenomenon of code-mixing (CM hereafter) between Irish and English as evident in a spoken language corpus gathered from young adults living in a Gaeltacht¹ area. The primary focal point of this research is the linguistic analysis of the speech sample with a secondary focus on the contextual location of the fieldwork area. The age group of the participants, 16-18 years, is unresearched from this perspective, and combined with the unique context of the social dynamics of the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht, provides an exceptional opportunity for research into current Irish language practices and ideologies.

The informant-participants are in their final year of schooling at Pobalscoil Chorca Dhuibhne, the relatively new community secondary school, founded in 2007, in the town of An Daingean², located in the southwest of Ireland. At this year of their Irish-medium education the students are assumed to be competent - though not necessarily fluent - in Irish but with varying degrees of ability and home usage of the language. This Irish-medium school combined with the home usage of Irish, creates an environment of peak contact with the language, and most students are at the pinnacle of their language usage and ability, unless they choose to continue using Irish after their time in state education. Therefore, these informants provide an insight into the current CM characteristics of Gaeltacht Irish-speakers as well as allowing for a linguistic trajectory for the language to be outlined based on previous research.

¹ The Gaeltacht consists of Irish-speaking areas in Ireland, primarily located along the western seaboard. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the Gaeltacht is optimistically defined as ‘A region of Ireland in which the vernacular language is Irish.’ The word is also applied to the Gaelic-speaking areas of Scotland but is translated as the Highlands, which cover a much larger geographical portion of Scotland than the Gaelic-speaking areas.

² The place-name of this town, as will be detailed in chapter four, was disputed. For the purposes of uniformity rather than preference, the Irish name will be used throughout the thesis.
CM is a trait of a speaker drawing on two codes [languages, dialects, styles] that are familiar to, or in common with, the intended interlocutor or audience. For the purpose of this research project the code will signify a language, and the languages under scrutiny are Irish and English. CM can be analysed from more than one perspective, for example it can be discussed in terms of linguistic influence on the languages used, the marked and unmarked use of a language, and the conveyance of stance through language choice. While initial studies into the phenomena deemed the practice of CM as a trait of a weak or lazy bilingual (Haugen 1950), it is now also understood to be a characteristic of a proficient bilingual and displays a complex use of two or more languages. The study of CM as a trait of bilingual speech is conducted along a continuum from the linguistic (Myers-Scotton 1993, 1998, 2002; Deuchar 2006, 2009) to the sociolinguistic (Gafaranga 2007; Auer 2002; Gardner-Chloros 2009). Ferguson (1959: 249) deems it important to focus on the mixed speech by stating that descriptivist research usually prefers detailed descriptions of ‘pure’ dialects or standard languages rather than the careful study of the mixed, intermediate forms often in wider use.

Research into CM in Ireland has been sporadic and generally focused on specific language situations: education, radio, interview, newspaper columns, poetry (Hickey 1999, 2001, 2009; O’Malley-Madec 2001, 2007; Ni Laoire 2009, 2012; Illes 2006; Mac Mathúna 2007). Generally the CM in Ireland carries a negative tone, often written with a purist approach or blaming factors for the characteristic’s widespread prominence, for example the mixing of L1 and L2 learners in the school thus requiring contrasting language targets. The research, however, of Stenson (1990, 1991, 1993) provides a detailed linguistic breakdown of CM and this will be used as a reference point for the development of Irish-English CM and the ‘influence of English’ (Stenson 1993) since her work was published over twenty years ago. Stenson’s research presents the CM pattern between Irish and English as ‘insertional’, and the question of whether this is currently the mode of CM will be addressed in this thesis.

This introductory chapter will outline the research questions that form the basis of this study and outline the content of each subsequent chapter. It will then continue to present a summary of the Irish language in Ireland including a brief historic overview and a
discussion of its present status: incorporating language contact, language policies and recent developments. Considering that the corpus for this project was gathered from a Gaeltacht area of Ireland, a general background to the Gaeltacht itself is necessary for a contextual and sociolinguistic understanding. A critical perspective of the cultural associations and assumptions of the Gaeltacht regions and populations will also be introduced.

1.2 Focus of the thesis

The aim of this research is to examine the use of CM in the Irish spoken by young adults and to determine whether the CM reflects stability between Irish and English or a convergence towards English. By applying a theoretical framework, Myers-Scotton’s Matrix Language Framework (MLF hereafter) (1993, 1998, 2002) to the corpus, the stability of the two languages within mixed speech can be determined. This close-analysis of mixed speech will flag any convergence towards English which would indicate a linguistic shift towards English, with accompanying Irish language degeneration. If, however, there is no apparent convergence and the theoretical framework upholds, this indicates a level of stability within the language contact situation and a distinction between both languages during the CM process. This linguistic analysis is accompanied by an assessment of the sociolinguistic factors relating to the participants, the location of the fieldwork and the broader national context. Questions of ethnicity identifiers, cultural hybridity and stance will be discussed in relation to the young adult speakers, and these issues can be further extended to the entire Gaeltacht area of Ireland.

1.2.1 Research Questions

The thesis has one dominant research question that leads to several secondary questions. While the fundamental questions were established at the outset of the project, some of the topics evolved over the course of the research, and were deemed pertinent to the validity of the study and in contributing to the field of Irish language studies. As will become apparent throughout the thesis, the topic of Irish-English CM is limited, with Stenson (1990, 1991, 1993) being the first and sole researcher of the phenomenon for almost a decade. In recent years, there has been an increase research (Hickey 2001, 2004, 2009; Ó Malley-Madec 2001, 2007; Ni Laoire 2009, 2012; Mac Mathúna 2007; Ó Duibhir
2009; Ó Domagáin 2013; Mac Fhlannchadha 1999) but none of these studies discuss the characteristic with a focus on the linguistic equilibrium between both languages in mixed speech. The research questions are listed as follows:

- Can Irish-English CM, as supported by the spoken corpus, support the Matrix Language Theory that denotes a case of ‘classic’ CM?
- Is this mixed speech a/the peak of language use and ability for the young adult participants?
- Can the participants’ stance towards the Irish language be determined through the data collected?
- What does the analysis contribute to the research trajectory of Irish-English language contact?

While some issues are confined to individual chapters, the specific focus of each chapter will be drawn together in the final and concluding chapter. The chapters are summarised as follows.

1.2.2 Chapter Two: An Approach to a Theoretical Analysis

The phenomenon of CM is a complex trait of bilingualism and this is reflected in the various methods of analysis, ranging from purely linguistic examination to conversational analysis. This chapter will outline the context in which CM occurs: situations of language contact, and CM is discussed along with examples of the pro- and contra-perspectives of its use. The linguistic terms code-mixing, code-switching, loanwords, borrowings and switches are defined and attitudes towards this trait of mixed speech are outlined. International literature will be referenced in this review, however close attention will be focused on CM research between English and the Celtic languages Welsh and Gaelic. The chapter will conclude by summarising the theoretical analysis that will be applied to the spoken corpus: the MLF model (Myers-Scotton 1993, 1998, 2002) which states that there will be a matrix or dominant language if the data is a ‘classic’ case of CM, and this should be established in the strong majority of clauses. A summary of the theoretical approach, including the unit of analysis, will be outlined while highlighting the revisions to the framework applied by its author Myers-Scotton between 1993 and 2002. The MLF is not undisputed however with MacSwan (2005a, 2005b) being a most vocal opponent and this dispute is briefly explored.
1.2.3 Chapter Three: A Review of Irish-English CM Research

A review of the research undertaken on Irish-English CM is conducted with the intention of placing the analysis findings from this project within the context of the ongoing research. Although CM research is a relatively recently developed branch of linguistic studies, some researchers have examined language samples retrospectively (Mac Mathúna 2007; Stenson 1990). The work carried out on Irish-English mixing, however, is limited with only a handful of researchers concentrating on this specific phenomenon. As a result there has been little effort to determine whether the influence of English has a morphosyntactical effect on the language rather than solely contributing vocabulary, with words that can be assimilated or used in their bare form.

The phenomenon of CM has been taking place in Ireland for an extended amount of time and this is evident in the established loanwords within the national language lexicon. There will be a comprehensive discussion of loanwords from English and other languages, a topic that is quite complex given the disparity highlighted by Ni Ghearáin (2011) in native speakers not adopting new terminology into their language repertoires and the pace at which the language is expanding.

1.2.4 Chapter Four: The Sociolinguistic Context of the Project

The sociolinguistic and contextual setting for the research project is detailed in this chapter. While a brief summary to the status of Irish and the Gaeltacht is provided in this introductory chapter, a detailed examination of the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht is presented here. The main focus is on the two debates associated with this Gaeltacht area in recent years and how this reflects the hierarchical dichotomy and the overt language ideological debate (Blommaert 1999) ongoing over Irish, English and bilingualism. These local disputes seem to have disrupted the stability of the language community, presented ideological dilemmas for the residents of the area and created a divide in the community. A review of the media coverage of both the language debates will emphasise emerging discourses that will be lined up with the local and national discourses. This chapter will discuss the evolving identity of Irish speakers and the notion of the Gaeltacht as a cultural entity by exploring ideas of identity. The discussion is enhanced by a multidisciplinary
approach to the research, drawing on postcolonial theory (Bhabha 2005) and political/historical science (Anderson 1991).

1.2.5 Chapter Five: Fieldwork Methodology
Fieldwork for this research project was carried out in December 2008 in two parts: a questionnaire and a recorded speech sample. This chapter discusses the approach to the fieldwork methodology and the course of fieldwork from initial communication with the potential participants to final transcription of the recorded data. This methodology will be supported with references to other researchers working with the Irish language, with recorded speech and with young adults. The final methodological approach will be supported and justified as the most effective mode within the fieldwork setting. The chapter will include retrospective comments on the data collection and reflections on the fieldwork process. A demographical summary of the participants will be drawn up to outline the overall profile of the participant group.

1.2.7 Chapter Six: Participant Profiles
Questionnaires were used in the fieldwork to allow for the participant profiles to be compiled and to present information regarding their relationships to the Irish language. Each participant’s language profile is presented and discussed, with particular focus on language domains and attitudes. Particular attention is paid to the questions regarding the language spoken at home and where necessary a comparison will be drawn from the recorded speech sample. The overall information from the questionnaires will provide an insight into the Irish language domains of these young adults resident in Corca Dhuibhne. Their speech patterns and attitudes towards language use will be related to the larger issues associated with language competition and ideology in the area. This chapter contains a short discussion on inter-generational shift and explores the idea of peak language usage and exposure.

1.2.6 Chapter Seven: Analysis of the Corpus
This chapter will present a close-examination of the corpus that was collected, almost 60,000 transcribed words in total and approximately seven hours of recorded, semi-formal speech. Through the application of the MLF (Myers-Scotton 1993, 1998, 2002), it will be assessed whether the practice of CM is a ‘classic’ case of CM. While this theory
is aimed at proficient bilingual speakers, any contribution from weaker speakers will be analysed where possible. Aspects of the corpus that the MLF fails to support will be outlined and suggestions for their analysis and categorisation will be put forward. A secondary analysis of the corpus will present characteristics of the dataset and posit whether there are any new developments incongruous to the trajectory of previous research carried out in the same region (Sjoestedt-Jonval 1938; Stenson 1990, 1993; Ó Sé 2000). The findings will also be situated among the research of Irish-English CM carried out both in and outside Gaeltacht areas (Ó Domagáin 2013; Ó Duibhir 2009; Hickey 2007; Mac Mathúna 2007). The chapter will conclude with a discussion of loanwords and a conversational analysis of the corpus to indicate switching motivations and stance.

1.2.8 Chapter Eight: Discussion and Conclusion
The thesis will conclude with a final discussion of the research questions in light of the research findings: is the pattern of CM practiced by the participants a case of ‘classic’ CM as presented by the MLF; has the influence of English become apparent via convergence in Irish; does the question of cultural identity associated with the Gaeltacht need to be reviewed; is the diminishing number of L1 speakers of Irish reflected in the spoken language; and how do the research findings contribute to the trajectory of Irish-English language contact. The stability of the bilingual context of the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht will be presented on the basis of the language practices of the participants, their sociospatial linguistic patterns, language attitudes and stance. Areas of research that are outwith the scope of this research project will be indicated for potential further development.

1.3 The Irish Language: A Brief History
The Irish language was the vernacular across the island for thousands of years and is the oldest spoken literary language in Europe (Government of Ireland 2010: 5) or, more accurately, Irish has the longest vernacular literary tradition. Over the course of history the language has experienced contact with other languages: Latin, Norse, Norman French and English. The long-term exposure and contact with Norse, French and English is evident in loanwords established in Middle and Modern Irish and this will be discussed in chapter three. The extended contact with English is ongoing and evidence of language
contact is apparent in both English and Irish as a result of the duo-directionality of influence. The impact of Irish on the English language evolved in the form of Hiberno-English (Hibernia being the Latin for Ireland). Bliss (1972: 63) states that:

> It can be demonstrated on purely linguistic grounds that modern Hiberno English is based on the English of the mid-seventeenth century; and it is, of course, historically very plausible that the Cromwellian plantations should have introduced into Ireland a type of English which would remain little affected by subsequent changes occurring in England.

The impact of the reverse contact, English’s influence on Irish, was twofold: a gradual national shift towards English and, on a micro-level, an increase in CM and code-switching (CS hereafter). As Bliss mentions in the earlier reference, a language is affected by changes (cultural, political, philosophical) and languages must therefore adapt to incorporate new cultural ideas, previously unknown to its speakers. There was also, however, a detrimental effect on the psyche of the Irish-speakers that, to some extent, is still somewhat ingrained in the cultural memory of Ireland and a major source of language ideological conflicts in the Gaeltacht.

During the nineteenth century, and particularly in the aftermath of the Great Famine (1845-1852), where it is estimated that one million people died of starvation and disease, and two million emigrated, the English language became an essential tool for opportunity and upward mobility. The massive increase in emigration to America, Canada, Australia and the United Kingdom only encouraged the spread of English and, by default, a shift away from Irish. With English it became easier for young adults to travel abroad, to earn a living, to set up a new life and to send money back to family in Ireland while Irish was deemed restrictive. This idea was no doubt cemented by the fact that English became the language of the Catholic Church in Ireland, the medium of education in 1831 and within this education system students were punished for speaking Irish. An account as recent as 1926, from the Coimisiún na Gaeltachta [Gaeltacht Commission\(^3\)] report, notes parents visiting the local teachers and imploring them to teach English to the children:

> In some Irish-speaking districts they want to throw away Irish as far as they can ... They have written to the teachers saying they don’t want their children to be

---

\(^3\) The author provides the translations throughout the thesis unless indicated otherwise.
taught Irish at all ... They know Irish themselves and they never gained anything from it. They feel that if the children knew more English they would get on better. (quoted in Walsh 2002: 75-76)

At the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century a cultural revival took place in Ireland that coincided with the push towards Irish Independence from the United Kingdom. The Gaelic Athletic Association was founded in 1884 with the aim of promoting Irish sports and Conradh na Gaeilge [the Gaelic League] in 1893 with the aim of promoting Irish literature. Douglas Hyde, the first president of Ireland, was a key figure in the revival of Irish and in his well-known speech ‘The Necessity for de-Anglicising Ireland’ (1892) he called upon Irishmen to turn to the rich cultural heritage of Irish and Ireland. A number of summer schools were set up in this period, the most famous being the Achill School which still hosts week-long immersion courses in Irish language, music and culture. Those who were keen to learn the language looked to the native speakers with newfound admiration. They were no longer thought to be backward but instead viewed as inspirational figures of the Irish language revolution. As Ó Torna (2005) discusses in Cruthú na Gaeltachta [Creating the Gaeltacht], the native Irish speakers were looked upon as noble savage who held the knowledge of and competence in an unpolluted Irish language that the learners strived for. The Irish language held appeal further afield, with Celtic scholars (Flower, Sjoestedt-Jonval, van Hamel, Thurneysen, Pokorny) travelling from all over Europe to meet with monolingual Irish-speakers and record the culture of Ireland in its ‘purist’ form. This Celtic Revival was also taking place in all the Celtic countries with the European-wide renewed interest in preserving the diminishing traditions, beliefs and languages. However, as Mac Giolla Chriost (2012: 399) writes

... members of Coimisiún na Gaeltachta - the body in charge of the review of Irish-language policy- believed that the Irish-speaking parts of Ireland ... conformed with the idealised view of the Gaelic heartland propounded by Conradh na Gaeilge. They cherished this idealised concept rather than informing themselves of the real socio-economic conditions that impoverished and marginalised part of Ireland.

Soon after the creation of the new state of Ireland, a concerted effort was set up to restore and revive the Irish language through various methods. Article 4 of the Constitution of the Irish Free State (Saorstát Éireann) Act, 1922 reads:
The National language of the Irish Free State (Saorstát Eireann) is the Irish language, but the English language shall be equally recognised as an official language. Nothing in this Article shall prevent special provisions being made by the Parliament of the Irish Free State (otherwise called and herein generally referred to as the “Oireachtas”) for districts or areas in which only one language is in general use.

This constitution was drawn up while Ireland was still a member of the Commonwealth and it is noted that Irish was the only language given preference over English in the Commonwealth countries (Walsh 2011: 41). However, as Ó hIfearnáin (2001: 8) writes, although Irish is the only ‘native’ language spoken in Ireland, by the time the Irish Free State gained its independence from the United Kingdom, the majority of ‘native’ people no longer spoke it. There was a drive to standardise the language as well as to modernise it, as will be discussed in chapter three, and a push to provide public notices and official documents in bilingual or monolingual Irish format. One of the larger undertakings, however, was defining the Gaeltacht areas of Ireland and working towards meliorating their economic conditions.

1.4 The Gaeltacht

1.4.1 The Foundation and Development of the Gaeltacht
The cultural revival was concurrent with Ireland’s successful independence campaign. After the foundation of the state in 1922, the Gaeltacht Commission was founded in 1925. Its aim was to outline the areas in Ireland where the Irish language was spoken, to encourage and promote it as the daily community language and to examine problems within these areas. These problems were primarily economic. They divided these areas into two categories: *Fíor-Ghaeltacht* [Irish-speaking community] and *Breac-Ghaeltacht* [Mixed Irish and English-speaking community] and each category had specific criteria. In order to achieve the status of *Fíor-Ghaeltacht* it was necessary for 80 per cent or more of the community to have the ability to speak Irish, and for the status of *Breac-Ghaeltacht* the percentage ranged from 25-79 per cent. It was intended that gradually the *Breac-Ghaeltacht* would develop into a *Fíor-Ghaeltacht* region. It should be considered, as pointed out by Ó Riagáin (1992), that the commission only assessed whether or not the
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4 For a detailed account of the foundation and development of the Gaeltacht see Ó Giollagáin et al (2007).
people had Irish and not their speaking ability. The national police force, An Garda Síochána, was dispatched to gather the data for the survey and one would question how precise the findings were. There were massive discrepancies between the commission's data and the census results in 1926. Ó Riagáin (1992) makes an example of the town of An Daingean, located in the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht: 82.2 per cent of Irish speakers according to the commission but 69 per cent according to the census. The figures do provide us with an idea of the real percentage of speakers at that time, albeit an extremely optimistic idea.5

The first Gaeltacht boundaries that were drawn up were quite ill defined with some very weak areas, in terms of Irish-speakers, being included. In 1956 a delimitation of the Gaeltacht areas was carried out by the government with a commission of inquiry (Ó hIfearnáin 2009: 544) that resulted in a major revision of the boundaries (Ó Riagáin 1997: 50). Since this time the only alterations to the Gaeltacht have been the inclusion of four additional localities: Clochán – Breannán (1974), Baile Ghib and Rath Chairn (1967) and areas of Muscraí (1982). The Gaeltacht areas are predominantly located along the western seaboard of the island and extend the length of Ireland. It is apparent from the fringe location of these areas that the language shift towards English emanated from the east, primarily Dublin which was a stronghold of English power.

The socio-economic issues of these areas were still to be improved at the time of the Gaeltacht foundation, as the regions were predominantly aligned with the areas previously identified with socio-economic problems by the Congested Boards District 1891 - 1923. The Gaeltacht lacked a middle-class with economic clout spanning the influential sectors of society and committed to the Irish language (Ó hAoláin 2009). However, the decentralisation of Gaeltarra Éireann6 to the Connemara Gaeltacht in 1969, the establishment of Raidió na Gaeltachta (1972)7 and the television channel TnaG in 1996 (latterly TG4) provided services and support with secure, permanent, pensionable jobs within the Gaeltacht. There are problematic issues of migration and unemployment

5 The accuracy of census returns ascertaining the Irish language will be discussed further in the thesis, as will the issues of self-assessment and language ability.
6 Gaeltarra Éireann was founded in 1957 to focus on economic improvement.
7 The station was founded after a linguistic human rights campaign to serve L1 speakers of Irish.
in the Gaeltacht areas and since its foundation there have been efforts to promote business and economic stability in these areas. Údarás na Gaeltachta [Gaeltacht Authority] was founded in 1980 after the initial efforts of industrialisation by Gaeltarra Éireann. Their primary aims were to create incentive for companies to set up within the Gaeltacht, to counteract emigration by creating employment, and to also dissuade the local population from commuting for employment outside the Gaeltacht.\(^8\)

_Roinn na Gaeltachta_ [Department of the Gaeltacht]\(^9\) that was founded in 1956 also aimed to improve the housing conditions of the Irish-speaking areas by offering grants, including education grants to those students over the age of six with the ability to speak Irish. An examiner, visiting the schools annually, assessed the language ability and recommended grants accordingly. While the amount of money paid to the children's families was small (£10 at the scheme’s outset), it was still a significant scheme as it encouraged keeping children in the education system and _Roinn na Gaeltachta_ later referred to the data when evaluating applications for other, more substantial, grants that were available to Irish-speaking households (Ó Riagáin 1992: 48). For example, grants awarded for housing. The improvement of housing actually proved a significant undertaking considering in 1969 only 10 per cent of the Gaeltacht areas had access to the public water supply (Kearns 1974: 104).

Tourism since the 1970s has developed as a, if not the, major industry in some Gaeltacht areas and it has a particular focus on cultural tourism. The areas attract students of all ages keen to learn or improve their Irish language skills. The Irish college summer retreat is a popular choice for teenagers in Ireland and these are important in providing a language domain outwith the standard education system to young speakers of the language. In fact in August 2013, an Irish language cover of a popular song performed by

---

\(^8\) For a detailed overview of the organisations founded to aid the economic development of the Gaeltacht areas see Mac Giolla Chriost (2012) and Walsh (2011).

\(^9\) The department has since changed name and scope, and has been constantly doing so since its inception: Department of the Gaeltacht (1958-1993), Department of Arts, Culture and the Gaeltacht (1993-1997), Department of Arts, Heritage, Gaeltacht and the Islands (1997-2002), Department of Community, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs (2002-2010), Department of Community, Equality and Gaeltacht Affairs (2010-2011) and Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht (2011 - 2014).
the students of Coláiste Lurgan, achieved internet fame with almost 3 million views as of mid-November 2013. The potential effect of tourists was voiced by Kearns (1974: 101) when he suggested that:

... the unbridled onslaught of outsiders could wreak havoc on local culture by bringing increased pressures for English speech. Unchecked, this could exact a terrible sociolinguistic toll. Thus the issue of tourism in the Gaeltacht has become controversial, eliciting emotional pleas both for and against.

Kearns’ concern for the impact of tourism is somewhat purist, as with the progression of, and improvements in, infrastructure and technology all speakers of Irish would become more exposed to English and new cultural ideas. McCormack (2005) writes about the impact the filming of Ryan’s Daughter (Lean 1970) had on the town of An Daingean and surrounding areas and discusses the exposure to financial wealth previously unseen by locals. Kearns (1974) writes that these Gaeltacht areas preserve the Irish language and culture as a cultural community or cultural entity. It is not surprising that the form of tourism that developed within the Gaeltacht areas is cultural tourism, highlighting the ‘authenticity’ of these areas, presenting the areas as living museums of the rich cultural heritage of Ireland.

Since the late nineteenth century, the Gaeltacht has come to occupy a particularly important place in historical development of Irish society’s conception of its identity, real and imagined. This relationship of the Gaeltacht to the wider society is complex, multidimensional and draws upon a coherent system of imagery that has formed not only the idea of the Gaeltacht itself, but many of modern Irish society’s ideas about how its world might or should be organised. (Ó Riagáin 1992: 101-102)

Despite the efforts of revivalist groups and government agencies over the course of the last century, the Irish language as a home language in the Gaeltacht areas is in steady decline. There are factors contributing to this language directly: exogamous relationships, in-migration to and emigration from the Gaeltacht, and the ubiquitous nature of the English language. There are also factors that are contributing to the language loss that are national problems especially since the economic recession: young adults emigrating and unemployment. Kearns (1974: 106) notes that there is an ‘aura of psychological negativism that pervades the area’ that is the result of ‘generations of emigration, unemployment, and poverty’. He equates this ‘aura’ with an overpowering despair and
cynicism that is palpable within the population. While this description is somewhat extreme, there are aspects that can be proved to the contrary in the 40 years that have passed. The Gaeltacht populations are now vocal in their demands, as will be demonstrated in the context of this thesis, and it is apparent that the non-Irish speaking populations of the areas are perhaps displaying signs of a defensive and vulnerable community.

1.4.2 The Gaeltacht Today

As Ó hIfearnáin (2009: 540) comments, for at least the past 150 years every Irish-speaking community has had contact with, and been obliged to manage, the two languages. The presence of Irish and English are obvious in the current Gaeltacht statistics, with Irish-speakers not always in the vast majority. A closer look at the 2011 Census statistics indicate that there were a total of 96,628 persons aged 3 or over living in the Gaeltacht areas, representing an increase of 5.2 per cent over the 91,862 persons in 2006. A total of 66,238 persons of these residents, or 68.5 per cent, said that they could speak Irish in 2011. This was an increase of 1,973 persons over 2006. However, the proportion that spoke Irish has dropped from 70 per cent in 2006 (Central Statistics Office 2012: 31). A recent study on the Gaeltacht areas (Ó Giollagáin et al 2007) predicts that Irish will remain a home/community language for only another twenty years unless the government implements major language policies. One particular figure gathered from the census is that 4,682 persons indicated that they could speak Irish but did not do so on a regular basis (Central Statistics Office 2012: 31) and this indicates a fundamental problem. The efforts to promote Irish as a community language within the Gaeltacht are failing this small group of speakers, but this also raises the question of language motivation that will be discussed in chapter six.

The Government of Ireland recently published the Gaeltacht Act 2012 which carries two primary purposes: to provide for a statutory language planning process to support the Irish language and to provide for amendments to the board and functions of Údarás na Gaeltachta (Government of Ireland 2012a: 1).
1.5 The Irish Language Today

According to the 2011 Census returns\(^\text{10}\), Irish speakers over the age of three in the Republic are numbered at 1,759,026; showing an increase of 7.1 per cent from the 2006 returns (Central Statistics Office 2012: 25). This amounts to 40.6 per cent of the total population, which includes those using Irish within the education system. The number of daily\(^\text{11}\) Irish speakers who use the language outside education is 77,185 representing 1.8 per cent of the population aged 3 and over (Central Statistics Office 2012: 27). While statistically the Irish language holds a somewhat stable position, despite the levels of proficiency of the 40.6 per cent of the population, its position within government policy is not reassuring for the future of the language.

Upon the establishment of the Irish Free State, and the subsequent drawing up of *Bunreacht na hÉireann* [Constitution of Ireland] 1937, Irish was allocated a higher status than in the 1922 constitution. The 1937 constitution is still in effect and Article 8 is as follows:

1. The Irish language as the national language is the first official language.
2. The English language is recognised as a second official language.
3. Provision may, however, be made by law for the exclusive use of either of the said languages for any one or more official purposes, either throughout the State or in any part thereof. (Government of Ireland 1937: 8-9)

Mac Giolla Chriost (2012: 401) notes that this elevated status within the constitution was merely a chimera, which is supported through the little if no change to the reality of the language for the following decades. As of June 2005, and implemented from 1 January 2007, Irish is actively recognised as an official working language of the European Union despite being a member since 1973, although research has highlighted that the Government of Ireland did not apply for an official status before then. This relatively new status of Irish within the EU is unique considering its minority status within Ireland in
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\(^{10}\) The Central Statistics Office published 10 reports based on the 2011 census returns, however their website [www.cso.ie](http://www.cso.ie) contains interactive tables for more specific research.

\(^{11}\) The Irish language questions on the census form are as follows: Can you speak Irish? *Answer if aged 3 years or over Yes/ No.* If ‘Yes’, do you speak Irish? *Mark - the boxes that apply.* 1. Daily, within the education system 2. Daily, outside the education system 3. Weekly 4. Less often 5. Never.
comparison with other languages within the union. Walsh (2011: 14 - 15) comments on the problematic nature of these language classifications and writes:

The nomenclature of languages is extremely contentious, as certain terms are deemed to be offensive or defeatist. ‘Minority language’ is the common and generic term to describe a language which is either numerically weak or not normalised in most domains ... However, this term is not accepted universally. As Irish is constitutionally the ‘national’ language and ‘first official language’ of the Republic of Ireland, some reject the label of ‘minority language’ ... Furthermore, in June 2005, Irish was recognised as an official working language of the European Union ... a status not granted to other languages commonly referred to as ‘minority’. The term ‘lesser used’ was first used by the European Bureau for Lesser Used Languages due to the preference of some speakers of Irish and of Catalan, which with over seven million speakers is numerically superior to state languages such as Danish of Finnish ... ‘Minoritised’ is also used, a term which is perceived as more dynamic and less defeatist than ‘minority’.

The state is therefore officially bilingual and Irish does hold a prominent presence across the nation: in the media, road signs, on the currency and, for example, the country’s national anthem is in Irish: Amhrán na bhFiann [The Soldier’s Song]. There are some fundamental issues however that have been, and are actively, documented and researched by academics and language activists. The language is prominent in the linguistic landscape of the nation, with most road signs presented bilingually. On closer inspection it is obvious that the Irish language is presented in a smaller font and in italics although preceding the English. In contradistinction in Wales, both Welsh and English maintain equal status and are presented in the same font. The relevant local authority determines which language succeeds the other. The issue of bilingual road signs in Ireland is currently under review with the aim of presenting the two languages equally. The National Road Authority announced in November 2013 that they would carry out a trial of new road signs presenting Irish and English uniformly (Editorial in Gaelpotted.com, 2013).

The language as a home language is, undeniably, in decline and is listed on UNESCO’s Atlas of the World’s Languages in Danger as ‘definitely endangered’ along with 645
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12 Since the introduction of the Euro to the Republic of Ireland on 1 January 2002, the presence of the Irish language is limited to the word Éire [Ireland] on the coins only.
other languages. In the last decade there have been numerous reports and research papers compiled to understand and assess the decline of Irish: *The Irish Language and the Irish People: report on the attitudes towards, competence in and use of the Irish language in the Republic of Ireland in 2007-'08* (Mac Gréil and Rhatigan 2009), *Comprehensive Linguistic Study of the Use of Irish in the Gaeltacht* (Ó Giollagáin et al 2007), *Review of Education in the Gaeltacht* (Department of Education and Skills 2013) to list a few. The Government of Ireland, with the Official Languages Act 2003, sought to address the state of Irish and outlined the Act with the intention of improving the language’s presence throughout Ireland. The Act’s aim is to:

... promote the use of the Irish language for official purposes in the state; to provide for the use of both official languages of the state in parliamentary proceedings, in Acts of the Oireachtas, in the administration of justice, in communicating with or providing services to the public and in carrying out the work of public bodies; to set out the duties of such bodies with respect to the official languages of the state; and for those purposes, to provide for the establishment of Oifig Chóimisiún na dTeangacha Oifigiúla and to define its functions; to provide for the publication by the commissioner of certain information relevant to the purposes of this Act; and to provide for related matters. (Government of Ireland 2003: 8)

Under this act, public bodies are to introduce or increase their use of Irish and *An Coimisinéir Teanga* [the language commissioner] was elected to oversee, review and report on the progress of this language act. A more recent governmental step towards the promotion and protection of the language is the 20-Year Strategy for the Irish Language 2010-2030, and its aims are listed as follows:

- Increase the number of families throughout the country who use Irish as the daily language of communication.
- Provide linguistic support for the Gaeltacht as an Irish-speaking community and to recognise the issues which arise in areas where Irish is the household and community language.
- Ensure that in public discourse and in public services the use of Irish or English will be, as far as practical, a choice for the citizen to make and that over time
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13 According to the 20-year strategy this status has been changed to vulnerable (Government of Ireland 2010: 6).
more and more people throughout the State will choose to do their business in Irish.

- Ensure that Irish becomes more visible in our society, both as a spoken language by our citizens and also in areas such as signage and literature. (Government of Ireland 2010: 3)

The strategy discusses the need to increase abilities in Irish, expand opportunities and encourage a positive environment for the Irish language to stabilise. What is evident, in both the act and the strategy, is that Irish is being promoted within a bilingual context: the government is aspiring to construct a level of Irish-English bilingualism by increasing and creating opportunities to use Irish where it was previously largely unavailable. Walsh (2012: 339) writing about the then recently published strategy comments that if adequately resourced and properly designed, the strategy has the potential to create, for the first time, a professional and dynamic framework for the implementation of Irish government policy on the Irish language. However, others are not so optimistic, as is evident in the following statement:

Very crudely speaking, in both north and south, it is a choice between pragmatism and aspiration. Given the very real fears that the Gaeltacht, as a linguistically homogeneous and territorially coherent social entity, cannot be sustained, given the fragile, but promising, new shoots in urban Ireland, and given the dynamic, but partly politicised, growth of the language in the north, pragmatism appears to be the imperative. (Mac Giolla Chriost 2012: 413)

Pragmatism is, of course, imperative given the declining number of native speakers within the Gaeltacht, but whether the measures set out in the Official Languages Act 2003 are achievable, or even feasible, are discussed further in the chapter.

1.5.1 Irish in the Education System

Irish has a central position in the education system of Ireland and is a compulsory language for all students of both primary and secondary school. The fact that students of Irish begin learning the language upon entering the Irish education system means they meet the critical age hypothesis. Myers-Scotton (2005: 36) summarises the hypothesis as follows: the notion that all children easily acquire any language to which they are

14 There are exemptions for the Irish language and these are listed in chapter six of the thesis.
exposed up until about the age of puberty; after that, acquiring a language becomes more arduous and more of a conscious procedure. However, the language acquisition process is not always a smooth transition with many grievances about the way the language is taught, with arguments regarding its archaic subject content and the lack of focus on speaking proficiency being voiced. Walsh (2011: 65) writes that the newly appointed language commissioner prompted controversy in 2005 when he claimed that after 13 years of instruction in Irish, most schoolchildren are incapable of holding a conversation in Irish. This statement was recently confirmed, even in Gaeltacht areas, by the Department of Education and Skills (Government of Ireland 2013: 3):

There is evidence that the standards of oral competence in Irish among students in the Gaeltacht areas has dropped significantly. The Harris report found that there had been a significant drop between 1985 and 2002 in standards of oral Irish among pupils in Gaeltacht primary schools. The survey commissioned by An Chomhairle um Oideachas Gaeltachta agus Gaelscolaíochta (COGG) in 2004 found that a quarter of all pupils in Gaeltacht schools completed their primary schooling with only a fair mastery of the language and that approximately 10% of pupils left primary school with little mastery of Irish. The survey found that almost one fifth of Leaving Certificate students in post-primary Gaeltacht schools had fair levels of fluency and that another 10% had little or no Irish. Even in the Gaeltacht areas where Irish is spoken regularly, 7% of students in Leaving Certificate had low levels of fluency in Irish. Research on the acquisition of Irish among Irish language speakers also shows that young speakers are failing to acquire native-like competence in the language.

The abolishment of Irish as a compulsory school subject is often raised in Irish politics and there have been political decisions in the past to reduce the language’s capacity in education and civil service options. The Fine Gael and Labour coalition government of 1973, for example, removed Irish as a compulsory subject for passing the Leaving Certificate exam (the senior state school exam) and as a compulsory subject for the civil service entrance exam (Walsh 2011: 45). Most universities in Ireland require a pass in Leaving Certificate Irish for acceptance to an undergraduate degree course. Despite the seemingly negative sentiment associated with Irish as a compulsory subject, Walsh (2011: 65) encouragingly highlights that ‘it is often forgotten that the education system has been one of the more successful elements of Irish language policy, as illustrated by the census returns: of the 40 per cent of Irish people who report that they can speak Irish, the vast majority have learned it at school’.
As pointed out by Ó Caollaí (in Mac Gréil and Rhatigan 2009: viii) there is a new image of Irish-speakers that is continuing from strength to strength in recent years: the Irish-medium schools\textsuperscript{15} outside the Gaeltacht areas:

In the mid-nineteen sixties, as a response to the continual downgrading and sidetracking of Irish in the mainstream schools, the voluntary language movement, successors of the people of 1893, began an alternative initiative which has resulted in a continuing build-up of new networks of total immersion pre-schools and primary and post-primary schools. These naíonraí and gaelscoileanna generally achieve very high prestige, and many have long waiting lists. They attract the active participation of parents and, by this means, they create new networks of speakers and increase the use of Irish.

The popularity of gaelscoileanna is a result of the parental support as a bottom-up movement as opposed to the previous top-down approach that was in existence (Ó Duibhir 2009: 14). The Irish-medium education has undergone a boom in the past forty years, with the number of Irish-medium schools located outside the Gaeltacht rising from ten in 1972 to 140 in 2008. However, despite the creation of ‘new networks’ and the ‘increase in the use of Irish’, these schools are located in urban, non-Gaeltacht settings and students have limited exposure to Irish outside the education domain.

While Fishman (1991) notes that education is often heavily relied upon for language shift reversal, the rise of Irish-medium schools should be a focal point for future language policies.

1.5.2 Irish in the broadcast Media

The Irish language in state media is represented mainly by the Irish language radio station Raidió na Gaeltachta and the television station TG4. RnaG has been broadcasting since 1972 when it was one of two legal radio stations in Ireland, now however it is one of many national stations, the rest of which transmit predominantly in English. The foundation of TG4 was an extremely progressive and forward-thinking move that had an extremely positive impact on the Irish language. As Ó hAoláin (2009) comments, the impact of the programmes aimed at teenagers, making an example of Aifric, for which 1,200 young adults auditioned, provided a new and exciting opportunity associated with

\textsuperscript{15} For a detailed description of the history of Irish-medium education see Ó Duibhir 2009, chapter one.
the Irish language. The channel also has airing rights to such sporting events as GAA sports and various rugby competitions and provides Irish language commentary which puts the channel in contention with the three other national channels: RTÉ1, RTÉ2, TV3 for high-viewing statistics. These two Irish-language media forms have had a substantial influence on attitudes towards Irish, especially in terms of professional careers options with many universities and colleges now offering media courses with a focus on Irish language media.

Ó hlfearnáin (2001: 18) provides a solid account of the relationship between broadcasting media and Irish in Ireland since the foundation of the Irish Free State. Prior to the launch of TG4, he comments that RTÉ Television has always produced quality Irish-language and bilingual programmes. However it is the semi-commercial nature of the organisation that has always been a challenge to devoting major resources to Irish and giving such programmes peak time audiences. Kelly-Holmes, Moriarty and Pietikäinen (2009: 233) comment on the focus of these streams of media:

> While Raidió na Gaeltachta promotes the internal heteroglossia of Irish in terms of the main dialects, this heteroglossia stops at the border with English. In contrast, the Irish television station TG4 mobilizes Irish-English heteroglossia in its targeting of L2 speakers.

RnaG and TG4 represent the Irish language entirely, but by regulation of the Broadcasting Committee of Ireland and under the Official Languages Act 2003, all stations are required to promote the Irish language. Kelly-Holmes et al (2009) further comment that the effort of the bigger broadcasting companies is ‘tokenistic’ and merely putting the minimum requirements in place, while smaller groups choose to promote the language beyond the minimal requirements. Two examples are provided: the radio station *Spin South West* which airs a two hour Irish language music show; and the radio station *Newstalk* which broadcasts news regarding the Irish language and related events. The article’s authors (2009: 235) propose:

> Instead of the minority language channel targeting the speaker and speech community with monolingual programming, we would argue that these new initiatives consisting of heteroglossic practices appealing to L2 speakers, constitute a shift in notions of normativity in minority language media policing.
As well as the Irish language content on local radio, there are community radio stations that operate through Irish, for example Raidió na Life. A local working group founded the station in 1989 with the aim to provide ‘a comprehensive Irish language radio service for the greater Dublin area, on an educational and community basis’ (Raidio na Life n.d.). BBC Northern Ireland also broadcasts in Irish on television and radio, and these programmes can be accessed throughout Ireland with cable or satellite services. The BBC Northern Ireland website contains interactive pages for Irish language speakers and learners, both young and old that encourages active bilingualism.

1.5.3 Attitudes towards the Irish Language

Ó Caollaí (in Mac Gréil and Rhatigan 2009: vi) comments on the awareness of attitudes towards Irish in Ireland over 100 years ago:

The 1893 people and their successors soon realised that the limited objective of “keeping Irish spoken in Ireland”, even if it were achieved in the short term, would not be sustainable in the long run if the current language dynamics were to remain unchanged. In the absence of a high comparative status and widespread use in public life, Irish could not rely, generation after generation, on patriotism or other emotion as motivating factors for achieving nationwide learning and use of Irish.

Between November 2007 and March 2008 a national survey of randomly selected adults\textsuperscript{16} was compiled to assess the Irish peoples’ attitudes towards Irish and their perceived use of and competence in the language (Mac Gréil and Rhatigan 2009). The results were compiled and researched by Mac Gréil and the report was published as The Irish Language and the Irish People: report on the Attitudes towards, Competence in and Use of the Irish Language in the Republic of Ireland in 2007 - ’08. The report concludes (2009: 119-120) that the findings:

... reflect the success and failure of the historic campaign to revive the language in the schools’ system and through the voluntary Irish-revival movement. In the overall, the position of the Irish language in 2007-08 is positive and quite encouraging. The general level of reasonable competence among the Irish-born of the national random sample is 47.1% and the attitudes towards the Irish language is very positive, i.e. 93.2% in favour and 6.7% prepared to discard Irish. Of the

\textsuperscript{16} Over 18 years of age.
‘those in favour’, 40.2% wished the language to be revived and 52.9% wanted it to be preserved.

A salient finding in the project is the age categories that were shown to be most pessimistic towards the revival of the Irish language, namely the senior-middle-aged (56-70) and the older age group (71+). Mac Gréil and Rhatigan (2009: 13) pertinently point out that:

... the senior-middle-age group is an important cohort whose support is important in society ... a very significant group as they tend to be parents and who also exercise leadership roles in the various organisations, i.e. political, industrial, occupational, recreational, cultural, judicial, security, education, religious, media, etc. Therefore, their active support for the Irish language is necessary if Irish is to succeed in becoming a popular language in Irish society.

1.5.4 Recent Irish Language Developments

While officially the government has outlined methods for encouraging Irish in the Official Languages Act 2003 and the 20-Year Strategy Plan, there are discrepancies between the intention and the action. These discrepancies came to national attention in December 2013 when An Coimisinéir Teanga Seán Ó Cuirreáin announced his resignation and expressed his opinion regarding the situation of Irish. The Office of An Coimisinéir Teanga was established in 2004 with three distinct statutory functions: to provide an ombudsman service, to act as a compliance agency in relation to state services through Irish and to provide advice on language rights and obligations. Seán Ó Cuirreáin held the position of An Coimisinéir Teanga since 2004 and was due to finish his term in 2016. In the transcript of his speech (Ó Cuirreáin 2013) to the House of the Oireachtas Joint Committee on Public Service Oversight and Petitions, 4 December 2013, a summary of the negative and positive developments in his role are outlined. For example, there is a statement concerning the attitude towards Irish which was noticed when handling an incident with the national police force, An Garda Síochána17:

17 A language rights awareness campaign is being promoted by senior management following an investigation into an incident in Dublin where a young man, who attempted to conduct his business through Irish when stopped by Gardaí in relation to a minor road traffic matter, found himself arrested and escorted in handcuffs to a Garda station where he was detained until a Garda was found who could deal with him through Irish. An Garda Síochána had failed in this instance to comply with a statutory commitment, which
In dealing with this case I noted an attitude, notwithstanding the constitutional status of Irish, that Irish speakers should be dealt with as if they were speakers of a foreign language. The discourse with Garda members involved in the incident placed “using Irish” and “dealing with foreign nationals” in the same space which might give rise to concern about how both groups were perceived.

On a more positive note, the senior management of An Garda Síochána has since made a more concerted effort to remedy the situation and to promote Irish-speakers within the force. However, the overriding sentiment to be garnered from the transcript is that token measures are being taken by public bodies to meet the state requirements for Irish. Walsh (2012: 331) further confirms this in examination of 2007 schemes under the Act, stating that the commitments made are minimalist, sometimes in the extreme and thus reflecting the nature of the legislation, the role of Irish in the body’s governance and, arguably, the sociolinguistic position of Irish in Irish life. Ó Cuirreáin (2013) further notes the new language schemes and highlights that the requirements are being compromised, for example making Irish language services available subject to ‘available resources’. The fact that many public bodies have chosen not to renew their language scheme required under the Official Languages Act 2003 points to the fact that most view it as a ‘box-ticking exercise’ or what Walsh (2012: 335) refers to as ‘a few words (will do)’.  

Returning to Mac Gréil and Rhatigan’s (2009) report on attitudes towards and competence in Irish, there is hope that the under-forty year old respondents displayed a positive attitude and that this could lead to good support for the language in the future. However, a good attitude towards Irish must be coupled with appropriate language policies, upholding legislation, enthusiasm and state support for the language to be even stabilised at this point. This optimism, unfortunately, is not reflected in Ó Cuirreáin’s speech. A poignant excerpt in Ó Cuirreáin’s (2013) resignation speech reads:

> As we begin to regain our economic sovereignty, it would be a travesty if we were to lose our linguistic sovereignty – a cornerstone of our cultural identity, heritage and soul as a nation. I believe this to be a clear and present danger.

recognises the right of the public to conduct business with the force in either official language, Irish or English (Ó Cuirreáin 2013).

18 For a close analysis of the 2007 schemes under the Official Languages Act 2003 see Walsh (2012).
Ó Cuirreáin’s resignation statement and further discussion regarding the lack of support for his post received wide media coverage and triggered a series of protest marches. *Dearg le Fearg* [Red with Anger] became the slogan for those protesting the government’s neglect of the language and the isolation of native-speakers. *An Coimisinéir Teanga*’s resignation has only highlighted the unique status of Irish within the Republic: the first official language with legislative requirements yet their implementation is, according to the examples provided by Ó Cuirréain (2013) and Walsh (2012), optional and/or flexible.

1.6 Cultural Entity and Cultural Identity

The language has been promoted as the basis of Irish culture, certainly the language revival before Irish independence was triggered on the basis of a contrasting cultural history from English. In 1972 the Commission for the Restoration of the Irish Language (1965: 6) declared that:

> The Irish language is the most distinctive sign of our nationality. Our present situation as an independent state derives in large measure from the idealism evoked by the Irish language movement. The need for this idealism is now as great as ever. A small state has the particular need to preserve its national traditions, to strengthen its independence of outlook and to safeguard its identity ... It is through Irish as a living language that we and those who come after us can most surely retain a lively sense and understanding of the unique and essential elements of the Irish character.

In the 20-Year Strategy (Government of Ireland 2010: 8) a reference is made to the Easter Rising and Irish independence, again strengthening this bond between the language and cultural nationality, and raising awareness of language loyalty:

> During this phase, Ireland will celebrate the 100th anniversaries of the Easter Rising and of our independence and these occasions will be linked to this Strategy, showcasing results attained, undertaking a major review of outcomes, and mobilising public involvement and support around the goals, spirit and vision of the Strategy.

These constant reiterations of the historical and cultural pertinence of the language, and by default the Gaeltacht, have created an ideological basis for understanding any language conflict in these areas. The ideals echo the words of the Republic’s first president, Douglas Hyde, almost a century ago and must be revisited and revised. This
promotion of the language is encouraging the use of Irish and therefore bilingualism, and it can be categorised as, what Myers-Scotton (2005: 60) terms as ‘nation-building through bilingualism’. Mac Giolla Chriost (2012) offers a pertinent observation that reflects this idea of nation-building in the early years of the Irish Free State. He writes (2012: 400) that ‘many of those who were involved most closely in the revivalist movement emphasised the acquisition of Irish by adults, the dramatic decline of Conradh na Gaeilge in this period, during which the number of branches shrank from 819 in 1922 to 139 in 1924’. This massive decline in one of the instrumental groups of Irish cultural nationalism reflects the temporality of the urgency to push the language as a defining factor in the quest for independence.

Ó Riagáin (1992: 15) discusses Irish, drawing on Bourdieu’s idea of the linguistic market, whereby linguistic competence like any other cultural competence functions as linguistic capital. Languages are always spoken in a particular market and the characteristics of these markets accord them a certain value. In Ireland today, the language for many weak or non-speakers remains nothing more than a cultural value with little or no economic value. There are also those who have a career based on the Irish language (education, translation, media) and the speakers who use the language as their language of communication in the home. These contrasting values and uses attached to the language are often the root of the language debate in Ireland. In recent months the resignation of Seán Ó Cuirreáin and consequent events continue to broaden the division between those contra- and pro-language support throughout the country.

1.7 Conclusion

This chapter has provided a basic basis for understanding the later chapters of the thesis. This background provides specific information regarding Irish in the Republic of Ireland19 and highlights the complex status of the language with an almost polarised position in the government: being both official yet neglected. Throughout the text, a number of the issues raised will be further developed on a more local level relating to Corca Dhuibhne: linguistic landscape, local language dynamics, language attitudes and

---

19 In Northern Ireland the language has different status and dynamic, and is not directly significant to this research project.
the question of language identity. In the last decade there have been efforts to shift the language from an entity of national identity towards the construction of a robust and practically meaningful civic identity (Mac Giolla Chriost 2012: 207). These efforts, as the language commissioner emphasised, are failing the language. The 20-Year Strategy states that ‘the future of the language depends on people who make a positive choice to embrace the opportunities that this strategy will create. This is the challenge for all of us.’ (Government of Ireland 2010: 3) The initial stated aims of ‘revival’ or ‘re-gaelicisation’, themselves arguably unattainable given the methods chosen, have shifted since the 1960s to a softer and vaguer policy of bilingualism (Walsh 2012: 328). And while the larger questions relating to language policy in Ireland are beyond the scope of this project, the implementation and reinforcement of policies in the fieldwork area have caused a local ideological debate that is central to the contextual setting of the speech sample.
Chapter Two: An Approach to the Theoretical Methodology

Every linguistic choice made by individual speakers is conditioned by innumerable pressures brought by a myriad of organisations, each potentially influencing language practices, language beliefs and language management itself. (Walsh 2012b: 327)

2.1 Introduction

This chapter will provide the basic definitions relating to bilingualism and language contact, which are necessary before continuing to a linguistic analysis of the bilingual characteristic of CM. While there is an extensive stock of literature on the topics of language contact induced phenomenon, this overview will be selective and streamlined to convey an understanding of the Irish-English situation. Where possible, the discussion will provide examples from the Irish context, to further locate the thesis in international research. However a detailed examination of Irish-English CM is provided in chapter three. The use of CM can have contrasting functions for speakers depending on their language ability and to this end the various functions will be presented. The content of the chapter will incorporate a discussion of CM under the following general headings: history, definition, implications and methods of analysis. The case for selecting the MLF as the theoretical framework for this research project will be presented. This model is not without criticism and some of the more staunch opposition of the MLF will be outlined and responded to. To conclude, there will be a brief discussion of ‘mixed speech’ and how research tends to overlook this idea. Throughout the chapter, it will be apparent that CM and CS are distinct yet closely related and often the definitions and motivations for use will be similar for both with the terms being used interchangeably.

2.2 Language Contact

Spolsky (2004: 123) defines language contact succinctly as a situation where two or more languages are brought into contact by virtue of bilingualism. The inclusion of ‘by virtue of bilingualism’ is the key to understanding language contact as will now be supported with an example from Ireland.

In the Republic of Ireland, according to the 2011 census results, a total of 363,929 non-Irish residents of the state speak a language other than Irish or English at home. The
number of state residents of all nationalities that speak a language other than Irish or English at home is 514,068. These figures represent a substantial percentage of the total population of 4,588,252. Therefore, this population must engage with the wider community for work, education, etc. through English and perhaps to a small extent Irish. This language contact can affect both the speakers and the language(s) itself and these effects will be discussed. A small fraction of those who speak a home language other than Irish and English in Ireland will not be affected by language contact, for example older generation monolinguals whose contact is limited to family and members of the same language community.²⁰ Therefore language contact is active in Ireland and embedded in the modern way of life. This can be further supported by Spolsky’s (2004: 51) comment that monolingual communities are rare and monolingual countries are even rarer.

How 363,929 members of the population have come to Ireland can be the result of numerous factors: voluntary or involuntary migration being the predominant factor. The cause of language contact can dictate the linguistic outcome of the contact between languages. The key factors that contribute to language contact include politics (colonisation, annexation, resettlement, federation), natural disaster (famine, floods, volcanic eruptions), religion (religious oppression), cultural (nationalism, ethnicity), economy (migration), education and technology (Li Wei 2000: 2-3). Linguistic outcomes can include intergenerational shift from one language to another, CM and CS, creolisation, attrition, language loss and language death. For example, Muysken (2000: 222) provides scenarios of some socially defined bilingual settings: frontiers between languages or language families; clusters of multi-lingual tribal groups, the members of which speak each other’s languages; dialect/standard language relations; minority language islands; bilingualism of native elites; colonial language/dominated indigenous language; and migrant communities. Within these conditions, it is likely that the bilingual setting will produce CM and CS, and Gardner-Chloros (2009: 43-43; 2009a: 98-99) further highlights three types of contributing factors:

²⁰ On the topic of intergenerational shift see Li Wei (2000) for an example of Chinese speakers living on Tyneside.
• Factors independent of particular speakers and particular circumstances in which the varieties are used, which affect all the speakers of the relevant varieties in a particular community.

• Factors directly related to the speakers, both as individuals and members of a variety of subgroups, their competence in each variety, their social networks and relationships, their attitudes and ideologies, their self-perception and perception of others.

• Factors within the conversation where CS takes place: CS is a major conversational resource for speakers, providing further tools to structure their discourse beyond those available to monolinguals.

Language contact will produce bilingualism, two types of bilingualism according to Muysken and Appel (2005: 1): individual bilingualism and societal bilingualism. The next section will outline the standard definitions associated with habitual language choices within bilingual settings, although many of the definitions can also be applied to language varieties: dialect and standard for example.

2.2.1 Diglossia

Within a bilingual community, there will normally be a standard of set language roles adhered to by participating speakers to allow for the language varieties to coexist harmoniously. This categorisation was first discussed by Ferguson (1959) and he (1959: 232) coined the term ‘diglossia’ modeled on the French word *diglossie*, as there was no English word for the term at the time. In short, the concept suggests that there are two varieties of language: High (H) and Low (L), and each has their own specialised function within the community. In one set of situations H is appropriate and in another set L is appropriate, with the two sets overlapping only very slightly (1959: 235-236). It is obvious from the use of the terms High and Low, that a variation hierarchy is implied with the High variety carrying greater prestige within the community. And in terms of stability, Ferguson writes (1959: 240) that diglossia typically persists at least several centuries, noting that if tensions arise they may be resolved by the use of relatively uncodified, unstable, intermediate forms of the language with repeated borrowing of vocabulary from H to L.

Fishman (1967) expanded on Ferguson’s definition to broaden the concept of diglossia, and most importantly he altered the concept in two ways: he places less emphasis on
communities with two language varieties and he accepts more separate codes within the community (Ní Neachtain 2013). He highlights the following relations that diglossia and bilingualism can form, and this is best represented by means of a four-fold table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Both diglossia and bilingualism</th>
<th>3. Diglossia without bilingualism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Bilingualism without diglossia</td>
<td>4. Neither diglossia nor bilingualism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Fishman’s (1967: 30) relationship between bilingualism and diglossia.

For each scenario Fishman (1967: 31-37) elaborates with examples as follows (paraphrased):

1. Communities comprised of entire nations where there is nationwide or widespread bilingualism, as in Paraguay where almost the entire population speaks Spanish and Guarani.

2. Regions that have experienced industrialisation under Western direction in such that the means of production were often derived from one speech community while the productive manpower were drawn from another. Initially both speech communities may have maintained their separate diglossia-with-bilingualism patterns. The needs as well as the consequences of rapid and massive industrialisation and urbanisation were frequently such that members of the speech community providing a productive workforce rapidly abandoned their traditional socio-cultural patterns and learned the language of the means of production much earlier than their absorption into the socio-cultural patterns and privileges to which that language pertained. Under circumstances such as these no well established, socially recognized and protected functional differentiation of languages obtains in many speech communities of the lower and lower middle classes.

3. Bilingualism is generally absent owing to two or more speech communities being united religiously, politically or economically into a single functioning unit. However, one of the communities involved is marked by relatively impermeable group boundaries and linguistic repertoires that are limited due to role specialisation. His example of Pre-First World War European elites in relation to their countrymen with the elites speaking French for intragroup purposes and the masses speaking another language for their intragroup purposes.

4. Only very small, isolated and undifferentiated speech communities may be said to reveal neither diglossia nor bilingualism. Given little role differentiation or compartmentalisation and frequent face-to-face interaction between all members of the speech community, no fully differentiated registers or varieties may establish themselves. Such groups are easier to hypothesise than to find.
Ní Neachtain (2013) recently applied the concept of diglossia to the Irish language situation. Based on research results she concludes that there is diglossia in relation to teenagers use of Irish and English, and they engage in the languages thus: Irish with older members of the community, Irish with colleagues at school, English for hobbies and entertainment and this includes with those who acquired Irish as a home language. She also comments on the diglossic setting of the school in Ireland, and how the CM’ed Irish has come to signify the Low variety of Irish. She concludes that the classic diglossia is gradually weakening as the country shifts towards bilingualism.

In the context of Ireland, with a distinct standard and dialect of Irish there is a scenario whereby the two Irishes each carrying H and L variety. In both instances the H variety carries less CM but as will be explained in chapter three Gaeltacht Irish speakers have displayed a resistance to adopting newly coined Irish language terminology (Ní Ghearáin 2011). As a result the dialectal H variety will contain a heavier use of CM. The L variety in both, being casual speech, contains heavier usage of CM as outlined by Ó Domagáin (2013: 231):

... mbíonn an débhéascna ar obair sna ceantair Ghaeltachta, mar sin de, biónn ócáidí faoi leith cainte ann a mbíonn an Béarla á úsáid iontu. Nuair a bhíonn an duine ag trácht ar an ócáid sin cainte is nádúrtha leis teanga na hócáide sin a úsáid. Tá tuiscint ag an baill an chomhrá ar an dá chód, mar sin de, ní fiú aistriúchán a dhéanamh ar fhocal nó ar nath cainte a bheadh in úsáid go minic as Béarla. Is cosúil go gcéideann an cainteoir gur mó eifeacht nó atá ag an Bhéarla in áit lomaistriúchán go Gaeilge a dhéanamh nó chaillfí cuíd den bhrí a bheadh leis.

[… diglossia is active in the Gaeltacht regions, therefore, there are distinct language events when English is used. When the speaker is referring to this language event it is the most natural speech that is used. The interlocutors understand the two codes, therefore, it is not work translating words or phrases that they regularly use in English. It is apparent that the speaker believes it more effective to use English rather than a bare translation to Irish otherwise its meaning would be lost.]

The presence of CM in H and L varieties of standard and dialectal Irish, combined with Ní Neachtain’s (2012) evidence of a shift towards bilingualism indicates the complexity in evaluating Irish language patterns. It is apparent, and will be supported in chapters six
and seven, that the range of Irish language speakers is disparate. CM and CS in each H and L does not allow for similar interpretation.

Myers-Scotton (1998) has composed the Markedness model (MM) that is loosely associated with the idea of diglossia. This model is based on how there are marked and unmarked language choices made in each interaction within each domain. The MM starts with the premise that comprehension of an utterance involves much more than decoding the linguistic signal (1998: 20). To conceptualise markedness means to develop the ability to recognise that the linguistic choices fall along a multidimensional continuum from unmarked to marked and to comprehend that marked choices will receive different receptions from unmarked choices (1998: 22). The model basically posits that a marked choice is a conscious decision to use the unexpected language or code in a given circumstance. This decision can be driven by a number of reasons: cultivating identity, creating familiarity, defiance, etc. Therefore each speaker as part of his or her linguistic capacity, and general cognitive capacity, has a markedness metric or evaluator by which the implication of marked choices can be foretold. The MM can be applied to languages, language varieties and codes. For example, Ní Laoire (2012) comments that in Ireland English is the unmarked language of interaction between those who are not acquainted with each other, making Irish a marked choice outside the Gaeltacht at least. Therefore, the unmarked choice of Gaeltacht Irish speakers will shift from Irish to English upon leaving the geographical boundaries of the Gaeltacht.

A shift in the language domains or a blurred definition of domains can contribute to an unstable bilingual community and a state of competitive dichotomy between the opposing languages. This change can happen gradually over time almost unbeknownst to the community members or very quickly. If a change occurs, the languages become opposed to each other, as they vie for linguistic domains. A dominant language and a recessive language develop with the former infringing on the domains of latter, forcing it into recession. Fishman (1991) notes that the shift can happen over the course of three generations. There are, of course, instances of rapid breakdown of language domains as a result of external factors for instance genocide or a natural disaster. There are examples of successful reversal of language shift, the most prominent being the revival of Hebrew
in Israel. Shohamy (2012), however, presents the negative long-term effects of this staunch language policy, namely the lack of linguistic equality for those without Hebrew (or without a strong proficiency in the language) now living in Tel Aviv and the negative effect on local dialects.  

The primary outcome of language contact, as is evident from the beginning of this chapter, is of course bilingualism. This state of bilingualism however may be temporary or permanent, depending on the circumstances of language contact and the presence or absence of diglossia. Within this bilingual community, there are language choices that are made, some by national bodies such as the government and others by the individual. As will be outlined in chapter four, the medium of education within the Gaeltacht is Irish, as outlined in the Education Act 1998, with the responsibility of contributing to the maintenance of Irish as the primary community language (Government of Ireland 1998: 10). This policy comes into question in chapter four where the Irish-medium secondary school becomes the source of a lengthy language dispute.

2.2.2 Efforts to stabilise or avoid language contact developments

There are examples of language communities striving to prevent the effects of language contact by adopting various approaches. Mesthrie et al (2000: 263) discuss the survival of 200 American Indian languages in spite of 400 years of Euro-American internal colonialism. This fact serves as a reminder that speakers are often able to act on deeply felt commitments to language maintenance even when facing pressures of assimilation and threats of cultural genocide. Spolsky (1998: 55) also presents groups that resist language shift by isolationism:

The greatest resistance to language shift was found in groups that chose to isolate themselves both linguistically and culturally from the mainstream. Two clear cases of isolationist Mennonite Christian groups (especially Hutterian and Old Order Amish) and the ultra-orthodox Hassidic Jews, both of whom rejected not just the language but also the dress and social conduct of their new country. In these cases, the isolation was self-imposed.

---

21 At a conference in 2008, Shohamy speaking on this topic mentioned that she is often asked about language revival in relation to Irish. For an overview of this matter see Ó Laoire (1996).
Spolsky (1998: 55-56) also discusses situations where the isolation was not voluntary but caused by social discrimination. These examples of active resistance to language contact and related effects are in the vast minority. As in Ireland, the position of Irish as a home language was recognised as low, with a declining trajectory, and action to delay or even reverse the decline came in the form of the Official Languages Act 2003 and more recently the 20-Year Strategy for the Irish Language, 2010-2030. These are obviously not efforts to prevent or resist language shift but more to nurture those with Irish and encourage others to learn.

2.3 Individual Bilingualism

Since CM is manifested only in the speech of the bilingual it is also necessary first to ask, who is a bilingual? (Bullock and Toribo 2009: 7) The definition of bilingualism is a long-standing debate in the field of academia. The regularly quoted statement is that a bilingual is not a person with monolingual skills in two languages; it is a person with two languages. In Myers-Scotton’s (2005: 3) introductory book to bilingualism she discusses bilingualism while raising questions on the topic:

“Being bilingual” doesn’t imply complete mastery of two languages. Further, speakers are rarely equally fluent in two languages. All humans of normal intelligence speak at least one language ... as humans, we are innately programmed to acquire a language quite effortlessly as young children when exposed to it. We say that speakers are bilingual when they have also acquired or learned to speak or understand – as a minimum – some phrases that show internal structural relations in a second language ... The problem is that there is no accepted formula for exactly what’s necessary for a person to claim to be a bilingual. Usually, being bilingual is associated with being able to speak two or more languages, not just being able to read an L2 with a dictionary by your side. But how much “speaking” of an L2 counts as being bilingual? Just being able to produce some formulaic phrases (e.g. greetings and the equivalent of “please” and “thank you”) isn’t enough to label you a bilingual in our view.

There are, of course, different motivations for acquiring or learning a second or third language. To use the Republic of Ireland as a case study, there are obligations to acquire a second language but these obligatory forces are varied. For example, an immigrant to the country will be required to learn English for socioeconomic advancement while maintaining a separate language in the home environment and with members of the same speech community. A contrasting obligation to learn can be applied to school students
who are generally required to learn Irish and a European language, traditionally French, German or Spanish. These languages are learned within the education system but are not responses to ‘the need to speak a second language’ (Myers-Scotton 2005: 5).

Bilingualism and language contact are therefore closely intertwined, as bilingualism develops as a result of contact between speakers speaking different languages, especially different L1s (Myers-Scotton 2005: 45). This contact is normally between languages in close proximity, a physical close proximity in that the speakers are coexisting in the same community.

2.3.1 Language Ability and Speaker Categorisation
This naturally progresses to the question of language ability and speaker categorisation, and there are some definitions worth outlining. Li Wei (2000: 4-5) provides a comprehensive summary of bilingual categories, a selected number of which are presented as follows to indicate the complexity of defining individual bilingual speakers and stages of bilingualism:

- Ascendant bilingual: ability to function in a second language is developing due to increased use.
- Balanced bilingual: mastery of two languages is roughly equivalent.
- Compound bilingual: two languages are learnt at the same time, often in the same context.
- Coordinate bilingual: two languages are learnt in distinctively separate contexts.
- Early bilingual: acquired two languages early in childhood.
- Horizontal bilingual: bilingual in two distinct languages that have a similar or equal status.
- Incipient bilingual: at the early stages of bilingualism where one language is not fully developed.
- Late bilingual: has become a bilingual later than childhood.
- Maximal bilingual: near native control of two or more languages.
- Minimal bilingual: only a few words and phrases in a second language.
- Secondary bilingual: second language has been added to a first language via instruction
- Semilingual: insufficient knowledge of either language.
- Simultaneous bilingual: two languages are present from the onset of speech.
- Vertical bilingual: bilingual in a standard language and a distinct but related language or dialect.
Traditionally in Ireland, research tends to categorise speakers as L1 and L2 speakers (Hickey 2001) with L1 signifying those who acquire Irish at home and L2 indicating those who learned Irish at, most commonly, school. When examining the census results, the number of Irish speakers is always represented but their level of proficiency, and until recently the frequency of use, remains unknown. On this matter Ó hIfearnáin (2013: 350) writes:

In Ireland, the state’s census gathers data on self-reported linguistic competence (does one speak Irish or not) and, since 1996, on frequency of speaking it (daily, weekly, less often or never), although without providing the respondent with any criteria as to what constitutes usage of the language in order to make a judgement. By contrast, in Northern Ireland, questions are asked about receptive and productive skills in Irish (and Ulster Scots), and in 2011 respondents could also declare their ‘main language’. In neither jurisdiction is a question asked about ‘mother tongue’, as is the case in censuses in many other countries. Even if such a question was to be asked, it is unlikely that the responses would be useful from an objective linguistic view due to a strong language ideology in Ireland which regards Irish as being native to all, even those who do not speak it. In Gaeltacht areas, where Irish is still spoken as a community language, informants may judge their linguistic skills in terms which are less abstract due to a level of linguistic awareness.

As was outlined previously in chapter one, the Gaeltacht boundaries were drawn up merely on the basis of people having an ability to speak Irish, and often this ability was assessed by non-Irish speakers. If anything, however, these results to academics are optimistic and encouraging for the future of Irish.

2.4 Code-mixing and code-switching

CM and CS are traits of bilingual and multilingual speakers who can draw from a repertoire of two of more languages, dialects or styles when communicating. Of course it is understood that the intended interlocutors of the speech event will also be capable of understanding the codes in question. All participants will have a shared and simultaneous membership in two social identities, those symbolised by each of the languages used (Myers-Scotton 1995: 334). The phenomenon of CM has been under scrutiny steadily for the past fifty years and whereas previously the phenomenon went relatively unnoticed, or rather un-researched. It was often commented upon but rarely deemed worthy of specific, concentrated analysis. Even Myers-Scotton (1993b: 48), one of the prominent CM and
CS researchers, admits to not recognising the characteristic while conducting fieldwork in Africa over the course of a decade. “Even when I myself observed language in use, as I often did, I managed to ‘ignore’ codeswitching.”

Initially the mixing of two codes was put down to interference, the L1 language interfering with the L2, and L2 perceived to be the weaker of the two. Gafaranga (2008: 13) discusses the offhand use of the term that has been adopted over from Second Language Acquisition terminology:

In the Second Language Acquisition literature, ‘interference’ is used to mean the negative effect of the learners’ first language on their performance in L2, an effect which can be observed at any level of language description: grammar, lexis, accent, spelling and so on. In interference, because L1 is seen to affect negatively the learner’s production in L2, the simultaneous use of both languages is viewed as disorderly and to be avoided.

Early studies of CM regarded its use as a trait of incompetent or non-balanced bilingualism, an easy method of resorting to a second or ‘fall-back’ language. As research continued and developed it was also recognised as a common phenomenon among balanced bilinguals where the languages are intricately and lexically mixed together. CS and CM do not strictly represent filling a lexical gap, as was formerly argued. The term code can refer to a language, dialect or style, and when two or more are used in the same speech event it is called CM or CS. It should be noted that CM and CS can be indicative of a language learner or weakened bilingualism but within the context of this study and related academic literature it is an effortless use of both languages by competent bilinguals. In this case, CM is predominantly not used to fill in vocabulary gaps or to overcome linguistic obstacles. As will be discussed further along in the chapter, CM is present or absent during certain speech occurrences depending on the context, intended audience or interlocutor. The unit for analysis for CM is now widely accepted as a speech utterance or clause that occurs within a sentence. The mixing of two languages can occur on a scale ranging from lexical borrowings to phonetic interferences, and from semantic calques to mixed sentences and wholesale language switching (Deuchar et al 2007: 298).

While often the terms are used interchangeably, the dominant definition is that CS takes place intersententially and CM occurs intrasententially (Deuchar 2006; Chan 2009;
Myers-Scotton 2002). This thesis primarily focuses on the intrasentential phenomenon, with secondary examination of the CS within the speech corpus. It could be tentatively viewed that CS is a more conscientious or marked choice of the speaker to portray stance or frame the discourse. Some research argues that CM is often not a conscious decision by the speaker:

Although it is popularly believed by bilingual speakers themselves that they mix or borrow because they do not know the term in one language or another, it is often the case that switching occurs most often for items which people know and use in both languages. The bilingual just has a wider choice – at least when he or she is speaking with bilingual speakers. In effect, the entire second language system is at the disposal of the code-switcher. (Romaine 1995: 143)

CM research on the balanced bilingual speaker understands that the speaker avails of CM rather than resorts to it, whereas language learners must often resort to CM in order to communicate. The following table presents CM as a communicative strategy observed in young Irish speakers in the early stages of language acquisition (Mac Fhlanachadha 1999: 54).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substitution</td>
<td><em>Fuair sé (em) husc- madra.</em>  [He got a husk-(y) a dog.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximation</td>
<td><em>Bhris tú é mar botún.</em> [You broke it as a mistake.] *target language = <em>Bhris tú é de thimpiste.</em> [You broke it by accident.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructuring</td>
<td><em>Agus bhí gach éinne an-/Bhí an áthas ar gach duine chun Pádraig a theiscint arís.</em>  [And everyone was very-/ Everyone was very happy to see Patrick again.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumlocation</td>
<td><em>Tháinig an bean amach as (-) an uisce. Agus bhí co- (em) *Ní raibh cosa aici ach (em) bhí (em) eireaball aici.</em>  [A woman came out of the water. And she had le- (em) * She didn’t have legs but (em) she had a (em) tail.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Coinage</td>
<td><em>ró-mhéad airgid</em> [too much money] *target language = <em>an iomad airgid</em> [too much money]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: MacFhlanachadha’s (1999: 54) five categories for CM as a communicative strategy

As is evident from the table, CM can prove a useful strategy for communication when the marked language of the context is not yet at a strong level of proficiency.
2.4.1 Loanwords

A loan is a codeswitch with a full-time job. (Gardner-Chloros 1984: 102)

Words inserted into a base language can, overtime, become part of the base language’s lexicon. For example, there are many words in English that come from other languages and this does not equate to CM. Over time words develop from mixes or switches into established loanwords. If we look at English as an example, it is apparent that the majority of loanwords are from Latin, Greek and French. The assimilation of these words takes place over various amounts of time depending, for example, on the agency that initiated the switch. This agency could be a terminology committee, an academic, a politician or an artist, but going back further the influences would have been religious and royal dynastic ties (with France for example). This is not to say, however, that every borrowed word will become eventually become assimilated into a language’s lexicon. Gardner-Chloros (2008: 61) later goes on to write a more descriptive differentiation between the two:

We cannot tell a loan from a code-switch by its linguistic form alone. It is the nature of the sociolinguistic contact which prevails at the time when an element is switched or borrowed which determines in what manner it is adapted or altered. Even within the same language pair, when words are borrowed in different historical periods, they may go through different processes of integration and end up looking different in the receiving language.

Poplack (1980) describes the use of loanwords as le mot juste for when the non-base language has the more accurate term available. Many languages contain loanwords that are indistinguishable by ‘any synchronic test’ (Haugen 1950: 211). The term borrowing is pointed out by Haugen (1950: 211) to be absurd as the borrowing is carried out without consent and there is no obligation to repay the word. Gafaranga (2008: 14) also presents this term as pseudo-scientific as it implies more or less clear boundaries between the languages involved, which leads to the question of language separateness. Of course there is the idea of cultural borrowing (Myers-Scotton 2006) where the turn of phrase would not translate or transfer aptly to the dominant language, in line with Poplack’s idea of le mot juste. Adoption is the recommended verbal noun, although for the purpose of uniformity the term borrowing will be used in this thesis.
Loanwords and borrowings are often created for the language to cope with newer situations and concepts. While Haugen (1950: 212) argues that borrowing a word is reproducing it innovatively in another language, this can be disproved, as bilinguals will claim to be speaking the first language with inserted borrowings from a second. While for English the etymology of the language can be investigated and the status of loanword confirmed, it is not so straightforward today to make a definition. This question has been examined by Deuchar (2006: 1988) at the ESRC Centre for Bilingualism based at the University of Wales, Bangor. The loanwords from her Welsh-English corpus are determined by their presence in the Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru [A Dictionary of the Welsh Language], considered to be the most authoritative and comprehensive Welsh dictionary. If an English-origin item is found in this Welsh dictionary, it is assumed to be a loan, whereas, if it is absent, it is assumed to be a mix. This, as Deuchar points out, runs into difficulty as compiling the dictionary and gathering the speech data were not concurrent, therefore some mixes may since have become loanwords. To overcome identifying newer loans as mixes, the data can be re-examined and single-word switches excluded in order to confirm the matrix language.

In discussing the question of what counts as a switch, we also need to distinguish switches from loans. Loans are words that have been borrowed from one language into another, like the English word restaurant, originally from French, and which would be found in a dictionary of the words of the recipient language. Where dictionaries are available for the languages concerned, we have excluded from our identification of switches any other language words found in the dictionary of those languages. This dictionary criterion is trickier with a minority language lacking a dictionary ... Of course, even where dictionaries exist they may be conservative and not record all loans, which means that we may have mistakenly identified some loans as single-word switches. (Deuchar et al 2007: 311)

However in the absence of a dictionary, which is often the case of minority languages, the researcher’s own judgment can come into effect, based on a proficient ability and familiarity with language norms of the language in question. The judgment of the researcher must also come into play when a word is distinguishable as either loan or mix according to the intonation in which it is uttered. In this instance, a mix may not be obvious from the transcription but will be supported by the actual audio recording proper.
While it is true that many languages are subject to language planning schemes of one sort or another, such efforts are usually directed either to technical fields with specialists setting new terminology or alternatively pundits defending language purity from the ivory towers or their respective ‘Academies’. In either case, the impact of such linguistic engineering decisions on the speakers at large tends to be limited, either because it concerns vocabulary they are unlikely to need in their daily lives or, in the case of native speakers of stable, dynamic language, it is the speakers themselves rather than the language authorities who decide what form their language will take, more often than not flaunting any rulings from on high. (Baxter 2004, 266-267)

This leads the research to questions of loanwords and dictionary criteria. Earlier in the chapter agencies that could qualify the status of a word: a terminology committee, an academic, a politician or an artist. The loanwords must also reflect the spoken language, which allows for a top-down and bottom-up approach to compiling dictionaries. As will become more apparent in chapters three and seven, the establishment of loanwords has links to the H and L variety, which also seeks to further divide the standard from the dialect. The criterion for meeting dictionary status is of particular instance to Irish as there are currently two lexicon databases (terminology and dictionary) and these are being updated on a constant basis. For many years Ó Donaill’s 1977 Irish-English dictionary was the definite dictionary, and in the preface he outlines the aim of the dictionary as (1991 [1977]: vii) including the words that were supported by evidence to be in ordinary usage of the language. There is a list of sources, for example the Irish Folklore Commission manuscripts, however further evidence of in vivo processes for data collection are not listed. This highlights a problematic area: if an English loanword is established in a local lexicon, e.g. in the combined lexicon of this project’s participants, can it thus meet dictionary criterion. In chapter seven, the methods of assimilation via phonology and orthography, are common in the case of Irish.

2.4.2 Sites of CM

In relation to the most popular sites for CM, nouns have consistently proven to be the most frequently switched and borrowed terms. It has been presented that perhaps this is due to the lack of lexical change involved. While in many languages (French, German, Spanish) the nouns have genders therefore the switched noun will be assigned a gender.
In the literature of CM the pertinence of single-word switches has been disputed with Poplack and Meechan (1998) considering most single lexical items as behaving as loanwords rather than categorising them as switches, and therefore other single language items are excluded from analysis. Myers-Scotton (2002: 41) regards single-word insertions as switches unless their status as a loanword can be supported. Research by Deuchar et al (2007: 322) also suggests that if there is an inflated proportion of single-words switches that this would present undue favour towards the insertion pattern, therefore an overall analysis of the corpus without single-word loans would reiterate the overall CM pattern.

There is also the transmission of calques or loan translations to be considered. Pfaff (1979: 297) outlines a series of questions to determine fully the status of a given L2 word in an L1 utterance: (a) Does an L1 equivalent exist? (b) If so, is it also in use in the community? (c) Is the equivalent L1 term known to the individual speaker? (d) Does the individual regard the word as belonging to L1 or to L2? Clearly, definitive answers to these questions can be found only through extensive studies of languages in use within the specific speech community, on the one hand, and by psycholinguistic probing of individuals, on the other. However, there are often cues in the utterances themselves, which indicate the speaker's perception of the foreignness of a word. Cues at the immediate point of language mixing include hesitation, asides, and translation or paraphrase. The presence of homophonous diamorphs, pairs of words that are phonetically similar in both varieties, are presented as language-neutral and therefore do not count as a switch or loanword (Deuchar et al 2007: 317).

As well as a language having to ‘keep up’ with advances, advances that can cause speakers to CM, there is an element of psychological attraction to another language. Myers-Scotton (2005: 64) discusses this in relation to bilingualism, but it is also relevant for the case of CM:

But at least today, the main psychological attraction of another language is its associations with a modernity that is not entirely definable. This is the cultural pull that today’s youth feel from English. With them, English has prospered for exactly the same reasons that the English-based culture has prospered. They both symbolize openness to change and even a preference for innovations. It’s partly
for this reason that one sees so many advertisements in the world in English, whether the majority of the local population can understand English or not.

This ‘openness to change’ can be related to Irish in the fact that it is absorbing and welcoming loanwords from other languages, but these words are primarily coming from English. English therefore represents modernity and Irish is striving to maintain the pace. The issue of modernity obviously can be associated with Irish-speakers wishing to learn English in order to increase their economic prospects, as mentioned in chapter one.

2.4.3 Prevention

In recent decades it is a common occurrence for new words to be introduced into languages, particularly minority languages, at an extremely fast rate. With advances in technology and medicine happening at an accelerated rate many countries have terminology committees established to produce their own language equivalent. The terminology committee in France is known to have a very rigorous approach to maintaining the French language. *Conseil International de la Langue Française* is not only committed to language maintenance in France but for the French-speaking countries of the world, and was established in Paris in 1968. The council’s remit is to enrich the French language and to manage the language’s resources. Terminology committees exist, it would seem, to allow for the standard language H variety to not require CM.

Aikhenvald (2001, 2003), in relation to the Tariana-speaking villages, examines the strong constraints against borrowing in this multilingual and obligatorily exogamous setting and then details certain morphological, phonological, and morphosyntactic features that fall within the awareness of Tariana speakers, causing them to reject certain words and structures as unacceptable “mixed” speech. She reports that borrowing from another language spoken in the region is severely condemned, but most especially borrowing from Tucano (an increasingly dominant and unrelated language in the area), and that speech considered imperfect or incorrect is openly ridiculed: those who introduce borrowed elements into their Tariana are subject to laughter and scorn (Aikhenvald 2001: 243, 2003: 129). This highlights often the social pressures to not CM, and can be extended to CM being a marked choice responding to domains and levels of formality and informality.
2.5 Theoretical Analysis of Code-Mixing

On approaching bilingual speech for analysis, there are many academic disciplines that have methods of analysis: sociology, linguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, neurolinguistics and oftentimes contrasting approaches can prove complementary. Today CM can be examined from a wide range of perspectives and many theories have been applied to various corpora. This section of the chapter will primarily focus on CM research that assists in understanding the contextual location of the speech, but it will also present a second method of analysis that can be applied simultaneously. For a detailed summary of models of analysis see Chan (2009).

2.5.1 Development

The study of CM has developed along a continuum encompassing sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics and applied linguistics: one aspect focuses on the linguistic construction of a bilingual clause and the other concentrates on the direction of the speech event for example the relevance of social situation, interlocutor or topic under discussion. While this project concentrates on the former of the two, the second approach will be briefly used in analysis of the corpus. For example Myers-Scotton (1998) discusses and develops the use of CS as a method of linguistically negotiating an identity and examines the markedness model of CS. This is a much broader use of the term of CS than is being applied in this research project but will not be excluded in the analysis.

Muysken (2000) provides a comprehensive account of, what he defines as, the three main patterns of CM: insertion, alternation and congruent lexicalisation.

   The insertion of material (most often a word or a constituent) from one language into an utterance in another language.

   The alternation between stretches of words in different languages.

   The congruent lexicalisation of a shared language structure with words from different languages.

Each pattern can be loosely predicted by sociolinguistic factors outlined in his book, and the table below summarises the various CM patterns, linguistic and extralinguistic factors.
Muysken’s (2000) model for assessing the CM pattern has been well received, and Chan (2009: 186) is particularly impressed by Muysken’s model, writing that:

The ingenuity of Muysken’s model lies in its attempt to connect the syntax of CS with sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics. He suggests that alternation is typical in stable bilingual communities with balanced bilinguals, whereas insertion is commonly found in former colonial settings where bilinguals are more fluent and at home with their first language. Congruent lexicalization is found where bilinguals, often second-generation immigrants, are fluent in two typologically similar languages, and these languages have equal prestige in society. Yet, syntax still plays a crucial role in this model. The three strategies represent the limits within which CS may vary on an individual or community level, although the three strategies are themselves defined by diagnostic criteria which are syntactic.

While it is not possible for every mix within a corpus to follow one pattern, Deuchar et al (2007) argue that a dominant pattern will always emerge from the analysis but surprisingly a strong secondary pattern can also be present. However it is also possible that the dominant pattern may shift over time. Muysken (2000: 249) suggests that prolonged contact may lead to a change of pattern, and that in particular, an insertional pattern may change to one of either alternation or congruent lexicalisation, again depending on both linguistic and extralinguistic factors. He suggests that alternation will be favoured by strong norms, language competition and typological distance whereas congruent lexicalisation is more likely in the case of non-rigid norms of correctness in speech, balance between languages and structural parallels.
Insertion is one of the more developed and researched patterns with Myers-Scotton’s (1993, 1998, 2002) focusing extensively and continuously on the pattern since 1993. It must be clarified is that the pattern will not be found in every mixed utterance, by every speaker in the corpus but that it will dominate the corpus. The field of CM is constantly evolving and developing, while initially restraints and rules were discussed, researchers are in a capacity to examine the characteristic much further. Simultaneously the language pairs being analysed are also evolving and dynamics shifting. Myers-Scotton addresses this shift in language interaction using the Matrix Language Turnover Model, which will be presented in section 2.5.4.2 of this chapter.

2.5.2 Conversation Analysis
The concept of conversation analysis (CA hereafter), which can be categorised under the umbrella term of interactional sociolinguistics, has been developed by Auer (2002) and examines closely the context in which the conversation takes place, scrutinising, for example, pauses and tone of voice to ascertain the function of switching within a conversation. Gafaranga (2009: 114) comments that the CA approach can be used in two different ways. Used in a broad sense, it can denote any study of people talking together, oral communication or language use. And, used in a more restricted sense, it points to one particular tradition of analytic work on talk-in-interaction. The CA approach to linguistic analysis is not theoretically based, without any fully developed theory but there are basic aims of the approach. In CA talk is viewed as social action (2009: 115), and it understands that talk is an orderly activity (2009: 116) and therefore aims to describe talk organisation. Therefore the association of CA to CS is that CS is used as a tool to frame, control or direct a conversation. CA adopts an emic perspective on bilingual conversations and assumes that language choice is a resource that participants can draw on and do so because of the normative nature of conversation (2009: 126). While this is not the proposed method of analysis for this thesis, elements from the CA approach will be drawn upon in chapter seven. There are components of a language data corpus that can either or both linguistic and CA analysis, therefore it is worthwhile referring to various approaches, providing they complement each other.
2.5.3 Investigating Stance

CS can be approached from a socioculturally analytical approach, examining its use to portray stance within an interaction. This interpretation of CS has gained currency in recent sociolinguistic literature (Smith-Christmas 2013: 230) and aids researchers in understanding the ways in which speakers position themselves, not only within the discourse but also with the wider sociocultural setting of the interaction. Jaffe (2007: 55) presents how CS can have one or multiple meanings, and these meanings can be related to (a) social meanings, conventionally attached to expressive activity or individual codes in a bilingual repertoire, (b) social meanings conventionally attached to switching between codes, and (c) individual knowledge, awareness, and intended related to (a) and (b). Therefore this frame for analysis must examine the data from two perspectives: the micro-interactional discourse and the sociolinguistic context. Jaffe (2007) has worked extensively on the French-Corsican bilingual classroom setting, and emphasises the importance of social meanings in a particular historical and cultural context, combined with the speaker’s attitudes, repertoire, and practices across a wide variety of domains (2007: 68-69). This extensive approach, especially within the setting of a minority/majority bilingual community, is key to ascertaining the social motivations or stance of CS between the two. Smith-Christmas (2013: 230) approached CS on the Western Isles of Scotland between Gaelic and English to gauge the stance of speakers, applying the micro-interactional analysis perspective and ascertaining the meaning of CS via sequential analysis of the conversation. Smith-Christmas (2013: 243) further concludes that it is not one language versus the other that is important in the stance reification process; rather, it is contrast between the two languages that is integral in facilitating meaning in the interaction.

2.5.4 The Matrix Language Framework

2.5.4.1 An overview of the Matrix Language Framework

The MLF shows how the base language will provide the morphosyntactical structure for the projection of complementiser or complementiser phrase (CP hereafter). Therefore the base structure places constraints on the syntactical locations in which mixes can be inserted. The Embedded Language can be inserted accordingly into the Matrix Language
or create an Embedded Language Island consisting of two or more morphemes that display structural dependency relationships. The CP is examined in relation to the morpheme order and identifying if the inserted language is a content or system morpheme. These examination processes will be discussed further along in the chapter.

The MLF has been extensively developed and revised by Myers-Scotton (1993, 1998, 2002) and has been written to be the most comprehensive framework for analysing cases of classic CM data (Clyne 2003: 81). The MLF is used to determine cases of classic CS as opposed to composite CS, which involves a composite morphosyntactic frame from both languages contributing to the bilingual unit of analysis.

Initially Myers-Scotton (1993) proposed that the Matrix Language could be determined as the language that provided the most morphemes in a discourse sample. However, this was proven to be problematic and she has since retracted this approach (2002: 61) on the basis that while the matrix language usually supplies more morphemes in a bilingual sample, it is not always the case. Another substantial revision by Myers-Scotton is the unit of analysis from sentence to CP. She (2002: 66) discusses the revision as follows:

One of the virtues of using the CP as the unit of analysis is that it is true that many sentences are complex, consisting of more than one CP. Part of the definition of CP is that the unit of structure includes Comp position: this definition disposes of the problem of where to put elements in Comp position (with one part of the sentence or which clause) if either sentence or clause are used as the unit of analysis.

Furthermore Myers-Scotton (2002: 8) defines the CP as follows:

The term CP refers to the specific type of maximal projection or constituent, projection of Complementizer. The CP is at the highest level in a tree of syntactic structures. It follows that CPs contain other constituents or maximal projections, such as NPs [noun phrase], VPs [verb phrase], and the like. Both independent and dependent clauses are CPs.

Researchers have interpreted this CP to mean a clause, in the loose sense, (Davies 2009, Deuchar 2006) and continue to separate the data into clauses for further analysis. Davies (2009: 83) writes:

A CP is always a clause, of course, but I use the more generic term ‘clause’ to cover both the CP and e.g. co-ordinating conjunctions that appear outside the CP- such words occur frequently between clauses in speech, and it is necessary when
analysing to associate them with one utterance or another. In this case, coordinating conjunctions were analysed as part of the CP they preceded, and this whole element is identified as a clause.

The clause in its simplest form is straightforward but in the case of complex clauses, it must be subdivided for analysis. Davies (2009: 121-122) discusses the breakdown of complex clauses with an example from Welsh.

Complex clauses can consist, hypothetically, of any number of embedded clauses, both finite and nonfinite. Such clauses are subdivided into individual embedded clauses were possible, with the residual main clauses also being a unit of analysis. In cases where that residual main clause itself is a complex clause with embedded clauses ... maximum subdivision is again aimed for.

The example cited, with clauses markers represented by square brackets, is: [oedd Jac a Jên [oedd yn ffînd penna lddo] yn chwaræ criced [pan oeddên nhw ‘n tyfu fyny]] and in English the examples reads: Jac and Jên [who was his best friend] played cricket [when they were growing up]] (2009: 122). This division into smaller simple clauses, however, presents many clauses that are ambiguous and as a result there is often insufficient information for the ML to be identified. The unit for analysis is therefore somewhat open for interpretation, given Myers-Scotton’s (2002: 53) extensive revisions and her reassurance that ‘the basic substance is the same.’

The MLF does not, however, include a framework for analysing monolingual CPs. Myers-Scotton (2002: 58) writes that:

... the Matrix Language is obviously transparent in monolingual speech. It is only in bilingual speech where the Matrix Language, the frame, becomes much of an issue, because - theoretically - either language participating in the utterance could be the source of the Matrix Language ... In monolingual CPs - even if they are part of a bilingual conversation - there is no Matrix Language - Embedded Language opposition within a CP.

This stance of monolingual CPs therefore excludes all examples of calques or loan translations from data assessing the MLF for classic CM. This characteristic of the corpus will be discussed during the analysis, and while it does not fall strictly under the category of CM, it will be discussed in relation to the MLF in the broader sense. The matter of loan translations, referred to as Béarlachas in Irish, is a pertinent issue in Irish language
acquisition, and although a trait of weaker speakers, is indicative of convergence towards English.

The mixed clauses, under scrutiny, should have an identifiable ML and EL based on evidence from the morphosyntactic structure of the clause and the type of morpheme assigned to each language. The MLF states that the ML is the language associated with the overall structure of the clause and the system morphemes and the EL is the language of content morphemes. The latter consists of nouns, verbs, adjectives, conjunctions, etc. and the EL can create an EL island that displays dependency between the morphemes within the island, outwith the morphosyntactic structure of the ML. The system morphemes consist of determiners, prepositions, quantifiers, possessives, auxiliaries, tense markers and Myers-Scotton divides the system morphemes further into three categories: early, late and bridge depending on their point of activation within the CP. Deuchar (2006: 1998) redefines the late system morpheme to suit the VSO order of the Welsh language:

For our purposes we shall re-define late system morphemes in terms of those involves in agreement processes rather than in terms of relations outside a morpheme’s maximal projection. This is because the notion of maximal projection tends to be theory-specific ... and also because in the case of a verb-first language like Welsh, current analyses would consider subject-verb agreement to take place within the same maximal projections, i.e. within CP or FinP.

In short, the system morphemes contribute to the syntactical structure of the clause, ensuring all co-indexed morphemes are accordingly responded, for example verb suffixes responding to the relevant noun or pronoun. The content morpheme provides the content information of the clause.

For the analytical approach to the Irish-English corpus the content and system morphemes are generally determined as follows:

Content: nouns, adjectives, verbs, discourse markers, established loanwords

System: prepositions, quantifiers, prepositions, possessive suffixes, auxiliaries, tense markers, articles, prepositional pronouns, particles, copula

In chapter seven, the construction of Irish in relation to English will become apparent, with the sites for co-indexing are greater in number as a result of the copula and
prepositional pronouns. The analysis will also highlight components of the corpus that indicate convergence towards English despite meeting the MLF well-formedness criteria.

2.5.4.2 MLF Turnover Hypothesis

Myers-Scotton (2002) also accounts for evidence of a shift of matrix language, and is applicable to instances of composite CM rather than classic. The underlying principle is that over time the ML has shifted from one language to the other. For example, if the Irish-English CM data contained morphosyntactical structures from English within an Irish mixed utterance, it would be an indicator of convergence towards English as the ML. The turnover hypothesis reflects an active shift away from one language towards another, and in the case of Irish given its already ‘endangered’ status it would be a worrying discovery among balanced bilinguals.

2.5.4.3 MLF Criticism

The MLF is not without its detractors, criticisms that Myers-Scotton is content to address and respond to. As evident in her book *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes* (2002) there are constant references to critical comments, misinterpretations and misguided comments by other researchers in the field. One complaint about the MLF comes from a researcher in the CA field of study, Gafaranga (2007: 62), and he writes:

... one of the weaknesses of the models, the Matrix Language Frame Model in particular, is that, drawing on the assumption that the sentence is the highest unit of grammar, these models fail to capture regularities across data sets. It was also suggested that the notion of Matrix Language might not be as useful a concept as it is said to be, since each CP must be examined indifferently in order to determine exactly what its Matrix is.

The argument is indeed sound, with the approach analysing each utterance on an instance-by-instance approach, however as Deuchar et al (2007) point out, it is worthwhile reviewing the corpus as a whole to investigate regularities or trends. This linguistic approach does not necessarily require the contextual setting of the clause and does maintain an ‘indifferent’ approach. To compensate for this criticism of Gafaranga’s, this thesis is combining the linguistic approach with a sociolinguistic approach.
MacSwann (2005a, 2005b) is also vocal in his rejection of the MLF with an active debate in issues of *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 2005. His primary argument is that bilingual speech is best analysed on a monolingual basis: the bilingual speech acts as one language. Rather than understanding a bilingual to have access to two languages, he (2005a: 6) presents that a bilingual has access to separate lexicons. He continues to explain that he uses the term ‘language’ to ‘refer to a collection of formally substantiated morphological and phonological rules which applies to a specific set of lexical items, contained in a lexicon. He (2005a: 20) determines that CM will draw lexical items from either ‘language’ and introduce features into the derivation with no CS-specific mechanisms admitted. This Minimalist Approach therefore is applicable to bilingual speakers at various stages of language proficiency. He argues (2005a: 19) that the MLF is a theory of linguistic competence and in this capacity he provides counter-examples to the MLF in sample bilingual clauses.

While MacSwan (2005a) makes a compelling case for the Minimalist Approach, one of the arguments against the MLF was crucial in selecting the framework for this research corpus: the link between proficiency and the MLF. As outlined in the abstract and chapter one, this thesis seeks to assess CM by balanced bilinguals in order to determine the stability between Irish and English. Weaker speakers of Irish engage in CM as a strategy that will aid in overcoming linguistic weaknesses and for these speakers MacSwan’s approach could be more appropriate. CM is established in spoken Irish and an asymmetry is possible by using Irish as the base for bilingual clauses. I believe that the typological distance between Irish and English would benefit more from the MLF. In chapter three problematic borrowing and CM in Irish will be developed and the case for the MLF supported further.

2.6 Brief Discussion and Conclusion

2.6.1 Discussion

Given the range of research and obvious prominence of CM and CS in spoken languages, Smith-Christmas (2012), although writing on CS, observes a downfall in the research also applicable to CM: how the research is based on a monolingual outlook. She (2012: 47-48) continues:
The question of why code-switching occurs is in and of itself reflective of the idea that at some level, switching languages is a deviation from the norm ... It could also be argued that the very act of defining an entity as a ‘mixed code’ is trying to articulate a phenomenon in monolingual terms; although there are two or more languages involved, they operate as a unified code, just as language operates as a unified code in monolingual speech. The reason that monolingual interactions are monolingual is because that is the only way they can occur, but somehow, this norm has been applied to bilingual interactions, and bilinguals are seen to need ‘motivations’ for their switches.

This is a pertinent observation by Smith-Christmas and is worthy of further contemplation within the context of this study. Ferguson (1959: 241) also comments on the form a middle language, between H and L that can serve as a connecting link between the two varieties, and by extension this can signify two languages.

This leads into a question of where one language ends and another begins. MacSwan (2005a: 5) believes this question to be more a matter of politics than linguistics and then continues to quote Chomsky:

… what we call “English”, “French”, “Spanish”, and so on, even under idealizations to idiolects in homogeneous speech communities, reflect the Norman Conquest, proximity to Germanic areas, a Basque substratum, and other factors that cannot seriously be regarded as properties of the language faculty. (Chomsky quoted in MacSwan 2005a: 5)

In the context of Irish, the issue of Hiberno-English as the embedded language brings this complex dimension to the Irish-English CM research. Stenson (1991) and later Hickey (2009) breach this topic, as Hiberno-English is the result of extended English-Irish language contact with loanwords being established, the reversal of the current direction of mixing.

... when considering the behaviour of English words in Irish, one frequently encounters a blurring of the phonological distinctions between the two languages which might be used in other bilingual settings to differentiate integrated from non-integrated forms. (Stenson 1991: 562)

In questioning the definition of language, for example as MacSwan (2005a: 5) suggests viewing a ‘language’ as lexicon, the discussion adopts a philosophical tone. Hinnenkamp (2003: 36) on the subject of language hybridity writes that ‘mixed language functions like a mirror of the historical, social, cultural and linguistic conditions’ under which the
speakers grow up. In the case of balanced bilinguals a strong boundary between languages can be appreciated but in the case of speakers who have yet to fully acquire the L2, the influence of L1 will dominate. In essence the mixed speech equates to a pidgin in that it is ‘social rather than an individual solution’ (Spolsky 1998: 61). The mixed speech should therefore not be confused with CM speech as used by bilinguals with good proficiency. This again seeks to reiterate the vast difference between CM by weak and strong speakers.

Mesthrie et al (2009: 171) propose, based on CS, that a speaker’s choice of language has to do with maintaining or negotiating a certain type of social identity with others. It continues that CS allows for a simultaneous access to different identities. As CS and CM are so closely related, the basis of the proposals can be extended to CM, and in the instance of Irish-English CM, the use of mixing signifies an identity: that of an Irish speaker living within the Gaeltacht, on the understanding that these speech communities comprise of many kinds of participants from the linguistically conservative to the ‘semi-speakers’ (Dorian 2010: 106-110).

To elaborate, if the corpus supports the MLF model and some of the participants are at a peak of their Irish language usage, does this indicate that the CM’ed language is their Irish language? This ‘community of practice’ (Eckert 2000) using (code-) mixed speech could be rooted in the community practices rather than drawing on the defined varieties of Irish (Gardner-Chloros 2009a: 113).

2.6.2 Conclusion
The aim of this chapter was to define that linguistic terms that will be employed in this thesis to discuss the research into Irish-English bilingualism, the context of the Gaeltacht bilingual community and, finally, to analyse the project’s spoken Irish corpus. In a research project of this nature, any ambiguity in these definitions would lead to a confused discussion and unclear outcomes. The MLF as the theoretical tool is pertinent to the status of Irish in that it can indicate where on the continuum between stability and shifting towards English the speakers can be located. Despite the negative literature on

22 Original emphasis.
the model (MacSwan 2005a, 2005b), it is a tool that Myers-Scotton constantly strives to improve, clarify and evolve as more and more researchers apply it to language pairs.
Chapter Three: A Review of Irish-English Code-Mixing Research

Although the history of language contact in Ireland is centuries old, the syntactic effects of that contact remain mostly unexplored. The rather dramatic word order differences between Irish and English offer an excellent opportunity to test some of the claims that have been made about the need for parallel structures in code-switching, as well as the universality of the more abstract proposals. Moreover, the sociolinguistic relationship of Irish and English in bilingual communities permits us to disregard certain of the variables confronted in other studies, such as major differences of speaker competence in the two languages, variance in directionality of switching, and problems of identifying a base or matrix language in cases of multiple intrasentential shifts. (Stenson 1990: 168)

3.1 Introduction

The history of language contact between Irish and English is long and, at times, tumultuous, and a lengthy survey is not necessary for the purpose of this thesis. As noted in chapter one, the primary contact is and has been for at least 150 years (Ó hIfearnáin 2009: 340) with English, which has gradually overtaken Irish as the primary language of Ireland. This is, of course, in juxtaposition to its secondary position to Irish as an official language in Ireland, as stated in Bunreacht na hÉireann [The Constitution of Ireland] (1937). Projecting from Muysken’s (2000) conclusions on CM pattern based on extralinguistic factors, it is expected that insertion would be the dominant pattern of CM in the Irish-English context, and this will be confirmed in this chapter by referencing earlier CM research.

This chapter will focus on previous research on Irish-English CM and summarise the findings. The research takes many forms and draws on various speech samples: poetry, natural-occurring speech, interviews and a radio drama, and this review will highlight the common factors that have been uncovered and any theoretical analysis that indicates a CM pattern. As will become apparent, the research tends to be primarily sociolinguistic, examining CM as a communicative strategy and indicating the position of the interaction on the continuum from formality to informality (Ní Laoire 2009) and stance (Hickey 2001; Ó Domagáin 2013). While Stenson (1990, 1991) applied theoretical frameworks to an Irish corpus, the selected models did not uphold with the Irish-English data, and today there remains a lack of a purely linguistic analytical review. Therefore this thesis is a complementary contribution to previous and ongoing research and will assess the CM
from a fresh perspective. There will be a detailed outline of the conclusions drawn by researchers and how these results will be used to compound the research outcomes of this thesis. This aim of this chapter is to allow for a trajectory of CM to be formed based on the CM characteristics that previous researchers identified.

The topic of Irish-English CM is a relatively underdeveloped in Irish language research where there is a strong focus on the phenomenon of language shift as a result of language contact. The recent Government of Ireland’s language policies: the Official Languages Act 2003, Statement on the Irish Language 2006 and the 20-Year Strategy for the Irish Language 2010-2030 make for exciting and current focal points for language planning research. To this end, although predating the language policy developments, O’Malley-Madec (2001: 261) writes that it is regrettable that all scholarly discussions of Irish over-concentrate on its possible extinction without carefully examining the creative as well as destructive ways in which speakers of the language have responded to the fact of being in contact with English. There are a handful of researchers focusing on the practice of CM but an ‘over-concentration’ on language shift and language policy does indeed prevail.

3.2 A basic summary of the Irish language

For a better understanding of the case of Irish-English CM the basic typological differences will be outlined and therefore the potential mix or switch-site possibilities can be outlined. Irish is an Indo-European, q-Celtic language that follows the basic structure of Verb Subject Object, while English is a Subject Verb Object language. This dramatic typographical contrast between Irish and English immediately signposts constraints to the CM sites. Irish is a language with a complex system of cases (genitive, nominative, dative, vocative, accusative) that require nouns to mutate accordingly and these sites can trigger compositional errors or linguistic compromises. For the majority of noun phrases, the adjective follows the noun, which again is the reverse of the English form of adjective-noun order. The language also uses the copula form; a particular form of the verb to be that is used to connect a subject with an object. The language also contains prepositional pronouns that are not associated with the English language. Irish maintains an echoic verb system and this will be discussed further along in the chapter.
3.2.1 Standardisation

The Official Standard of Irish was outlined first in 1958 with the publication of *Gramadach Na Gaeilge Agus Litriú Na Gaeilge: An Caighdeán Oifigiúil* [The Grammar of Irish and Spelling of Irish: The Official Standard]. By this time, it has been argued, the language was deficient in terminology and standard grammar, and lacked consensus in relation to orthography, grammar and typeface; and it was generally acknowledged that rules and grammar for writing in Irish ought to be redefined (Ó Murchadha 2010: 215).

This standard has since been updated indirectly via publications over the following 60 years: *Graiméar Gaeilge na mBráithre Criostáí* [The Christian Brothers Irish Grammar] 1960, revised in 1999 based on the publication of the standard Irish-English dictionary compiled by Ó Dónaill (1977). After a period of over fifty years the standard was reviewed more recently in 2011. The initial standardisation was a massive undertaking and Tóibín (1951: 9) comments that:


[It is understandable that no standard can be agreed that will satisfy everyone. I believe that it is not possible to agree on a standard that will satisfy anyone who has good Irish. The native is too strong in the Gaeltacht man. The pride is too strong in those who learned from books. But no one cares about us. The learning group of Ireland will be satisfied. And by not satisfying them, the game is lost.]

The first standardisation process for Irish was not without problems, especially since it was based primarily on the language conventions of those working in the Department of Translation. There was a debate on how to best outline a standard, divided between those in favour of basing the standard on Classical Irish and those in favour of closely resembling the speech of the Irish-speaking population (Ó Murchadha 2010: 216). Finally the standard was created with the aim of a being dialect neutral to allow for ease of understanding and use (2010: 211). Even prior to the publication of the standard in Irish, Tóibín (1951: 9) commented that it could only be a *comhghéilleadh* [compromise].

---

23 For a detailed discussion on the standardisation of Irish see Ó Murchadha (2010).
The decision to standardise the Irish language brings an added dimension of the H and L varieties to CM and CS (Ferguson 1959). Traditionally non-Gaeltacht spoken Irish is the standard with leanings towards a particular dialect, however a Gaeltacht dialect then comes into competition with the official standard for the H position. This topic was briefly discussed in chapter two about how the H can shift from standard to dialect depending on the stage of bilingualism of the speaker. However, the Gaeltacht speech as an officially recognised target for language excellence through its overt identification as a basis for the standard, only seeks to alienate non-Gaeltacht speakers (Ó Murchadha 2010: 234). These non-Gaeltacht speakers are located between two standards, both of prestige with the standard perhaps more so in the written form, and therefore the target language is often blurred.

3.2.2 Terminology
Terminology in Irish was developed within the Department of Education throughout the greater part of the last century. Committees of Irish-language experts were set up as early as 1927 with the aim of providing terminology for the education system. This also coincided with the foundation of An Gúm, a publication house, in 1926 to provide Irish language reading material and textbooks. In 1968 the Minister of Education established An Buancoiste Téarmaíochta [The Permanent Terminology Committee]. An Coiste Téarmaíochta and its functions were transferred to Foras na Gaeilge in 1999, according to the provisions of the Belfast Agreement.

Ni Ghallachóir (2004: 9) notes that during the time of the cultural revival in Ireland, vocabulary lists relating to trades were compiled and published in the newspapers An Cladheamh Solais and Fáinne an Lae. An overview of terminology throughout the twentieth century cumulates in a high demand for terminology from the nineties onwards. The demand on the terminology committee is the result of numerous factors: bilingual signage, state bodies seeking specialised terminology, and a diminished number of capable Irish-speakers in the state service. Also ‘... tá an Béarla ag éiri níos dothuigthe do-aistrithe, go háirithe i gcás béarlagair gnó is teicneolaitoicha.’ [English is getting more incomprehensibly un-translatable, especially in relation to business jargon and technology] (Ni Ghallachóir 2004: 9). The Good Friday Agreement (1999), the
foundation of *Foras na Gaeilge*, the Official Languages Act 2003, the status of Irish within the EU as an official working language and, most recently, the 20-Year Strategy for the Irish Language are the key components that currently drive the terminology committee as well as personal and professional use for Irish-speakers and learners.

The aim of the terminology committee is to approve, develop and provide authoritative, standardised Irish-language terminology and therefore increase the capacity of the language as a modern medium in a modern society, according to the statutory requirements within Ireland and the European Union. The demand for terminology, based on primarily English terms, is great with new words being added into the lexicon on an annual basis. Ni Ghallchobhair (2004: 8) writes that in rare exceptions ‘fágtar an téarma sa teanga eile’ [the term is left in the other language], therefore allowing an abrupt status of loanword rather than a gradual shift from mix to loan. While the resources are infinitely useful, a problem with this approach is that quite often the native speakers are not adopting the newly coined terminology and resort to using the English term instead. This does create a linguistic situation whereby a word can have a listed status in Irish terminology database, to use a variation on Deuchar’s (2006: 1988) listedness approach outlined in chapter two, while also having an established English loanword: a double entry in the Irish language lexicon. But this is not a new occurrence in the field, as Stenson (1993: 121) comments that well-established loanwords, with phonological assimilation to Irish sound patterns, often filling a lexical gap or replacing older native forms (*coláiste* ‘college’, *pláta* ‘plate’, *seirbhís* ‘service’) coexist with English words borrowed without phonological assimilation. She notes that this is especially the case with younger speakers who tend to use unassimilated English on an ad hoc basis, but it was widespread across several generations. There is also a plethora of homophonous diamorphs operating as Irish words, for example the Irish word for taxi is *tacsai* that in a spoken utterance would be regarded as language neutral as suggested by Deuchar et al (2007: 317).

Ni Ghearán (2011) examines language policy in Ireland, with a focus on newly constructed terminology in Irish and its subsequent use among those who speak or use the
language. Her work addresses the adoption of new terminology among Irish-speaking Gaeltacht communities.

... tugann an litriocht le fios go bhfuil fadhb inghlacthachta ann i measc phobal urlabhra na Gaeilge sa Gaeltacht. Baineann an fhadhb seo ní hamháin lena gcleachtas teanga – meastar nach nglacann siad le tèarmaiocht nua-aimseartha sa Ghaeilge, ach lena gcreideamh teanga chomh maith – creidtear go mbionn dearcadh diúltach acu i leith na nuathéarmaiochta agus i leith na pleanála oifigiúla tèarmaiochta. (2011: 2)

[... the literature informs us that there is a problem with acceptance among the Irish-speaking community of the Gaeltacht. This problem is not only associated with their language usage - it is regarded that they do not accept modern terminology in Irish, but with their language belief as well - it is believed that they have a negative opinion of new terminology and official language planning.]

This issue that has been addressed by Ní Ghearáin highlights a strong motivation for Irish-speakers to avail of CM in conversation, and it also reiterates the practice of CM for new cultural ideas (Mac Mathúna 2007; Stenson 1993; Sjoestedt-Jonval 1938). However in this case, and since the foundation of the terminology committee, there is an Irish term but it is being rejected and/or neglected. A sample of speech from Ó Domagáin’s (2013: 220) Gort an Choirce, Donegal Gaeltacht, corpus encapsulates this issue of new terminology and native speakers:

*Bheul, níl an accent agat ach tá do chuidse pure, tá na foclaí agat ar achan rud. Cluinfidh tú cainteoirí dúchais anseo agus Béarla uilig a bhíos acu ar new terms, like computers agus mar sin dó. Cha raibh ach a dhath mar sin againne nuair a bhi muid óg so níor fhoghlaim muid na foclaí riamh.*

[Well, you don’t have the accent but yours is pure, you have the words for everything. You will hear the native speakers here and they’ll have only English for new terms, like computers and the likes. We had only a little of then when we were young so we never learned the words.]

The subject of H and L language practices in language pairs is raised by Ni Neachtain (2012) and it seems pertinent to the various codes of Irish in the accepting or refusing terminology. Ó Domagáin (2013), O’Malley-Madec (2001), Ni Laoire (2012) and Hickey (2009) point out that CM is a characteristic of casual speak in Irish, i.e. the L language or the vernacular. As noted by Ni Ghearáin (2011) the terminology is accepted by those whose Irish language would be in the H (Ferguson 1959) category. It also can be related to the standard versus dialect discussion, whereby the use of inclusion of new
terminology by native speakers would be a mix of varieties, a CM and a marked choice within an utterance. This again would reiterate Tóibín’s (1951: 9) concern that the standard was not for the native speakers, and perhaps it has remained so. The complex nature of CM between varieties is beyond the scope of this chapter.

This matter of standardisation and terminology can be linked back to the pioneering article of Ferguson on diglossia, with two varieties in use with a High and Low hierarchy present. He (1959: 242) writes that H should include in its total lexicon technical terms and learned expressions that have no regular L equivalents, since the subjects involved are rarely if ever discussed in L. He (1959: 242) further explains that the L variety will include popular expressions and the names of very homely objects or objects of very localised distribution. However in Ireland, perhaps as a throwback from the late nineteenth / early twentieth century, there remains a profound admiration of native speakers and in particular to the vocabulary and nathan na cainte [expressions].

3.2.3 Target Language of Young Adults

As is established in chapter two, CM is a characteristic of language contact, and in Ireland the languages in contact are Irish and English. The ever-expanding presence of English in the Irish language domains is perhaps the most intrusive of factors that influences CM in Irish. The English language is ubiquitous in Ireland and therefore practically unavoidable, and as a result English is always a default option for speakers of Irish. There are other indirect factors that can influence an Irish-speaker’s language, for example the matter of language prestige and language idols. The issue of language prestige has shifted, and younger speakers are looking towards non-conventional language idols. Traditionally older speakers in the community were the focal point for aspiring speakers and learners but today this target standard has shifted.

The Irish of young Gaeltacht speakers, however traditional their linguistic background, is now also moving very rapidly from the local variety to one that is influenced by English generally, but also by the kind of Irish practiced in the broadcast media, at school and in the non-native revivalist speech community, and can be heard at phonological, lexical, grammatical and syntactical levels in everyday speech. (Ó hIfearnáin and Ó Murchadha 2011)
Ó Domagáin found in his examination of Irish in a Donegal Gaeltacht area that CM was fashionable among young speakers and these young speakers believed those who didn’t CM were old-fashioned (2013: 236). This attitude again reiterates the evolution in terms of language prestige. He also notes that as these speakers are growing up they are surrounded by two languages and it is therefore no surprise that they would draw upon both, as is already accepting as a method of communication within the speech community. This shift from the traditional Gaeltacht Irish target that was, and still is among older speakers, regarded as the most prestigious form of the language highlights how the spoken language of young Irish-speakers is being influenced by external factors.

3.2.4 ‘Good’ Irish

The question must then be asked as to what constitutes ‘good Irish’. The standard of Irish, its associated ideology and ubiquitous presence in the Irish education system promotes itself as ‘good Irish’. The standard, of course, is the more widely spoken across Ireland with the majority of the 40 per cent using Irish in education speaking the standard. But this creates a ideological problem for native speakers crossing into a standard Irish domain. This particular problem is voiced by a native speaker who attended tertiary education to study Irish: ... tógadh le Gaeilge mise agus ... cheap mé go raibh Gaeilge maith agam ... go ndeachaigh mé ag déanamh an Dioplóma sa nGaeilge ... ní raibh ... céard é an focal, confidence, bhí sé just imithe uaim [...] I was raised with Irish and ... I thought I had good Irish...until I started the Diploma in Irish ... it wasn’t ... what’s the word, confidence, it was gone from me] (Ní Ghearáin 2011: 214) Ó Domagáin (2013: 239) also equates the native speaker as a good speaker of Irish when he writes that there are still good speakers but the younger generation are missing certain values and qualities as a result of the evolving dynamic of the Gaeltacht.

These two instances present the Gaeltacht native speaker (older speaker in the case of Ó Domagáin (2013)) as speakers with good Irish. The observation that younger generations are missing values and qualities seems to determine their Irish as not good. The changing nature of Irish in the Gaeltacht is subject change as Gardner-Chloros (2009: 43-43; 2009a: 98-99) highlights in the factors contributing to CM:
Factors independent of particular speakers and particular circumstances in which the varieties are used, which affect all the speakers of the relevant varieties in a particular community.

Factors directly related to the speakers, both as individuals and members of a variety of subgroups, their competence in each variety, their social networks and relationships, their attitudes and ideologies, their self-perception and perception of others.

I would argue that Ó Domagáin’s (2013: 239) comment is prescriptive in its differentiation between good speakers and younger speakers in that it discounts the sociolinguistic factors that are constantly active in a language contact situation.

3.3 The Direction of Code-mixing

Stenson (1990: 169) answers the question relating to the direction of the CM by stating that the practice is always unidirectional, from English into Irish. She bases this in part on the fact that the speakers studied generally speak English only to those who cannot speak Irish, thus precluding the possibility of switching in such cases (1990: 194). This is indeed true among balanced bilinguals but while CM does not occur from Irish to English, there are examples of well-established Irish loanwords in English. Ó Coileáin (2003) discusses the Irish words in English based on a West Limerick corpus collected in the 1930s under the auspices of Irish Folklore Commission. He presents the continuum of these Irish words in the spoken English of the region by drawing on informants from different age groups and assessing their knowledge of the Irish words. Some of the Irish nouns were known only to the 50-60 age group for example: batharam [a downpour], caibín [an old hat], scairt [burst of laughter or shout] and útamálaí [an awkward person]. There were also nouns known to the previous age group and 25-30 year olds: bradach [braddy cow, thievish], ciotóg [left-handed], mí-ádh [misfortune] and triopall [a cluster, a bunch as of rushes etc.]. Irish nouns that were familiar to the 50-60, 25-30 and 10-15 year old age groups included: banbh [a young pig], ciaróg [a beetle], scealp [slice, portion] and súgán [hay or rope]. There are also some nouns that are in use within various configurations of the age groups. There are other well-established loanwords from Irish in English, not limited to Hiberno-English, due in no small part to the extended language contact between the two, for example smithereens.
In Ireland, there are also a handful of Irish language words and phrases in the national lexicon that function as ‘token loanwords’, to coin a phrase. Some of these examples have been observed personally in casual conversation with interlocutors unaware of the subject of this thesis, and other examples are well known in society. Sláinte [health] is the term widely used to express good wishes before imbuing alcohol. There is a longer version: Sláinte, agus bás in Éirinn [Health, and death in Ireland] that carries a more patriotic and nationalistic tone. Other words include grá [love], cúpla focal [a few words], fáilte [welcome] and blas [accent]. These words do not fully function as loanwords as the English language equivalent is still within the national lexicon. Except for sláinte, these words or phrases are used as tools of implication, implying that the speaker has a grasp of the Irish language but is not willing to converse in Irish at that time, due to a lack of proficiency. Ní Laoire (2012) also comments on the use of Irish, with CM, by speakers who are not necessarily proficient when abroad, using the language as a mode to mark their identity and use a ‘secret’ intragroup language. Walsh (2012: 335-336) describes this phenomenon as follows:

In Irish, the expression ‘cúpla focal’ (literally, ‘a few words’) is widely used by Irish ‘speakers’ who do not know that much Irish at all but who, to varying degrees, consider themselves part of the larger Irish speaking community. Although there can be an emphasis on symbolic or tokenistic displays in the case of many minoritised languages in western Europe, the Irish situation is at the far end of that spectrum due to almost a century of official promotion at national level and relatively high passive knowledge of the language among the population. This dynamic raises fundamental questions about the nature and scope of the endangerment in the Irish situation, when a fairly large percentage of the population already knows (a bit of) the threatened language and thinks that such limited knowledge will suffice to provide public services in Irish. The ideology of ‘the few words’ is deeply embedded in many aspects of Irish language policy …

Kelly-Holmes (2011: 522) locates this token use of Irish within a discourse of ‘us-versus-them’ and states that ‘being a “normal” Irish person, and belonging to “us”, means knowing Irish, and buying into the discourse of endangerment and revitalisation at a superficial level, but not speaking the language or claiming to be fluent in it.’

With the exception of the loanwords established in Hiberno-English and the use of tokenistic Irish, the direction of mixing is unidirectional with English imbedded into Irish. Stenson (1990: 169) writes that Irish is never inserted into English discourse and
therefore the question of identifying a base or matrix language is straightforward as the base language is always Irish. Whether this statement can still be supported is a fundamental question of this research project. Over twenty years have passed since Stenson’s writing this, and during this time language contact between the two languages has boomed, to the point where today all speakers of Irish are bilingual.

3.4 Béarlachas

Mac Fhlannchadha (1999) presents the findings of CM and switching as a communicative strategy that results in a simplified and often incorrect Irish language construction. This practice of calqual phrasing refers to a term, phrase or word literally and grammatically translated from English to Irish. There is also, as Dorian (2010) supports from her Scottish Gaelic data, a strong element of simplification during this process. This practice indicates the degenerative effect of CM but Mac Fhlannchadha (1999: 55) later writes that it is perhaps a temporary status on the continuum towards a more balanced state of bilingualism. This calqual mixing is a characteristic of non-balanced bilinguals. A colloquial term for badly constructed or English-based grammar in Irish is Béarlachas that translates as Anglicism or Anglicisation and carries negative connotations. For example a popular grammatical site for this trend is the misuse or lack of an chopail [the copula] when speaking about permanent characteristics or identity related to people or objects. Tá mé múinteoir instead of Is múinteoir mé [I am a teacher]. The strong presence of calqual loans can be viewed as convergence or attrition indicating a strong language shift towards English. In the case of Irish, however, the practice of Béarlachas is generally confined to language learners and is easily recognised by proficient speakers.

Stenson (1993: 111-112) also speaks about calques or loan translations, in particular the single word calques and phrasal calques that were apparent in colloquial slang, with some being present in the work of Sjoestedt-Jonval (1938). Also noted is that there are occasional semantic extensions where there is a tendency to extend the meaning of the loanwords themselves to adapt to an Irish language phrase. Stenson (1993: 113) writes that often English verbal particles are used in composition with Irish nouns or verbs to form an idiomatic phrase which is based on the English form. The meaning of these structures can be aspectual, directional or idiosyncratic, for example thug siad over [they
took over]. Stenson (1993: 111) further discusses the use of the word *fáil* [get], and its being used as a passive or inchoative by analogy with *get*. She provides the following examples: *Fuair sí tinn.* [She got sick.], *Tá mé ag fáil* jealous. [I am getting jealous.]

### 3.5 Defining code-mixing in Irish

In the research literature, it is apparent that the terms CM and CS are almost interchangeable with often no differentiation being offered. This is not an oversight restricted to the Irish-English work but is evidenced across the literature internationally as mentioned in chapter two. In Ó Domagáin’s (2013: 209-213) article on CM, he observes that there is no set definition for CM or CS among researchers into the Irish language, but this by no means unusual in the field of CM field with researchers using both terms to indicate the same phenomena and interchangeably. In contrast to Ó Domagáin’s research that focuses on conversational CS, this research project uses the term CM to define the presence of English in Irish language utterance and CS to define a full switch to English. The full switch will often indicate a new clause or sentence, returning to the Muysken’s (2000) definition of CM happening within a speech utterance and intrasentential.

One obvious gap in the research is a lack of any detailed definition or method for defining CM. The few definitions will be outlined here. Stenson (1990: 170) describes ‘switching’ as anything from a single English word to a whole phrase within a sentence, which is nonetheless perceived as an Irish sentence. Ní Laoire (2009: 191) writes that the phrase ‘code-switching and borrowing’ are unambiguous use of English within a corpus, recognised by a different phonological, morphological and syntax. This can be in the form of a single lexical item, a complete phrase or sentence in English or a string of English words. Ní Laoire later (2012) provides a more detailed description of the terms CM and CS:

*Códmheascadh:* Malartú idir leaganacha nó teangacha taobh istigh de chlásal nó de fhráisa i.e. sliocht an-ghearr nó focal (nó cuid d’fhocal) aonair sa dara teanga á mheascadh isteach leis an mbunteanga agus á usáid taobh istigh de shruth focal sa bhunteanga. 
*Códmhalartú:* Sa chiúil is cúinge, malartú idir leaganacha nó teangacha thrathearainncheach an chlásail nó na habairte i.e. an sliocht sa dara teanga a bheith níos faide ná clásail nó abairt. Úsáidtear an téarma chomh maith mar olltéarma a chlúdaionn códmhalartú agus códmheascadh ar aon.
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[Code-mixing: Switching between variations or languages within a clause of phrase i.e. short string or single word (or part of a word) in the second language being mixed into the base language and used within the same flow of words in the base language. Code-switching: In the narrowest sense, a switch between variations or languages beyond the boundaries of the clause or the sentence i.e. a string in the second language being longer than a clause or sentence. This term is also used as an umbrella term incorporating both code-switching and code-mixing.]

It is obvious from this description that this research project’s understanding of CM and CS is in line with Ni Laoire second definition presented above. Despite the various terms in Irish for describing these characteristics: códmheascadh, códmhalartú, códaistriú, the definition is generally obvious from the content of the research and therefore does not become an obstacle.

3.5.1 Established code-mixing in Irish

There are already widely used CM characteristics that are well established and accepted in the Irish language that can be discussed. The following are not restricted to L1 or L2 learners and extend across language styles as well as dialects and some are listed in the Foclóir Gaeilge-Béarla (Ó Dónaill 1992). Perhaps the most common site for CM is the noun, which will often be used to fill a vocabulary gap. Stenson (1993: 121) notes that these mixes are inserted on an ad hoc basis and noticeably used more frequently by the younger generations, later confirmed by Ó Domagáin (2013: 236).

The verb system in Irish is one of agreement or disagreement with the verb in question, there is no ‘yes’ or ‘no’ in the language because the verb is always used to affirm, negate or state. What one will hear on Raidió na Gaeltachta and TG4 is the use of the English ‘yes’ and ‘no’ in conjunction with the correct Irish verb in immediate succession. This is a common method of emphasis or stress within the Irish language. The transition of the verb responses from echoic system to a system of responsive particles [mir freagartha] or antwortform was identified as far back as 1973 by Ó Siadhail. The echoic system is an Indo-European characteristic that contrasts from the system of responsive particles, examples being:

An iompraionn sé an bord?: Iompraionn/Ní iompraionn or Portat mensam?: Portat/Non portat i gcomórtas le còras le mir fhreagartha [in comparison to the
For example, Ó Duibhir’s (2009) research examining the CM and CS of primary school pupils shows that the most common English words in the corpus, located intrasententially, are: yeah, no, so, okay, just, like, right. On the high instances of ‘yeah’ and ‘no’ he (2009: 115) writes that they:

... may be determined by the fact that there are no simple words in Irish for ‘yes’ and ‘no’. For agreement/disagreement conversationally in Irish it is normal to echo the positive or negative form of the verb or to use the copula … Even if this factor influences the all-Irish school children who are L1 English speakers, it does not however, explain the high usage of the particles by Gaeltacht pupils who are L1 speakers of Irish. The practice of prefacing their answers in Irish with the aff./neg. particles ‘yeah’ and ‘no’ has however, been noted in the speech of Gaeltacht speakers … The use of these particles may be for stylistic reasons and to add emphasis rather than due to a lack of vocabulary.

3.5.2 Typological Sites for CM and Methods of Assimilation

Stenson (1993: 108-109), examining the study of Sjoested-Jonval (1938), comments that while the lexicon was open to relatively free borrowing, the phonology and morphology remained essentially unaffected. The exception being calques or loan translations, but it remains that the lexicon is the most readily affected level of grammar. The continued research will confirm this, as nouns remain a common site for English, with discourse markers also heavily drawing on English (O’Malley-Madec 2001).

Ó Domagáin (2013: 215-225) identifies the following sites for CS in his Gort an Choirce corpus, that is supported by earlier research (Stenson 1990, 1993):

• Nouns: (which he further subdivides into proper nouns, nouns relating to past times, housing, professions, industry, modern life and technology.

• Adjectives and adverbs: In this category he highlights that -(e)áilte is an established method of assimilation and it is the speaker’s choice to affix the adjective.

• Verbs: In this category he highlights that -(e)áil is an established method of assimilation and it is the speaker’s choice to affix the verb.

• Numbers and Dates: Regarding the use of English for numbers and dates, and this is confirmed by Ní Laoire (2012), Ó Domagáin (2013: 223) writes:
Nil fíanaise ar bith ann nach bhfuil na bunúimhreacha dúchasacha ar eolas ag muintir na háite mar cinnte go mbionn siad in úsáid acu in amanna ach is léir gurb é córas an Bhéarla a thagann chun béil go minic go háirithe le huimhreacha móra nó le huimhreacha a mbeadh rian na castachta orthu dá ndéarfai i nGaeilge iad. Ní bhíonn muintir muintir Ghort an Choirce á mbuaireamh féin le tranglam chórás na Gaeilge agus chuige sin téitear i muinín an Bhéarla chun na simpíocht.

[There is no evidence that the basic numbers are not known to the local people but certainly they used them sometimes but it is obvious that the English system that comes out usually, especially with big numbers or numbers that would be complicated in Irish. The people of Gort an Choirce don’t bother themselves with the cluttered Irish chorus and therefore they use English for simplicity.]

- Discourse markers: He concludes that the hundreds of samples of English discourse markers display the ease with which the participants from Gort an Choirce CM.

Also there is the practice of pluralising nouns in English by adding an Irish suffix, popular stems being -anna,-(a)ithe,-(a)í,-(e)acha. But Stenson (1993: 115) comments that the nouns that get pluralised in this manner tend to be established loans of long-standing and not contemporary borrowings. Interestingly there is also a pattern in the use of the English -s to transition from singular to plural to occur in Irish, although this is very rare and is discussed in the chapter seven with examples from the corpus. While Sjoestedt-Jonval (1938) noted this was not a particularly frequent occurrence, Stenson (1993: 115) noted that this use of the -s represented a minimal incursion of English inflectional morphology in the Irish noun system, although it remains extremely limited: gadaí [thieves] and ceannáis [hawkers].

The verb can also be easily assimilated with the addition of the -áil,-eáil suffix. Driveáil mé sios inné. [I drove down yesterday.] This practice is universal and may also be freely adjusted to denote and include tense and person suffixes. Driveláileamar sios inné. [We drove down yesterday.] Stenson (1993: 115-116) notes that verbs that are vowel or f-initial are only assimilated with the addition of a suffix in the past tense, and not with the d’ + lenition form in Irish. One example of this is ‘fainteáil si’ [she fainted]. An

---

24 The counting system and dates in the Irish language is not simple, with many numbers altering the noun. And as Ó Domagáin notes in his corpus, the number is often spoken in English with the noun in English or Irish, varying from speaker to speaker.
uncommon verbal characteristic noted by Stenson was the use of verbal nouns appearing in the bare English form - *Cén chaoi a bhfuil tú* feeling? (1993: 116).

There is some phonetic influence, which contributes to the phonemic inventory of the language. Stenson (1993: 113-114) comments that affricates are common as loanwords, to the point where doublets are evident with unassimilated forms alongside earlier forms in which the affricate is borrowed as a fricative. She provides the following examples: chance/sea, jacket/seaicéad to which the lexicon is constantly expanding.

O’Malley-Madec (2001) has carried out research and concludes that they are loanwords established into the Irish language. The English discourse markers in one of O’Malley-Madecs’s (2001: 262) speech samples amounted to 60 per cent of the English CM. Stenson (1991: 573) ignores the presence of discourse markers stating that the phenomena is not characteristic of the contact situation in question. Perhaps, given the metalinguistic nature of discourse markers, she chose to focus on the more complex linguistic aspects of CM. Hickey (2009) also conducted detailed research into the use of discourse markers by the educators in an Irish-immersion pre-school and her findings more or less confirmed the work of O’Malley-Madec. Hickey (2009: 674) also comments that discourse markers function as topic management tools and hedging in Hiberno-English and therefore they are used in a similar fashion in Irish.

3.5.3 Historic Loanwords in Irish
Stenson (1993: 107-108) writes that the historic documentation of CM in Ireland is weak, but this is not to imply that a retrospective analysis of historical documents has not occurred.

Documentation of contact phenomenon from earlier periods is somewhat difficult to come by, since the manifestations of language contact in Irish (and other languages) have suffered from a rather disputable image. Influence from other languages was viewed as corruption, and speakers whose language shows heavy influence from other languages tend to be avoided by scholars, who have been inclined to prefer the conservative forms of the languages they study as being more correct.

This is not necessarily true but perhaps calls for an innovative approach to seeking historical documents. Mac Mathúna’s (2007) analysis of CM based on Irish language
texts from 1600-1900 is a case in point. A history of loanwords in Old and Modern Irish has been documented, primarily those from Latin, Norse, Norman French, Anglo-Saxon and English. While Latin and French contact diminished, the English language has been in steady and increasing contact since the fifteenth century. These words are both well and long established in Irish and often only recognisable to those familiar with lexical history of the language. The trait of assimilating words is seen as a healthy trait linguistically and often responds to the demands of the language’s speakers. This is the case for the three languages in question and is well supported in research. Ní Ghallchobhair (2004: 8-9) provides examples of well-established loanwords related to sociocultural changes in Ireland.

Christianity brought Latin terms relating to religion and writing: *sagart*, *easpag*, *eaglais*, *séipéal*, *teampall*, *peann*, *pár*, *scriobh*. [priest, bishop, church, chapel, temple, pen, parchment, write v.]

The arrival of the Normans brought words of French origin: *cistin*, *buidéal*, *páirc*, *garsún*, *réasún*, *pardún*. [kitchen, bottle, park, boy, reason, pardon]

The English language brought words related to new concepts: *tábla*, *staighre*, *bríste*, *cóta*, *hata*, *gúna*, *sráid*. [table, stairs, trousers, coat, hat, dress, road, street.]

These sociocultural changes in Ireland opened up the Irish language to new concepts and new cultural notions that placed substantial pressure on the Irish language to expand and incorporate these new ideas. The vocabulary underwent assimilation to Irish, however the similarity to the ‘lending’ language is often apparent in some cases: *pardún*: *pardon*, *garsún*: *garçon*, *sagart*: *sacerdos*, *teampall*: *templum*, *hata*: *hat*. These words are all listed in Ó Dónaill’s Irish-English dictionary (1992 [1977]) which is popularly deemed the definitive dictionary although somewhat dated.

The presence of established loanwords in Irish only emphasises that CM is often a characteristic of a healthy language contact situation. As Ó Domagáin (2013: 201) writes that despite English going from strength to strength in Ireland from the fifteenth century onwards, the Irish language is still alive having moulded herself to meet the requirements of time. The language is still alive and spoken today despite over 500 years of constant language contact and despite a national language shift towards English; the language has adapted and incorporated loanwords that have aided its survival.
3.6 Functions of code-mixing

In chapter two the CM purposes as identified by Mac Fhlanachadh (1999: 54) were presented and these functions were related to non-proficient Irish language speakers. To reiterate, Mac Fhlanachadh (1999: 55) indicates that these young speakers are still ‘in a state of flux’ and he is hopeful that this is merely a temporary stage that will develop into Irish language proficiency. Ó Domagáin (2013: 226-232) recently seeks to answer why CM is used by proficient bilinguals and he suggests the following functions based on his Gort an Choirce corpus:

*Feidhm Thagartha* [Referential Function]: CM to full a vocabulary gap. This does however make it difficult to differentiate between CM by choice and CM by necessity.

*Feidhm Threorach* [Directive Function]: This is based on the accommodation theory and regarding the interlocutor’s ability in the language to be less proficient therefore incorporating CM to ensure mutual understanding.

*Feidhm Eispireach* [Expressive Function]: CM is used to express *an beo beathach* [the lively multiculturality] that the speakers possess.

*Feidhm Fhatach* [Phatic Function]: In this case the CM introduces a new tone or meaning to the discourse.

*Feidhm Mheititheangeolaíoch* [Metalinguistic Function]: When there is a direct reference to language B (English) via quotation or signposting/advance notice.

*Feidhm Fhileata* [Poetical Function]: This is generally used for anecdotes or a play on words and is normally restricted to literature and music. Poetical CM is not a spontaneous occurrence but a carefully constructed form and Ó Domagáin found no sample of this type in his corpus.

3.7 Theoretical Linguistic Analysis of Irish-English CM

While CM can be applied functional roles in the Irish-English discourse, there has been no major theoretical analysis of the language pair. Stenson (1990) tests the corpus-specific constraints and the more formal generalisations of Poplack (1980) and Sankoff and Poplack (1982) namely the D-structure and the S-structure. It was found that both models fail to account for the noun-adjective order which is a dominant position for switching in Irish-English CS. Stenson proved that the constraints of both frameworks proved inadequate when applied to languages displaying even minor typological differences. She continues to suggest possibilities for the unaccounted switching evident
in her data. As of 1990 and the research compiled by Stenson, no single theory is upheld in Irish-English, but perhaps given that it was the early stages of CM research, there was no theory fully developed. For example, Myers-Scotton has published on the MLF for over a decade and often adjusts the model, reflecting the evolving nature of languages and languages in contact.

3.8 Code-mixing in Irish Immersion Education

Before examining the research carried out in Irish immersion schools, it is worth bringing in a brief discussion of elements of language uses and proficiency. As Myers-Scotton (2005: 42) writes:

Languages are used in a number of different ways and in different situations. First, consider the ways that languages are used; basically, we can talk about speaking, listening, reading, and writing skills. And, of course, not all speakers have the same degree of proficiency in any of these skills, nor is there an absolute way to say what counts as proficiency in any one skill. Second, consider the relevant situations of language use.

While the matter of domains (Fishman 1967) was discussed in chapter two, it is worth commenting that the notion of immersion language, and even that of the Gaeltacht, supports a heightened sense of the four skills highlighted by Myers-Scotton: therefore promoting a more profound acquisition or maintenance of Irish. That being a more profound general acquisition as opposed to preparing to sit the Irish subject Leaving Certificate exam. This is, in loose terms, the difference between acquiring and learning a language. Acquiring a language in the traditional sense refers to when a child speaks a language as a first language in the home (Myers-Scotton 2005: 42).

The work of Hickey (2004) concentrates on the spoken Irish of young children and writes that this offers an insight into the process of change within a minority language and shift from that language. Many of Hickey’s publications (1999, 2001, 2004) discuss the various concerns raised when grouping L1 and L2 speakers within the same learning environment: target language acquisition and the questions of language promotion. This area of research, while it does not relate to the language community as a whole, can reflect attenuation, CM and CS, and effects of language contact by this particular age group and their leaders/supervisors (referred to in Irish as stiúrthóirí [leaders]). Discourse
markers were the most common uses of English by the leaders and these were used to
attain the attention of the children: ‘now’, ‘c’mon’, ‘ok’, ‘sure’ that are used either
initially or finally. The use of ‘yes’, ‘yeah’ and ‘no’ are very frequently used, not only in
Hickey’s data but, as previously mentioned, universally by Irish-speakers as a method of
emphasising agreement or negation. The second most popular lexical item for switching
is the noun, and Hickey (2004: 1309) notes that nouns made up more than half of the
Irish-only homes childrens’ English mixes, in contrast to the use of discourse markers by
the leaders. She divides nouns into two categories: borrowings that are commonly used in
normal adult Gaeltacht speech and apparent vocabulary gaps and here she quotes
Stenson: “it is not possible to isolate a clearcut level of integration that can
unambiguously distinguish borrowing from codeswitching in Irish” (1991: 559). These
nouns can be assimilated or not and rarely affect the lexical typology of the Irish
utterance thus reinforcing the insertion pattern of CM:

_Tá, tá bicycle agamsa._ [I have a bicycle.]

_Cuir bandage ar Aoife._ [Put a bandage on it Aoife.]

_Ní dhéanfaidh tú an star._ [You won’t do the star.]

The groups contain children from Irish-speaking backgrounds, Irish and English
backgrounds and English-only backgrounds. Hickey’s (2004: 1301) research comments
on the group dynamic, supported by other case studies, and notes that: ‘when the minority
language is in contact with a majority language of high prestige, even when the minority
language has official backing as the target language of the group, then speakers shift to
the majority language to win approval.’ This is supported by the proportion of utterances
in Irish used by the L1 speakers in varying group settings e.g. with L1 speakers or with
L1 and L2 speakers. Overall it was seen that the average of Irish utterances by Irish-only
and Irish-English homes declines significantly when in groups with a majority of
English-only homes. This is certainly insightful into the balance of linguistic prestige and
how, even at so young an age, this distinction has already been determined. This
influence of English via everyday interaction with non-Irish speakers and the media has
influenced these young and exposed speakers despite efforts to nurture the Irish language.
Hickey examines the direction of the CS and the circumstances when the participants use
either Irish or English. It is pertinent that she also examines the group leaders and teachers in their use of Irish towards the children, concentrating specifically on children attending Irish-medium nursery schools. Hickey examines the use of Irish in conjunction with the interlocutor and how this varies from child to child. Irish is used predominantly in this domain but English is often resorted to for emphasising a matter with the children.

Mac Fhlanachadh (1999) conducted research with young L2 speakers of Irish, older than the participants in Hickey’s research, attending an Irish-immersion school and his focus is on the compromise to Irish language evident in the corpus. His identifies five CM strategies for communication by L2 speakers of Irish that were presented in chapter two. That these young speakers are using CM as a strategy highlights, as Mac Fhlannachdha himself points out, that they are still in transition period of learning. This research poses the question that the speakers at this early stage of L2 acquisition have a grasp of grammar that is in a state of flux and therefore the traits are as a result of pressure to adhere to the medium of the domain rather than an embedded stylistic phenomenon. The research focuses on the interlanguage of the participants and how it is illustrative of linguistic weakness that is evident in the use of CM. In the research outcomes it is obvious that morphological and syntactical integration is very limited in the switches, which runs contrary to Trudgill’s (2011) idea of the optimal learner. Trugdill mentions that the younger the speaker, the more complex the mixed code as the speaker is of optimal language learning ability. This further confirms Mac Fhlannchadha’s (1999: 55) opinion that the language of his corpus reflects a temporary status that is ‘in a flux.’ In his corpus he notes that often the switches are made to compensate for a lexical or structural deficit and they are often marked:

\[
\text{Agus fuairimid (em) cúig (em) cúig (em) (eh)\ nil a fhios agam é é as Gaeilge\ (em) icecreams each.}
\]

[And we got (em) five (em) five (em) (eh)\ I don’t know it in Irish\ (em) icecreams each.]

Switches are often a sign of temporary inability to retrieve an Irish word or phrase and can often contain the correct word within the same utterance.
While the three researchers, Ó Duibhir (2009), Hickey (1999, 2001, 2004) and Mac Fhlanachadha (1999), concentrate on the younger speakers, there are elements that can contribute to the overall understanding of CM. In the language of the stiúrthóirí there is strong presence of CM and this is in line with the target language of the young learners. Again, Hickey’s examples highlight the use of ‘yes’ and ‘no’ as established, unassimilated loans and the common practice of English discourse markers. This, in turn, raises the question of English filling vocabulary gaps. As already presented, the verbal system in Irish does not have a standard ‘yes’ or ‘no’, therefore these English words represent an element that is not in the language. The discourse markers however do have Irish language equivalents and are also commonly used. MacFhlanachadha (1999: 55) is also quite optimistic that the heavy presence of calqual translations from English is merely a temporary state of the language while these young speakers are in the early stages of language acquisition.

3.9 Code-mixing as an Indicator of Formality/Informality

O’Malley-Madec (2001, 2007) has worked on the presence of English in her Irish language corpus gathered in the Galway Gaeltacht and her corpus has both formal (radio interview) and informal (casual conversation) examples from each of the participants which highlight the various styles of speech. Her corpus was collected from a Fíor-Ghaeltacht (Carraroe) and a Breac-Ghaeltacht (Claregalway) and she notes significant differences in the use of English in both groups. She gives particular attention to discourse markers and English nouns positioned in Irish matrix sentences. O’Malley-Madec notes a method of communication that she entitles code alteration whereby the participant changes code entirely to coincide with a change in topic of conversation. This pattern was present in the Breac-Ghaeltacht community where English discourse markers and nouns were not frequent in contrast to the Fíor-Ghaeltacht community where discourse markers and nouns in English were a regular occurrence. Therefore the presence or lack of presence of English mixes is very much dependent on context: situation and topic.

Another facet of O’Malley-Madec’s work concentrates on the presence or absence of English in spoken Irish varying from informal to formal situations. ‘When we go beyond
a casual observation of this language behaviour we discover very quickly that English words and phrases are used only in certain speech-styles and not randomly.’ (2001: 261)

This can be related to hyperconvergence (Giles, Coupland and Coupland 1991) to accommodate an intended audience and to accommodate perhaps a weaker bilingual. There is a tendency for the speaker to take control of a speaker/audience setting and strive for the audience approval but not converging style. O’Malley-Madec (2001: 272) concludes that the native speaker of Irish in Gaeltacht areas deploy a rather finite set of English words and phrases for the purpose of marking speaker style. Ní Laoire (2012) concludes that the native speaker of Irish in Gaeltacht areas deploy a rather finite set of English words and phrases for the purpose of marking speaker style. Ní Laoire (2012) confirms that Irish with CM is an unmarked choice of informal speech interactions, a style-choice of the speaker. She further confirms O’Malley-Madec’s observation by commenting that fluent bilinguals will often not draw upon CM when in instances of formal discourse: radio interview, television interview, public meeting. This would align the marked choice of CM with the H variation. It is worth reiterating at this point however, that while CM is available to all Irish-English bilinguals, not all bilinguals avail of CM.

3.10 Research on written sources

This project, and the majority of the Irish CM research, draws on the spoken word to analyse the characteristic. The spoken word can be spontaneous and natural, or formal and effortful, both of which reflect the speaker’s instinctive language use in a particular interaction. It is also apparent from O’Malley-Madec’s (2001) research that CM is a linguistic style choice, as she confirms that CM occurs less frequently in formal settings. The spoken word can then be examined incorporating the interlocutors, the topic, the language or languages used, and a case presented for or against alignment with a framework. However, the written word can provide a complementary source for research into language use. Despite Ní Laoire (2012) noting that CM in the written form is rare outside of efforts to mimic spoken Irish, research has been carried out. Books, newspaper articles, scripts and song lyrics for example are deliberate mediums of language use with an targeted reader or audience. Similarly to a speech event containing CM, text can be an effort to present language styles and traits. In Ireland, sources of Irish texts are plentiful with thriving publication houses: Cló Iar-Chonnachta and Cois Life, and a number of online websites: foinsie.ie, beo.ie, gaelport.com and nuacht24.com to list a few.
Researchers have worked on Irish-English CM and work that concentrated on reflecting the vernacular and spoken word will be highlighted to confirm patterns of mixed speech.

Mac Mathúna (2007) offers a comprehensive view of the Irish-English CM between 1600-1900 and details the phenomenon with references to literature written in Irish during that period. This use of CM in literature, particularly poetry, is assessed and the development is presented from single words to full phrases. Mac Mathúna (2007: 32) also confirms, as does Sjoestedt-Jonval (1938), that the early stages of CM are concentrated on the introduction of new objects and ideas to Irish culture.

Dé réir a chéile, tháinig an códmhéascadh Gaeilge/Béarla chun cinn mar cheann de na bealai trína ndeachaigh lucht saothraithe na Gaeilge dul i ngileic lena dtimpeallach nua teanga. Go deimhin, níor fhada gur tuigeadh do chuíd acu go bhféadadh an Béarla cur le hfeacht na ceapadóireachta, ach feidhm oiriúnacha bhaint as mar an dara harm cruthaitheach i gcomhthéacsanna áirithe. Is amhlaidh a fuair frásaí agus sleachta Béarla bheithe istigh i reimsí áirithe Gaeilge ag tréimhsí ar leith ar shíl nach raibh coitianta roimhe sin, nuair is taobh le hiasacht aonair a bhí an teanga dhúchais den chuid is mó.

[Gradually, Irish/English code-mixing came to the fore as one of the ways through which Irish-speaking workers engaged with their new language environment. That is to say that by making suitable use of English as a second creative tool in certain contexts, it was not long before some realised that it could add to the efficacy of composition. The fact is that phrases and excerpts from English were found, in a particular range of Irish, at a particular time and in a manner, which was not common before, when the native language mostly favoured lone borrowings.]

Ní Laoire (2009) has examined the use of English in an Irish language radio drama as an indicator of social practice. The drama Baile an Droichid25 [Bridgetown] was aired on Raidió na Gaeltachta from 1985 -1995 and revisited on Christmas Day 2009. The drama consists of 8 main characters ranging in age, gender, first language, social network and background, and the primary dialect of the drama is Connemara Irish. The main focus of research is the linguistic behaviour of the individual characters in their interactions and the optional use of CS. Ní Laoire derives that English is used in more informal situations depending on the interlocutors. Her example of an authoritative social figure who rarely

---

25 The script is written by Joe Steve Ó Neachtain who is a famous Irish language actor and writer who would be capable of representing the spoken word accurately in text.
uses English is the local priest. As a result, the other members of the community persistently avoid availing of English morphemes when communicating with him in Irish. Another figure in the drama, Peartalán, is recognised as being socially awkward and unable to differentiate between formal/informal situations. It is interesting that she notes the occurrence of echoing: an example of this is the word *brushín* is used by the character Phil who uses the noun in English with the diminutive *-ín* added in Irish. When her interlocutor uses the correct Irish term *scuaibín* Phil then engages the Irish version further along in the conversation.

**Phil:** *Arno, le uisce coiric a bheannú. Oh Lord, nil aon bhrushín ann leis an uisce coiric a chraiteadh, nior chuimhnigh mo chroí ariamh air. Ó cuartaigh rud eicint, maith ’fear.*

**Peartalán:** *Cad mar gheall ar scuaibín fiacail, Phil?*

**Phil:** *Ó soit, stop. Gabh amach is faigh slám tui agus déanfaid muid scuaibín dheas mar a bhíodh ann fadó.* (2009: 203)

[Arno, to bless the holy water. Oh Lord, there is no small brush there to sprinkle the holy water, I didn’t think of it. Oh, find something, good man. What about a toothbrush, Phil? Oh ugh, stop. Go out and get a handful of straw and we’ll make a nice small brush like the old kinds.]

Ní Laoire develops the notion of in/out groups of the society based on Eckert's *Linguistic Variation as Social Practice* (2009). Ní Laoire examines Irish CM as a social interaction tool that conveys an in-group or a group that uses informal speech.

Ní Laoire (2012) points out that the use of Irish in text messages often engage in liberal CM but currently there has been no research undertaken into this method of communication. This could also be extended to the use of Irish on the internet, and perhaps more specifically on social media sites where the language context is largely informal.

3.10.1 Literary Representations of Corca Dhuibhne

For the purposes of increased understanding the representations of the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht in text, and the practice of CM in written format, two books were examined: *A
"Thig ná Tit Orm" [House Don’t Fall on Me] (Ó Sé, 1987) and "Dúnmharú sa Daingean" [Murder in Dingle] (Ní Dhuibhne, 2000) were examined.

*A Thig Ná Tit Orm* is an autobiographical account of a young man’s life written by a man local to Corca Dhuibhne. As will be mentioned in chapter four, the area is renowned for the large output of Irish language literature, and in particular for autobiographies. This genre of literature is also prominent in other Gaeltacht regions: *Rotha Mór an tSaoil*, *An tOileánach*, *Mo Bhealach Féin*. Ó Sé’s publication was selected, as it was the most recently written and therefore the most relevant local text to the corpus. The book contained very few examples of CM, and English words mixes were assimilated accordingly. CS was primarily in the context of quoted speech samples.

*Dúnmharú sa Daingean* is set, for the most part, in the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht and was published as a popular Irish language fiction novel. However, there is very little CM throughout the text and any English words or phrases are presented in italics that serve to highlight and differentiate the use of English furthermore. To compare this text with, for example, the script for *Baile an Droichid* shows a great contrast in the representation of native-speakers of Irish. One can only presume that Ní Dhuibhne chose to portray a puristic portrayal of the Irish-speaker rather than a realistic.

Overall, these two examples run contrary to what Ní Laoire (2012) says in relation to CM in the written form. She posits that it is rare and only used when portraying the natural speech of native speakers. In these two examples however, this was not the case, with natural speech from Gaeltacht areas being represented with very little CM.

### 3.11 Linguistic Implications for Unbalanced Bilinguals

While CM so far in this chapter, is largely explained in the context of balanced speakers and the language expanding with the growing influence of English, it is necessary to be aware of its implications for speakers with a less profound grasp of the Irish language, both standard and dialect. There is some discussion into the use of CM by weak speakers of Irish, which Ní Laoire (2012) suggests, somewhat prematurely, that the new heavily CM’ed Irish language, ‘*An Nua-Ghaeilge’* [The New Irish], has the potential to be a creole or pidgin, equating it to the likes of *Franglais, Spanglish, Tex-Mex*. The
foundation of this suggestion is that L2 learners are acquiring the Irish language from L2 speakers of the language. The result is a language heavily influenced by English, particularly with calques adhering to the English morphosyntactic structure. This creolisation of Irish, she posits, is a new type of variety: a hybrid variety. This code evolves as a language that does not loyally represent either Irish or English, and would be an example of non-classic CM (Myers-Scotton 2002) and thus indicating serious convergence.

Ó Curnáin (2012) discusses the reduction of every linguistic aspect of Irish, describing the process as ‘anáil laghdú ionchuir, ionghlactha agus aschuir don Ghaeilge and anáil an Bhéarla agus an dátheangachais’ [exhaling the input, acceptability and output of Irish and inhaling English and bilingualism]. He discusses the language on a continuum from traditional to non-traditional and further on to post-traditional by examining a corpus that spans over 50 years. The post-traditional speakers in his research being born after 1990 and therefore indicative of young adult speakers. He concludes that the language is in steady decline and one major factor is the acquisition of English at a very young age by Gaeltacht children. While the detailed examination shows shifts in the Irish language, this is in line with the dramatic increase in English exposure. The two languages are, most likely, used by all Irish-speakers on a daily basis and some traces of English will be left on the Irish language. However, perhaps Ó Curnáin is being overly pessimistic in light of the language developments occurring in the context of extended and extensive language contact.

3.12 Brief Discussion and Conclusion
The Irish language was examined by Stenson (1990, 1991, 1993) from a linguistic perspective but during the subsequent twenty years, the influence of English has expanded, and the number of Irish native speakers has continued to decline. A project of the nature of this thesis is vital to analyse the status of bilingualism within a Gaeltacht community at a specific point of time by applying a current theoretical framework. This analysis can then be merged with previous research and an overview of language contact construed. For example, Mac Fhlanachadha (1999: 55) writes:
These results have clear pedagogical implications for those teaching in this particular linguistic context, an all Irish school where Irish is the language of communication and instruction but where English is the students’ home language. As a communication strategy, switching is of short term rather than of long term benefit for those learners as they proceed towards language structures and the danger is that these speech patterns may become fossilized if the subject’s competence in the weaker language, Irish is not developed. The type of switching in which they engage serves their immediate communicative needs as they interact daily with each other and they have developed a third code which satisfies these needs.

The results from this analysis, in reference to the participant profile, will allow for this issue to be reviewed. Whether or not the characteristic traits of CM that Mac Fhlannchadha (1999) identified in his corpus are present in the L2 speakers of the Pobalscoil will be pertinent. As he writes, these characteristics or strategies are deemed mere glitches on the route to Irish language competency, but if still present in the L2 speakers at the end of their state education will indicate a weakened or compromised Irish language among learners.

Although the research in Irish-English CM is relatively small, there are many elements that have been presented that aid in understanding the phenomenon. The historic loanwords are indicative of sociocultural changes in Ireland that placed pressure on the language to adapt accordingly. This pressure is still a current issue for Irish, and there is a constant demand for new terminology in order for the language to maintain momentum along with English. This demand is met by the terminology committee but creates the scenario whereby an Irish term is in existence and used by specific Irish-speakers while the English word, functioning as a loan, is practiced by another group of Irish-speakers. With this background on the topic, an investigation into and discussion of CM by young adult speakers of Irish can allow us to contemplate the status of Irish within the paradigm of a national shift towards English. This will also allow for a method to define loans from mixes that will display a trajectory of Irish CM by referencing the words of Sjoestedt-Jonval (1938) and Stenson (1990).

This review of the research literature concludes that while there is research on the direction of CM, the functions of CM, social motivations and historic loanwords, there is no current application of a theoretical framework to a corpus. Stenson’s (1990) work
predates the establishment of the MLF but indicates that insertion is the dominant pattern. There is also an obvious reluctance in defining mixes and loanwords in Irish based on a strategic analysis. It does appear that, as is the case in other minority language CM research (Deuchar et al 2007) that much of this differentiation between mix and loan is based on the researcher’s discretion and linguistic capability. Ní Laoire (2012) is correct is stating that CM is a repertoire characteristic of a proficient bilingual and there are specific sociolinguistic rules for its correct usage. However learners often are not yet capable of adhering to the rules and this leads to CM as a detrimental characteristic:

There is usually a dramatic increase in the amount of codeswitching, with the threatened language incorporating features from the contact language(s). Grammatical features may be affected, such as an increase in the use of inflections and function words from the dominant language. Knowledge of vocabulary declines, with younger people familiar with only a proportion of the traditional vocabulary known by older people, and older people being unfamiliar with or antipathetic to the borrowed vocabulary that is replacing it. (Crystal 2000: 22).

This reference from Crystal is perhaps an over-generalisation of the outcomes of language contact, and is more appropriate to settings of bilingualism without diglossia (Fishman 1967). In Irish, aspects of the lexicon are expanding due to the efforts to ensure the language is modernised and has the capacity to cope with new terminology. The traditional language vocabulary and idiom are in decline but this, one could argue, is a coping strategy of languages faced with extended language contact with a dominant language, issues that are incorporated in the Ferguson’s (1959) discussion on diglossia. It also reflects the changing nature of the society in which the younger speakers live. Overall, the research of CM among balanced bilinguals does not indicate an imminent language death.
Chapter Four: The Sociolinguistic Context

No one wishes difficult social or linguistic problems to arise for the delight of academics. But if - or, rather, when - they do arise, we can hope that they will be dissected, explained and contextualised to the mutual benefit of academic knowledge and social policy. (Edwards 1996: 36)

4.1 Introduction

In chapter two, a summary of the research into CM and CS was provided, and in that context the role of sociolinguistic or extralinguistic factors was discussed. The effect that these factors can have on a language or bilingual community is immense and can determine the trajectory of language use. The profile of each bilingual community is unique, with the dynamic created by personal approaches, government policies and language norms to highlight just a few. Gardner-Chloros (2009a: 98) writes that the sociolinguistic approaches to CS research retain some considerable explanatory power, which can provide a first step towards understanding the significance of CS in social life. It is necessary therefore to closely examine the context in which the corpus for this thesis occurred. While close similarities can be drawn to other Gaeltacht regions of Ireland, and even the Gaidhealtachd of Scotland, the microlevel influencing factors are exclusive to every individual setting.

In this chapter, the sociolinguistic factors prominent within the selected community, Corca Dhuibhne, will be discussed and explained, highlighting the impact on the language variety of the participants. Obviously the depth to which the microinteractional context of the participants can be analysed is potentially endless: detailed account of registers within specific domains, interactions with particular interlocutors, language performance and capability, language interest, language loyalty and so on. The platform of the school provides a level playing field by which the language of the participants can be measured, with an examination of the linguistic profiles and attitudes provided by way of the questionnaire. This chapter will also present a handful of issues that can contribute to an understanding of the overt and covert language ideologies within the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht. The role of the media and the question of cultural identity will later be developed and assessed on a local and national scale. Each potentially influential factor will be presented to gain an understanding of how a dichotomous relationship can
evolve, with a language competition developing between the local ‘ideology brokers’ (Blommaert 1999: 9).

The research of this chapter summarises the context of the Corca Dhuibhne community including two language ideological disputes and later discusses the information by drawing on various academic disciplines. This approach is to strengthen the final analysis of the data and questionnaires. Edwards (1996: 35) recommends this mode of research when he writes ‘a comprehensive, multidisciplinary analysis of ethnic-minority-language situations will be intrinsically useful context by context’.

**4.2 The Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht**

![Map of the Gaeltacht regions, with Corca Dhuibhne highlighted. Map originally sourced from www.udaras.ie](image)

The Gaeltacht region of Corca Dhuibhne is located on the Dingle peninsula in County Kerry in the southwest of Ireland. As with most Gaeltacht regions in Ireland, it is located on the western seaboard, indicating the final pockets of Irish-speakers and the national shift towards English, emanating from the east. The entire peninsula itself is not classified as a designated Gaeltacht area, as evident in the following map in which the Gaeltacht areas are presented in beige. There is a second Gaeltacht located in Kerry in the more southern peninsula, Úibh Rathach that has a smaller population and a lower percentage of Irish speakers. The main town in the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht is An Daingean, which is the largest town in all the Gaeltacht regions.
The Corca Dhuibhne and Uíbh Rathach Gaeltacht areas have a combined population of 8,449 according to the 2011 census returns, and the percentage of Irish-speakers was determined as 74.5.\textsuperscript{26} Within the region the patterns of bilingualism vary greatly between the thirteen District Electoral Divisions (DED)\textsuperscript{27} of Corca Dhuibhne. It is obvious from the census results over the twentieth century that the DEDs towards the west have consistently more Irish-speakers while An Daingean has consistently lower percentages.

\textsuperscript{26} Information retrieved from www.cso.ie interactive census tables.
\textsuperscript{27} In the 1974 revision of the Gaeltacht parameters two DEDs were added to the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht: An Clochán [Cloghane] and Cé Bhréanainn [Brandon]. Ó Gadhra (1989: 64) commenting on this inclusion of these DEDs writes:

\textit{Mar is léir bhi sé i gceist na paróiste Chlochán/ Cé Bhréanainn, ar an taobh eile den slíabh ó Ghaeltacht aitheanta Chorca Dhuibhne a aithint aris tar éis gur bhuaigh siad comórtas Ghlór na nGael. Bhí sagart diograiseach san aithg an am a thiontaigh ar an Aifreann a léamh i nGaeilge srl. Ní léir gur leanadh den iarracht ó shin, nuair a d’imigh sé.}

[As is evident it was proposed to again recognise the parishes of Cloghane/ Brandon, on the other side of the mountain from Gaeltacht Chorca Dhuibhne after they won the Glór na nGael competition. There was a dedicated priest in the area at the time that converted to reading the Mass in Irish etc. It is not clear if this effort was continued once he left.]

Ó Riagáin (1992: 99) further comments that this revival was short-lived as home bilingualism does not show up in his survey statistics for that area.
From the graph it is evident that both Dún Chaoin and Márthain had almost 100% Irish-speaking population in various years in comparison to An Daingean, which was consistently in the lowest two percentages for every census. In the 1926 census Dún Chaoin, for example, had a 48% population of monolingual Irish speakers in comparison to 0.007 per cent (14 in 1,998) in An Daingean (Ó Riagáin 1992: 77). When the Gaeltacht Commission (1925-1926) was outlining the Gaeltacht boundaries initially, An Daingean was included in the Fíor-Ghaeltacht category rather than the appropriate Breac-Ghaeltacht category meaning that An Daingean was included in the Fíor-Ghaeltacht despite not meeting the 80 per cent criteria.²⁸ Ó Riagáin (1992: 84) clarifies that a small number of cases were affected by the presence of a town and in this case An Daingean was designated as Fíor-Ghaeltacht because it was the largest town on the peninsula. Therefore An Daingean was functioning as a baile seirbhise [service town] for the Gaeltacht hinterland and the Irish-speakers would be constantly engaging with services in the town. Irish would therefore have been a strong community language but a weak home language, as his research survey confirms. There are towns throughout the Gaeltacht areas that function as service towns, usually located on the periphery of the Gaeltacht area. This essentially upgraded status of An Daingean to Fíor-Ghaeltacht, while an
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²⁸ The Fíor-Ghaeltacht and Breac-Ghaeltacht criteria are outlined in section 1.4.1 of this thesis.
understandable and comprehensive breach of the 80 per cent requirement, has perhaps
resulted in contrasting attitudes towards and values placed on the Irish language. An
Daingean is at the centre of this social system, with the exception of the Clochán area,
and it was quite possibly never fully Gaelicised (Ó Riagáin 1992: 73). This issue will be
discussed later in relation to the shift in language domains that took place in and around
An Daingean. According to the 2011 Census returns, An Daingean has a 16.4%
population who speak Irish on a daily basis and this is quite low considering the top ten
towns range from Mín Lárach, Co. Donegal with 81% of daily Irish speakers to Béal
Átha an Ghaorthaidh, Co. Cork with 38% (Central Statistics Office 2012: 28).

As well as support from the Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht, there are
well-established enterprises that work to promote the language and support the
community. Comharchumann Forbartha Chorca Dhuibhne ²⁹ is a cooperative that was
founded in Corca Dhuibhne in 1967 with the aim of enhancing the social, economic and
cultural life of the community. It plays a very important part in the community by
organising Irish language education courses and computer courses, and receives funding
from a number of governmental bodies including Údarás na Gaeltachta, The Arts
Council, Department of Education and Science, FÁS and The Heritage Council. In terms
of support for the Irish language, Oidhreacht Chorca Dhuibhne [Corca Dhuibhne
Heritage] operates under the comharchumann and its main aim is to promote the Irish
language through learning. They organise courses in Irish for both adults and children
throughout the year, ranging from Irish language to music, folklore to local history, and
there are various diplomas offered through the Acadamh na Gaeilge at the National
University of Ireland, Galway. Oidhreacht Chorca Dhuibhne had a 2010-2013 strategy
plan that outlined their aims for the promotion of Irish in the region, under the provision
of the Official Languages Act (2003). Tús Maith³⁰ [Good Start], Scéim na gCuaireoirí
Teanga Baile [The House Visitors’ Scheme] and Scéim na gCuntóirí Teanga [Irish
Language Assistants’ Scheme] are innovative schemes undertaken by Oidhreacht Chorca
Dhuibhne to support children and parents at home, and children at school to learn Irish.

²⁹ It was the first of two cooperatives founded in all the Gaeltacht areas.
³⁰ For a discussion on the schemes see Ó hIfearnáin (2013) and Ní Chathail (2003).
The schemes have been in operation since 2005 and represent the positive and proactive members of the community eager to nurture young speakers of Irish.

4.2.1 Ó Riagáin’s Research

Ó Riagáin (1992) carried out extensive research on the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht, focusing on the language network of participants and their attitudes towards language maintenance from the perspective of personal and governmental approaches. In particular he examines the extent to which Irish is used in the home and community, and the social, spatial and temporal variations in these patterns (1992:1). Ó Riagáin presented his analysis in two formats: firstly he divided the region according to the District Electoral Divisions, and secondly with region divided into the West, East and the town of An Daingean. The CLAR research combined with Ó Riagáin’s research supported that the traditional social networks had become less isolated and more diffuse than formerly and increasingly merging with networks of low-ability speakers of Irish or English speakers (1992: 11). Ó Riagáin shows that one quarter of return migrants to the Corca Dhuibhne area return to the area having married during the period away from the area. This introduction of spouses who may or may not speak Irish, or chose to learn the language, is significant for the maintenance of Irish as home language. A concerted effort from the language community combined with governmental support is necessary to reduce or deter the language shift towards English in the Gaeltacht areas. A selection of these efforts was previously described under the umbrella term of the Corca Dhuibhne Cooperative.

The sociospatial patterns of language use are subject to change over time in response to positive and negative influences from the external environment, as mentioned in chapters two and three. Ó Riagáin’s participants were asked to speak about whether they spoke Irish or English at the following locations: the shop, the public house, the church, Garda station [police station], post office, public meetings and the farm. From these answers he was in a position to compile patterns and networks of Irish language use by the participants. Ó Riagáin’s survey also questioned the respondents on language attitude and questions of ethnicity. He (1992: 111) concludes that:

It appears to be the case that, while above average levels of bilingualism in the Gaeltacht as a whole (compared to national averages) may be reflected in a higher
evaluation of Irish as a symbol of ethnicity, this does not necessarily imply that ethnicity itself (which the factor may be taken to index) is a particularly important factor in mobilising collective action of the kind required to maintain bilingualism or to reserve a process of language shift.

The relationship between language and the three main areas of the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht: West, An Daingean, East, appears to vary from region to region. Ó Riagáin draws on Bourdieu’s idea of linguistic market and values associated with the language to develop this idea. Ó Riagáin’s (1992: 44-45) extensive research concludes, and this can be applied to most Gaeltacht areas, that:

It is obvious that a long-standing relationship has existed between Corca Dhuibhne and wider society, both within Ireland and abroad. In view of the often cited ‘isolation’ factor as an explanatory variable in theories of language change, this point must be emphasised ... not isolation in any absolute sense, but an evolving relationship between the local community and its outside world. These changes can be seen as both a cause and consequence of the very profound radical transformation that has occurred in the local community since the beginning of this century.

4.2.2 Cultural Tourism
The tourism industry has boomed in the Corca Dhuibhne peninsula over the last thirty years, with cultural tourism being a primary focus. Cultural tourism is a specific genre of tourism that draws tourists to a region to discover something new and fresh. Denvir (2002) defines cultural tourism as follows:

The benign view of cultural and heritage tourism, in the context of such attitudinal diversity among tourists themselves, is that it is an authentic historical re-creation or a creative remembrance or interpretation of times past and that it thus: offers opportunities to portray the past in the present. It provides an infinite time and space in which the past can be experienced through the prism of the endless possibilities of interpretation. Postmodern tourists use the power of their intellect and imagination to receive and communicate messages, constructing their own sense of places to create their individual journeys of self discovery. (Wiendu quoted in Denvir 2002: 28)

Mass tourism to the area began as early as the 1960s, well before the development of tourist services that are currently provided in the area (Nic Eoin 2009: 167). However, the driving force of the majority of tourists to the area needs to be identified, as Denvir (2002: 24) comments:
It is also worth noting when discussing Gaeltacht tourism, that, as Ireland is hardly a “sun, sea, and sand” destination, cultural and heritage tourism is one of the main USPs (unique selling points, to the uninitiated in market-speak) promoted by Bord Fáilte, the Irish Tourist Board.

To this end, Gaelsaoire [Irish holiday] was established in 1997 by Údarás na Gaeltachta to market holidays to the Gaeltacht to those living in Ireland and abroad. In the late 1960s Irish college courses for secondary students were set up, but prior to that there was a well-established relationship with University College Cork and students were sent to stay with local families and in purpose-built hostels over the Easter holidays and other off-peak times (Nic Eoin 2009: 172-173). According to the current local Irish colleges website, www.colaiste.ie, there are eight course-types aimed at secondary school students and trainee teachers. The courses are predominantly residential courses and the students stay with a local family therefore being a source of profit for the local residents. A note from the website also indicates the economic benefit of the colleges to the local community.

In terms of its ongoing contribution to the wider community, Coláistí Chorca Dhuibhne generates an income of over 2m per annum for the area and when the appropriate multiplier affect on the direct income is applied, it can be said that this income is worth in the region of 4.5m per annum to the area. (Coláistí Chorca Dhuibhne n.d.)

Obviously the biggest attraction to the area for younger adults, those not yet independent of their parents, is the Irish college course. These courses ‘have been a fundamental part of the cultural, educational, and linguistic life of Ireland since the language revival movement initiated by the Gaelic League at the end of the nineteenth century’ (Denvir 2002: 37). The desire to learn Irish, not just by Irish people, but international scholars was to encourage a strong literary tradition in Corca Dhuibhne.

The area has also had a substantial contribution, over the course of the twentieth century, to Irish language literature. In her book An Litríocht Réigiúnach (1982) Nic Eoin notes that this region was the most productive of all the Gaeltacht areas and not just in autobiographies but history, folklore, fiction and children’s books. Perhaps the most widely read are the autobiographies of those who lived on the Blasket Islands: An tOileánach (Ó Criomthain), Fiche Blian ag Fás (Ó Suilleabháin) and Peig (Sayers),
many of which have been translated into English as well as other languages. It should be noted that these publications were heavily encouraged from visiting scholars from across Europe. The Celtic Revival, mentioned in chapter one, sparked a drive among academics to recount the lore and lives of those in Celtic countries who were largely uninfluenced by English language and modern society. Similarly in Scotland, for example, John Francis Campbell sought to seek out *Popular Tales of the Highlands and Islands I-IV* (1860-1862). Nic Eoin (2003: 159) summarises that:

... the Great Blasket became a destination for such renowned cultural tourists as the English Celtic scholars Robin Flower and Kenneth Jackson, the Scandinavian professors Carl von Sydow and Carl Marstrander, not to mention the native Irish language scholars and cultural nationals such as the enigmatic Brian Ó Ceallaigh ...

Nic Eoin (2003: 159) comments that the literary works of Blasket Islands were the result of cultural tourism encounters. In her chapter ‘The Native Gaze: Literary Perceptions of Tourists in the West Kerry Gaeltacht’ (2003) she assess the local literature from the native-tourist interaction perspective. She also refers to the topic of tourists visiting the islands in Ó Criomhthain’s *Allagar na hInise*:

*Lá saoire is ea é. Ní radharc go dtí ar naomhóga é ag teacht as gach aird faoi dhéin an Bhlasceid. Ba dhóigh leat gur piastai mara ag gluaiseacht iad, ó seisear go hochtar i ngach ceann acu. Ní bhíonn imeacht gan an ndinnéar orthu. Dúirt duine éigin gur dhóigh le duine gur diolta ón Rialtas a bhí an tOileán ach a bheith ag ullmhú tae dóibh gach Domhnach agus lá saoire ...*

[It’s a holiday. There’s nothing to be seen but naomhógs making for the island from every direction. They move like sea monsters, each of them carrying six or eight people. They don’t leave either without their dinner. Someone said that you’d think the islanders were paid by the Government to prepare tea for them every Sunday and holiday ... (Nic Eoin’s translation)] (Ó Criomhthain quoted in Nic Eoin 2003: 160)

Ironically Nic Eoin (2003: 164) points out that the book *Lár Dár Saol* by Seán Ó Criomhthain ‘documents what is a classic case of the expansion of tourism coinciding with the erosion of the native lifestyle which provided part of the attraction for the tourist in the first place’. The appeal of the Corca Dhuibhne, in particular the western areas of
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31 A type of boat.
the peninsula, drew attention from far and wide and primarily on the basis of a cultural exchange: a learning experience.

It is obvious that quite a substantial amount of tourists flock to the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht annually to immerse themselves in the Irish culture. The people of the peninsula that are involved with tourism promote this cultural aspect to entice tourists to the area. There are archaeological sites, the Blasket Island Visitor Centre and the rugged scenery, and these are marketed to support the image of a traditional Ireland.

While the draw of Irish language and culture appeals to many visitors, Helen McCormack writing in *The Independent* (2005) believes that it was the filming and release of the film *Ryan’s Daughter* (Lean 1970) that brought Corca Dhuibhne to international attention. In a similar vein, Professor Harry White (2012) comments that it was the prominence of Irish traditional music in Kubrick’s feature film *Barry Lyndon* (1975) that brought the traditional music to the international platform. Therefore the promotion of the traditions and lifestyle onto the big screen has, as proposed by McCormack and White, presented Ireland as a potential destination for international tourists.

The area has strategically modernised its appeal, and in recent years hosts, for example, Other Voices (one of Ireland’s ‘most unique music events’ according to the website), the Dingle Food Festival and the Dingle International Film Festival. In 1993, a Blasket Island Centre was opened and aims to honour the community who lived on the remote Blasket Islands until their evacuation in 1953. The ‘unique’ story of the Blasket Islands becomes a commodity, the story a ‘unique selling point’, although there are many similar island community stories from around Ireland and Scotland, for example St Kilda and the removal of its inhabitants in 1930. Denvir (2002: 31) equates tourism to pilgrimages stating that ‘the trip or tour is the latter-day pilgrimage, with tourism almost a surrogate religion selling the “old,” “authentic,” “unified” word to the lost postmodern wanderer with the dollars or euros to fund his quest for meaning and significance.’ At the time of gathering fieldwork for this project in 2008, a display was installed about the Blasket residents who emigrated to America, and this display functions as a drawing point for second and third generation emigrations to ‘connect with their origin’.
Indeed as Moriarty (2014: 470) comments the ‘desire to maintain the traditional appeal of Dingle has led to the commodification of a rustic capital, of which the Irish language forms part, in order to monopolize on the global tourists’ quest to experience authenticity’. She (2014: 470) confirms Denvir’s (2002) referral to the Gaeltacht’s USP [unique selling point] by highlighting that ‘minority languages and other symbolic and semiotic resources become highly marketable commodities’.

4.2.3 Linguistic Impact

In the case of designated Gaeltacht areas, tourism does create a linguistic impact on the language of the community. Denvir (2002) refers to a survey conducted in the townland of Dún Chaoin, which is referred to as ‘the heartland of the Kerry Gaeltacht and its much-vaunted literary and oral tradition’. The Mac Amhlaoinh survey findings are summarised as follows:

Dún Chaoin has a population of 181, compromising of 66 men, 59 women and 56 children (51 of whom are at school locally and 3 in higher education). There are 162 houses in the area, 64 of which are permanently inhabited (five on longterm lease). Irish is not the first or dominant language of seventeen of these homes. Eight-six houses (53 percent of the total) are holiday homes, some owned and used by local people who have left the area and others by outsiders. Twelve holiday homes were under construction at the time (and so entitled to significant tourism grants) and another ten were planned. This development will increase the overall percentage of holiday homes in the area to 59 percent. (Denvir 2002: 25)

There are obvious linguistic and cultural implications for the high percentage of holiday homes in the area, but also the homes remain unoccupied for a large portion of the year creating a half-empty townland, not conducive to a lively community spirit. The issue of ‘us versus them’, or insider and outsider, again develops. The preponderance of holiday homes in Dún Chaoin was predicted by the Irish writer Máirtín Ó Cadhain in 1966, complaining that the area was in danger of becoming a caravan park (quoted in Denvir 2002: 25). Denvir (2002: 26) continues to say that the language impact of tourism, though sometimes given a lip service comment en passant, is almost universally ignored in the literature.

It will be suggested through this chapter, that the Corca Dhuibhne community is struggling with the essence of cultural tourism, and at times overlooking the reality of
maintaining a community that is a destination for cultural tourists. On the one hand, there is a drive to present the area as rich in cultural and heritage values including the Irish language, yet on the other hand there is a drive towards English that responds to the needs of the members of the Gaeltacht community. This dichotomy presents itself in two dramatic disputes in the area, and the baseline of each dispute is monolingualism versus bilingualism.\textsuperscript{32} Or perhaps, most appropriately, the baseline is bilingualism versus bilingualism.

4.3 Place-Name Controversy: An Daingean/Dingle/Daingean Uí Chúis

The town of An Daingean was very much in the public eye when its place-name was debated under the Placenames (Irish Forms) Act 1973. Under this Act the Minister Éamon Ó Cuív enforced earlier legislation that all public road signs within the Gaeltacht would be Irish only. In 1970 the Minister for Environment Bobby Molloy introduced legislation that only Irish place-names would be used in the Gaeltacht areas of Ireland. The Act was accepted without much difficulty but the Placenames Order (Gaeltacht Districts) 2004 was reiterating the Act and enforcing the correct Irish place-names. Under the Official Languages Act 2003 it was a linguistic criteria for the Gaeltacht place-names to contain no English version in the following cases: in any Act of the Oireachtas, in maps and on road or street signs. The section from the act reads as follows:

\begin{quote}
Part 5: 33. (2) Where the Minister makes a declaration under section 32 in respect of a place-name in a Gaeltacht area, the English language version of the place-name shall no longer have any force and effect as on and from the operative date but without prejudice to anything done before or after that date including the use of that version other than its use-

(a) in any Act of the Oireachtas passed after the operative date or any statutory instrument made after that date under any Act,

(b) in such maps prepared and published by or with the permission of Ordnance Survey Ireland as may be prescribed or

(c) on a road or street sign erected by or on behalf of a local authority.
\end{quote}

(Government of Ireland 2003: 36-38)

\textsuperscript{32} In the recorded speech corpus, it is discussed that a handful of students work on the boats bringing tourists to and from the Blasket Islands. Also in the questionnaire one student replies that she speaks Irish with the summer students who stay with her. This indicates how tourism plays a central role in the participants’ lives, acting as a form of income and interaction even at this young age.
On 21 December 2004 the Minister Éamon Ó Cuív signed the Place names Order (Gaeltacht regions) 2004 that was prepared by the Placenames Commission. This order was to be put in place throughout the Gaeltacht areas on 28 March 2005. Prior to its publication a draft was circulated amongst the local authorities and made available in the media for any of the decisions to be questioned. Of the 2,319 place-names in the Order, 24 were questioned and some of these 24 were altered for the final draft. At this point, there was no dispute made on behalf of the An Daingean place-name, which under the Order was to be presented publicly as *An Daingean* in place of the bilingual *Dingle/Daingean Uí Chúis*. There were objections by local residents who argued that the An Daingean place-name was a linguistic obstacle that would affect the local tourism industry. They asserted that the bilingual place-name was an internationally recognised tourist destination and therefore the Irish-only name would only lead to confusion and a possible decrease in tourism.

At this point the local councillors decided to organise a plebiscite with the intention of contesting the Placenames Order. The plebiscite was based on the following act from 2001:

Local Government Act 2001, Part 18

189.—(1) A town council may by resolution, for which at least one half of the total number of members of the council vote in favour, adopt a proposal to change the name of the town to a proposed new name. (Government of Ireland 2001: 152)

A plebiscite was organised for October 2005 and the ballot list consisted of 1,222 names, including both residents and ratepayers of the town. It was a postal ballot and cost €10,000 to organise. While the plebiscite was based on town residents only, residents of the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht outside of An Daingean were in favour of the revised place-name and against the plebiscite. They formed a group, and went under the title of *Todhcháí na Gaeltachta* [Future of the Gaeltacht\(^{33}\)] but were still denied entry onto the ballot list. *Coiste Dingle Daingean Uí Chúis* [Dingle Daingean Uí Chúis Committee] was subsequently set up in response and the community became divided on the topic. Despite Minister Ó Cuív stating that the outcome of the plebiscite would have no influence on the

decision, it went ahead as planned. Of the 1,222 votes that were posted: 1,095 were returned, 70 were against the motion, 1,005 were in favour and 20 were spoiled. The following month those involved in the protest applied to the Minister for the Environment, Dick Roche, to change the place-name. A resolution was eventually reached in April 2008 when the Minister for the Environment, John Gormley, decreed that the place-name would be Daingean Uí Chúis but that the bilingual name would be used outside of the Gaeltacht.

The place-name dispute can be understood in the context of the idea of international tourism, identity and change.

The modern tourist is fed upon and invigorated by tradition. The receiving society, in this respect, comes to reflect on its own traditions and values through the confrontation with otherness signified by the presence of tourists. The reconstruction of its identity begins with the gaze of the foreigner, and finds within this gaze a point of reference which guarantees that identity. So the evaluation of the affirmation of its own identity can only be accomplished by reference to the Other. (Lanfant quoted in Denvir 2002: 29)

This leads to the question of whether the community is seeking to be defined by those not living in the area: tourists and other outsiders. Returning, and potential, tourists are influencing the linguistic dynamic of Corca Dhuibhne, and this goes entirely unnoticed by the tourist. On this trajectory, one could ask if the Irish-speakers stop speaking Irish when the tourists are out of earshot? It would be assumed that knowing the high market cultural tourism of the area, the monolingual sign would contribute to the experience of the cultural tourist. Would it not emphasise the ‘unique selling point’ of the Gaeltacht: Irish as the ‘dominant’ language? Nic Eoin (2009: 158) refers to the sociological matter of the ‘desire to please tourists’ and this argument of a bilingual place-name reflects this sentiment in Corca Dhuibhne, and while perhaps not the dominant sentiment, it all the while contributes to the linguistic tension in the area.

4.3.1 Linguistic Landscape

This debate created a large divide in the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht and there was extensive graffiti to be seen on the road signs, primarily the English name Dingle being added to the road signs. There was an ongoing presence of the debate in public view as a number of business opted to display their allegiance in the form of a poster, banner or
sticker. The linguistic landscape will, inevitably, elicit strong reactions owing to the ubiquitous nature of language acting as a constant reminder. In his paper examining the development of the Gaeltacht, Ó Tuathaigh (1980: 12) discusses the advantages and the disadvantages of the modus operandi of Údarás na Gaeltachta, formerly Gaeltarra Éireann, and the following statement is pertinent when examining the case of An Daingean:

But industrial development and increased tourism have taken place without due regard for (and some would say with dangerous indifference to) the impact of these forms of economic development on language behaviour in the Gaeltacht.

Ó Tuathaigh is referring to the language interaction with English rather than the issue of bilingual place-names but certainly the language behaviour is compelling. The status of An Daingean as a weak Gaeltacht town is coming to the forefront, the almost complete refusal to accept the Irish-only sign indicates the true bilingual status of the town. It is perhaps indicative of the notion of a baile seirbhise [service town] and how the aim of promoting Irish as the community language in the town has shifted towards promoting Irish-English bilingualism as the community norm, serving not just inhabitants of the peninsula but tourists as well.

The linguistic landscape is a phenomenon that has recently emerged in sociolinguistic research and is constantly undergoing development (Shohamy 2006). The presence and visibility of languages in the public domain can be an indicator of the linguistic hierarchy within a community or nation therefore explaining the determination of those opposing to the name change in An Daingean. The politicisation of the landscape can fortify language debates in areas from one single sign to a country’s bilingual signage policy. Shohamy and Waksman (2009: 31) write that the linguistic landscape is an arena through which various agendas are being battled, negotiated and dictated. On observing the linguistic landscape, questions can be asked about who created the signs and who they are aimed at. In Ireland, as mentioned in chapter one, the national road signs are bilingual, outside the Gaeltacht, with the Irish place-name written in lower case lettering italics and the English place-name underneath with upper case Roman font. According to An Coimisinéir Teanga’s Use of Irish on Traffic Signs (2011) it is a statutory requirement that the place-name information is bilingual and that the National Roads Authority and local authorities
are required to adhere to the guidelines of the manual. Presumably the Irish language appearing above English to reflect its status as the first official language but the smaller font reflects a sense of obligation.

Moriarty (2012, 2014) studies a wall in An Daingean as a particular point in the linguistic landscape where the language ideology debate can be overtly examined. She concludes (2012: 86) that this ‘Dingle Wall’ is ‘an example of linguistic activism from the bottom-up in an attempt to transgress top-down imposed norms disrupting the assumed authority of the state to impose top-down language norms.’ This is a useful examination of an evolving story in the linguistic dynamic of the area, and through continuous observation of the wall it is possible to determine the urgency or waning of the language debate. This public forum will present the language ideologies of those willing to take a public stance by contributing to the language visibility.

4.4 Education Controversy: Pobalscoil Chorca Dhuibhne

The reaction of Corca Dhuibhne’s local residents to monolingual Irish versus Irish-English bilingualism was to become the focal point of a second controversy regarding the local secondary school. The peninsula is now served by one public co-educational secondary school: Pobalscoil Chorca Dhuibhne. As mentioned in chapter one, this school was founded when two local schools amalgamated in September 2007- Meánscoil na Toirbhirte and Scoil na mBráithre Criostaí - both unisex and with varying degrees of Irish-medium language education policy.

The matter of Irish and the education system is important to this thesis and therefore it is essential for some background information to strengthen the context of the research. Ó Riagáin’s (1992: 66) survey notes that:

... as regards post-primary schools, all of which are centred in An Daingean, only 29% of respondents in any area across the region with children of that age claim that they are following all-Irish programmes. Thus, although, the entire area is a Gaeltacht, on the evidence of the survey data, about one third of primary school children and up to three quarters of post-primary are not following all-Irish programmes.
He (1992: 71) also implies that parents focused on speaking Irish with children rather than between themselves for the benefit of the £10 scheme or attitudes towards the role of Irish in the socialisation of children.

The school is located in a new, purpose built building located near the centre of An Daingean and the language medium is promoted as Irish only. As outlined in the introduction to this dissertation, the language policy of the Gaeltacht areas heavily promotes Irish and the language medium of education is Irish. According to the Education Act 1998 (1998: 30) the state will support the provision and promotion of education through the medium of Irish in recognised schools generally and in schools located in a Gaeltacht area. However, it should be noted that the same act also states (1998: 31) that from time to time the minister will advise regarding ‘the educational needs of people living in a Gaeltacht area.’ The language medium of the two original schools was Irish but, as will become apparent, a loose or bilingual approach would be the more accurate description of the language policies. However Ó Riagáin (1992: 66) does point out the Gaeltacht education has been primarily through Irish, not exclusively through Irish. Given the location of the school on the peninsula, the only optional education institutes available are a private girls’ boarding school near An Daingean (Coláiste Íde34), the secondary school in Castlegregory (50km daily commute from An Daingean) or a school in Tralee (100km daily commute from An Daingean). This issue of school selection is also raised by the Department of Education and Skills (2013: 4) when it notes:

... there is also the issue of parental choice. In the case of Gaelscoileanna situated outside the Gaeltacht, parents make a conscious decision to have their child educated through Irish as there normally is a choice of schools in the locality. Gaeltacht schools are often situated in isolated rural areas and parents do not have the same level of choice of alternative schools.

The extended controversy surrounding this school in An Daingean began at its inception in September 2007 when the school term began. Within a couple of weeks of opening over a fifth of the school’s 470 students protested the strict language policy of the school. Some students refused to attend classes and were vocal in their dispute, finding the

---

34 This school was excluded from the research as the students are from all over the country, and not necessarily representative of the local area.
national media keen to broadcast the story. The role the media played in both disputes will be discussed further along in the chapter. Despite their protests the principal, Pádraig Feirtéar, and the school’s Board of Management, with full support from the Kerry Education Board, insisted that the Irish-medium policy would continue to be implemented. The parents of these students came together to form the group ‘Concerned Parents of Corca Dhuibhne’ and their concern was that the language policy was putting their children at a disadvantage educationally, and not allowing them to reach their academic potential. This policy, they argued, was a violation of civil and human rights and they proceeded, with vigour, to take action.

Action came in the form of public meetings, a petition and a campaign taken to the Minister for Education Mary Hanafin to conduct a survey of the local opinion. At the public meetings, it was reported in the media that those who attempted to speak in Irish were heckled and jeered at. A group also formed that were vociferously against the suggested bilingual policy and the Minister’s involvement in the debate, the group named themselves Tuismitheoirí na Gaeltachta [Parents of the Gaeltacht]. It was this group that opposed the Minister’s postal survey in January 2008 which was circulated to assess the opinions of parents. By March of that year 88 households, representing 120 students, were eager to pursue a court case demanding a bilingual stream of classes in the community school. A mediator was nominated by the High Court to assist the various bodies in coming to a mutual agreement but after almost one year no progress was made. The ‘Concerned Parents of Corca Dhuibhne’ wanted extra Irish language classes to be organised for those whose standard of Irish was not sufficient and for these classes to be made available to them from first year through to sixth year. This group, which represents

![Table 4.2: Extract from Ó Riagáin (1992: 65) on the use of Irish language at Public Meetings](#)
12 students, finally accepted a court order that was signed off on in July 2009. However, the dispute came to a close in November 2012.

The school’s website provides an extensive amount of information on the topic of policies and this accessible and open information reflects on the school’s stance throughout the entire debate. The policies and mission statement reinforce that the school was adhering to the Language Act 1998 by providing education through Irish owing to its location in the Gaeltacht. This also emphasises that the dispute was among the members of the community, the school itself was neutral throughout the extended procedure. The mission statement on the website, for example, is presented bilingually with Irish as the first language.

_Iarbhunoideachas lán Ghaeilge a chur ar fáil do phobal Chorca Dhuibhne, idir óg agus aosta, agus freastal a dhéanamh ar réimse leathan ábaltaigh ag tacú le hoideachas don duine ina iomláine i dtimpeallacht aireach ónóisach. Chuige seo tabharfaidh na páirtithe oideachais go léir tacaiocht agus comhoibriú dona chéile. Cothófar luachanna Cristúilí le meas ar an duine féin, ar an gcultúir, ar an oidhreacht, ar an teanga, agus ar an timpeallacht._

To provide postprimary education fully through Irish for the community of Corca Dhuibhne, regardless of age, and to cater to a wide range of abilities supporting education for the person as a whole in a caring respectful environment. Furthering this aim the partners in education shall co-operate and support one another. Christian values shall be fostered with respect for the individual, for culture, heritage, the Irish language, and the environment. (own emphasis, Pobalscoil Chorca Dhuibhne n.d.)

The aim ‘to cater to a wide range of abilities’ is open to interpretation, but is likely to be in reference to the language abilities of students. According to the school’s website, there are now two _cúntóirí teanga_ [language assistants] to assist with helping each student achieve a proficiency in Irish to allow them to flourish in the school.

Warren (2012) presents the argument that those acting against the Irish-medium school are acting out of fear, a response reaction that reflects the unusual linguistic dichotomy of the area. Irish is presented as the promoted and designated dominant language within the Gaeltacht areas of Ireland, however English, the international power language, is in the secondary position. Again this returns to the question of the language competition in the area.
4.5 Discussion

… the outcome of a debate directly or indirectly involves forms of conflict and inequality among groups of speakers: restrictions on the use of certain languages/varieties, the loss of social opportunities when these restrictions are not observed by speakers, the negative stigmatization of certain languages/varieties, associative labels attached to languages/varieties. (Blommaert 1999: 2)

Both these disputes caused a profound split among the community of An Daingean and the wider Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht. There are questions of inclusion and exclusion to be discussed, as well as the matter of linguistic harmony within the community. The questions of identity and language loyalty are raised, with members of the community expected to associate with one language or the other, and to confirm the allegiance, essentially, to Irish or bilingualism.

Warren (2011, 2012) has written on the language controversy surrounding the school from the perspective of an academic and a parent. He (2011: 4) writes:

As a parent I was confronted with having to take a position in relation to the Irish-medium language policy of the school in Dingle as a result of my own children attending the school. The situation forced upon me the requirement to transform private sentiments into public political acts. Eventually this took the form of me publicly defending the school’s language policy, making me a participant in the cultural politics that later became an object for my sociological study. The decision to make the cultural politics of language and identity an object for academic study arose from my need to understand the nature of this cultural politics and the positions I was adopting within it.

This excerpt portrays the vulnerable position parents, students and teachers in An Daingean were faced with: Irish-speakers and those in favour of the policy having to defend the school despite the official and dominant position of Irish within the Gaeltacht.

Referring back to a basic aim of the Gaeltacht - to nurture the young speakers of Irish - this controversy had them defending and fighting for the language. This issue of education within the Gaeltacht has since been addressed by the Department of Education.

[In the speech corpus, one participant comments vaguely on this topic. To paraphrase, she said her mother was asking why she was concerned about the dispute because she would be finished soon, and she responded that she was concerned for her young cousins, nieces and nephews who would be coming through the school. While her stance on the dispute was not discussed, she concludes by saying: Nuair atá siad san ag dul like, well, b’fhéidir go mbeadh sé criochnaithe faoin am sin. Le cinamh Dé. But we’ll see. [When they are coming like, well, maybe it will be finished by that time. With the help of God. But we’ll see.]
and Skills and in the 20-Year Strategy for the Irish Language 2010 - 2030. Within this plan there is a section on education on the Gaeltacht, and while it certainly was not included as a result of the *Pobalscoil* controversy, particular attention would have been focused on this issue in light of the *Pobalscoil*.

This public language dispute was an obviously stressful time for the school, the students and the parents and tension was high in the community. It does raise the question of whether this debate could have erupted from a different setting. If the schools had not amalgamated, would a debate have arisen? While we cannot be sure, it is plausible that the issue of the place-name only exacerbated the education dispute. Unfortunately, the aftermath of these debates means that the community will be divided according to their position on each debate. In the case of both disputes, one group succeeded in their cause and the outcome will remain prominent in the public domain for the future, maintaining a long-term effect on the dynamic of the community and the generations to come. The various discourses that emerged from the language ideological debates, both stemming from different sources and driven by different members of the community, raise questions that reflect the ongoing sociolinguistic setting in the Gaeltacht.

4.5.1 Media

The role of the media in both the place-name and school debate played a prominent part of relaying the story to a wider audience, which in turn questions why these particular ideological debates ‘spilled over into the public domain’ (Jaffe 1999: 39). In all likelihood An Daingean’s international draw as a tourist destination, as highlighted by Moriarty (2014: 475), drew the attention for the place-name debate and in its aftermath the school’s policy attracted wide media coverage.

At the time, the Irish language weekly newspaper *Foinse* was in circulation and there was the Irish language television and radio by means of TG4 and *Raidió na Gaeltachta* as well as a plethora of English media. During the debate, there was lively debate on blogs and forums, primarily posted anonymously. This again raises the issue of private/public that Warren (2012) uses to discuss the local dynamic in the aftermath of the disputes. However on the internet forums anonymity allows this public/private line to be blurred.
This, however, allowed the division to be strengthened with the language competition obvious in the reports, therefore maintaining the us/them division.

An excerpt from the *Irish Examiner* in the nascent stages of the school debate comments:

... despite generations of Irish people being force-fed the language at school and government programmes designed to rejuvenate the language. Most of these initiatives have failed as each passing census records that fewer and fewer people describe themselves as competent Irish speakers. Though the number of people using the language has been in decline for centuries those who love it and make it a central part of their daily lives, those who use it to animate their culture, cherish it with deep loyalty and determination. Nobody would wish to do anything other than encourage that love but the Ireland of 2007 cannot tolerate exclusion based on race, religion, nationality, gender or language, even if it is Irish. For that reason the position adopted by Pobal Scoil Chorca Dhuibhne in Dingle, that it will not teach through any language other than Irish, is wrong. (2007)

The article continues using negative and subjective words to describe the situation: ‘force-fed’, ‘intransigence’, ‘meanness of spirit’, ‘wrong’, ‘unacceptable’ and, of course, referring to the school as a ‘kind of Finsbury Park Mosque by the sea.’

Throughout the article, there is no reference to the Education Act of 1998 or any use of the word Gaeltacht yet the author seeks to draw a comparison with the indoctrination of radical Islamic ideas. The article is also unfounded in stating that ‘fewer and fewer people describe themselves as competent Irish speakers’ when, according to the census returns, the reverse is true.

Negative journalism towards the preservation of Irish language is unfortunately not a rare occurrence in Ireland, Ó Caollaí (in Mac Gréil 2009: vii) refers to ‘the relentless expression of negative attitudes in much of the popular mass media’. In the age of Web 2.0, there is an abundance of modes for negative attitudes to be voiced: blogs, forums, comments on news articles, social media sites. Inevitably any news regarding the Irish language or the Gaeltacht incurs negative comments that, in the aftermath of the national economic recession, primarily focus on public expenditure. For example, a recent development related to Irish was the announcement that the Language Commissioner

---

37 This mosque, located in London, has developed a reputation for promoting radical Islam.
38 A term coined by O’Reilly (2005) to describe the internet’s development which allows for users to interact and create an online presence beyond static websites. It denotes online interaction between users.
would resign in February 2014 and three immediate comments on the national news website www.rte.ie website regarding the announcement read:

jimmy: how much of a state pension will he get another waste of money as if we need a language commissioner

Frank: This guy wants to marginalise Irish people by forcing Irish down our throats. I do not want to listen to Irish ever again yet it is being introduced gradually in different services like buses trains and government agencies. 2 Billion a year to support a hobby for most of the people interested in Irish. Imagine no more austerity budgets, no more emigration? We could use the money for better things like jobs and care for sick people.

Marconatrix: Have you even the slightest idea how completely pathetic remarks like these make you look to all the other small European countries that proudly maintain their own local languages and cultures, above all to your Celtic neighbours? Even the tiny IoM seems to be making a better fist of supporting their language. With close on a century of independence under your belts you ought to be leading the pack, instead all we hear is negativity and self-hate. Is mór an trua! Can it be a coincidence that places like Iceland and the Baltic states, places with a very strong sense of who they are, bounced back the fastest from the financial crisis? (Editorial 2013)

The anonymity of the posters encourages a more pugnacious tone in the negative comments, which often incur defensive responses, and a debate will ensue. As Warren (2011) discusses the idea of private/public is an issue for the language debate with locals having to present an opinion publicly and to therefore ‘take sides’ in the debate. Anonymity online prevents this public stance to be associated with a person, although people do proudly attribute their full names to public comments also.

For example, a recent blog post with the title ‘7 deep insights from a single Kerry road sign in Ireland’ summarises the place name debate in three sentences:

Dingle in the Irish language is known as Daingean Uí Chúis. A shortened version of that name is simply “An Daingean” (which means “The Fort”, by the way). Rather than show the correct name, the local authority has used the shortened name, presumably to simply save on signage. (Bitesize 2014)\(^{39}\)

---

\(^{39}\) For a more detailed analysis of online ideological debates related to the Irish language see Kelly-Holmes (2011).
Although the idea of the ‘moneysaving’ tactic of the local authority is spurious, this is a current interpretation of the dispute and one, according to the comments on the blog, which is accepted.

Kelly-Holmes (2011: 511) observes the emergence of three discourses: a discourse of truth, a discourse of ‘them and us’ and a discourse of ‘sexy Irish’ when examining an online discussion touching on the sociolinguistic and language-ideological situation of Irish. While the third discourse is not pertinent to the An Daingean place-name or school debate, the other two emerge quite obviously. Her (2011: 512) explanation of the discourse of truth is that it advocates ‘the exposure of lies about the situation of Irish, and the contradiction between its official status and its “real world” status’. The media examples cited in this section of the thesis portray this discourse of truth, or perhaps a more appropriate term in these instances is a discourse of untruth: making unfounded claims, diminishing the language’s official status and statistics, and making vast assumptions relating the financial support Irish receives. These biased discourses are responded to, as in the example, with facts and statistics that reflect the actual status of the language, as supported by Kelly-Holmes’ (2011) article. This additional lower tier to the discourse of truth takes the idea of ‘reinforcing the commonsense assumption the although, symbolically, Irish people may subscribe to supporting the Irish language … the “true”, authentic, identity – not just symbolic one – is constructed in the truth discourse as a monolingual one, expressed in English’ (Kelly-Holmes 2011: 522) a step further. Rather than seeking to reiterate that Irish is ‘symbolic’, the discourse of untruth disputes even the symbolic associations of Irish, viewing it as ‘a hobby’ and a waste of money. Of course, the core element of this discourse, in Ireland, is the economical support of Irish, which could, supposedly, resolve matters of unemployment and care for the elderly.

4.5.2 Language Association and Language Loyalty
The idea of the imagined community and the idea of language as an identity come to the forefront in these local disputes. The ‘us versus them’ notion is apparent, especially when community members are being ‘jeered at and heckled’ for speaking Irish in public meetings. How a community can respond so vehemently and vocally must indicate a
covert discontent within the Corca Dhuibhne community. The original message of what Kearns (1974: 82) describes as ‘an area that preserves the Irish language and culture of the Irish race’ in the form of a cultural community or cultural entity does not appear to be the case with Corca Dhuibhne as a whole.

According to the www.dingle-peninsula.ie website, as pointed out by Warren (2011) and Moriarty (2012) a tourist to An Daingean should expect:

… a unique storehouse of Irish cultural heritage. Until recently, the peninsula was remote from the influences of the modern world, and this meant that the language and traditions of the area have survived intact to a greater degree than in most of Ireland.

The website continues to portray a romantic and mythical image of the area that is reminiscent of the promotion of the Irish-speaking areas in the early twentieth century: the appeal that Douglas Hyde associated with the Irish language, the appeal that brought scholars from all over Europe to visit the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht and that encouraged the penning of the famous autobiographies. The disputes, to some extent, contradict this image presented by the local tourist board but whether these controversies filtered down to potential visitors is uncertain. For those with an awareness of the disputes, there is a palpable tension in the area and the marked/unmarked choice comes into play.

Warren (2011: 9) discusses the ‘relational and contingent understanding of identity, including that of space/place’ and ‘the identity of space/place involves definitional struggles’. There is an apparent struggle with the affiliation of either Irish or non-Irish speakers in Corca Dhuibhne. The, perhaps unconscious, loyalty to the Irish language and the pertinence of a cultural ambassador for cultural heritage is not easily dismissed. Warren goes on to suggest a relational framework that will enable the dynamic of An Daingean and Corca Dhuibhne to be understood: space/place, social/political and public/private. By adhering to these categories, one can:

... understand places as constituted out of the interaction or collision of different trajectories of history, economics, culture and politics which are non-linear and so produce quite distinct imaginings of place that sit side by side with each other. Consequently Dingle can be imagined as a particular kind of space of natural beauty and linguistic heritage in a way that doesn’t disrupt people’s sentiments towards the Irish language. (Warren 2011: 12)
However the language does not signify the same meaning to everyone who speaks it, and this will later be demonstrated by the answers of the participants in chapter six. Being an L2 speaker can represent a completely contrasting set of attitudes, uses and notions when compared to an L1 speaker. Convergence towards English and divergence from English substitute two entirely separate cultural systems. Identities can emerge in different forms: an individual identity, a community identity and a national identity. Following from this, the compartmentalization of language use begins to develop and domains are formed.

4.5.3 Cultural Identity and Hybridity

From the contextual information on the region, it could be assumed that the participants are conflicted as to which language they identify with. Within the Gaeltacht region, especially in Corca Dhuibhne during the place-name and education debate, the locals had to choose a stance on Irish or English. One could argue that the hybridity of this young generation was not considered and the opinions and associations of their parents and senior members of the community were exaggerating the language hierarchy and competition. As mentioned earlier in relation to the Irish language in Ireland today, contact with the English language is inevitable. Stenson (1993) writes that there were a handful of monoglot Irish-speakers alive at the time of her research, restricted to older speakers. Today the Irish-speakers are bilingual, but as Ní Neachtain (2013) stated there is a national (among Irish speakers) shift towards bilingualism but within a diglossic setting.

This matter of identity can be linked to one of three theoretical paradoxes of nationalism that Anderson (1991: 5) outlines:

… the formal universality of nationality as a socio-cultural concept - in the modern world everyone can, should, will ‘have’ a nationality vs. the irremediable particularity of its concrete manifestations, such that, by definition, ‘Greek’ nationality is sui generis.

Anderson (1991: 6) then suggests to define nationalism as ‘an imagined political community - and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign’. Of course, this matter is here being transferred to the Gaeltacht as a sociocultural entity based on a language. In sociolinguistics the term ‘speech community’ is widely used as a ‘more natural boundary for sociolinguistic study than, say, geographical cohesion alone.’
Mesthrie et al. (2005: 37) The speech community of the Gaeltacht is divided between Irish speakers, bilingual speakers (Irish/English) and English only speakers, and of course members of the community who speak another language. Having contrasting home languages and language abilities does not exclude people from the speech community as English, in this instance, is a common denominator. In keeping with this idea of Anderson’s ‘imagined community’, the Gaeltacht can be interpreted as one such community for a number of reasons:

1. The foundation of the Gaeltacht and Gaeltacht areas (Belfast, Dublin, Derry and Erinsville in Canada) varies from when they were established, how they were established and who was responsible for founding each region.

2. Although geographically identified, not all residents are actively participating in the defining feature of a Gaeltacht: the Irish language. The physical borders are not permanent and longstanding with adjustments previously made and potential reviewing based on the recommendations of Ó Giollagáin et al. (2007) in the linguistic review.

3. The essence of community implies a sense of familiarity based on interaction between the members. Therefore the Gaeltacht community ‘is imagined’ because the members ... will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion’ (Anderson 1991: 6).

The demand for language assistance by students and parents to be introduced in the school was a reflection of a bilingual identity and not a denial of monolingual Irish culture. This demand in itself is vocalising the changing dynamic of the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht. Or perhaps it is vocalising the requirements of those who were never fully Gaelicised in the area and wish to be accommodated. It is quite indicative that the lobby groups in the school debate were ‘concerned parents’ and not ‘concerned students’, therefore implying the older generation are the driving force behind the protest. This idea of a bilingual identity is in line with the concluding remarks of chapter two, that bilingual research is all too often based on the two monolingual aspects coming together, rather than the active bilingual entity.

---

40 In the group of participants for this study, for example, there are three who speak German as a family language and were living within the Gaeltacht at the time of data collection.

41 The Gaeltacht community is distinct yet not completely unrelated to the community of Irish-speakers. The overriding community, encompassing both groups, recently came together in protests against the government’s treatment of the Irish language.
‘Sociolinguistic volatility today can be best understood, in many settings, as a reflection of groups in transition’ (Edwards 1996: 29), and it is therefore necessary to review the cultural boundaries and associations in Corca Dhuibhne. Bhabha’s theory of hybridity from postcolonial theory studies can be applied to this bilingual community as both languages represent a culture: Irish-speakers within the Gaeltacht and bilingual-speakers within the Gaeltacht. These two identities are not exclusive to one another, as all Irish-speakers are bilingual and all bilinguals can speak English, but it is how they identified themselves during the disputes that is pertinent. Bhabha (2004) emphasises the hybridity of cultures, which on one level simply refers to the mixed-ness, or even ‘impurity’ of cultures. He writes that as cultures are in contact this leads to a hybrid form: a cultural complexity. Complexity is certainly *le mot juste* in this instance as the disputes displayed. Is there a cultural difference between Irish and non-Irish speakers in the Corca Dhuibhne region even though they have grown up together, attended school together, developed friendships and all within the same geographic location? Bhabha (2004: 178) eloquently writes that:

> In-between culture, at the point of its articulation of identity or distinctiveness, comes the question of signification. This is not simply a matter of language; it is a question of culture’s representation of difference-manners, words, rituals, customs ...

While Irish is ‘a cornerstone of our cultural identity, heritage and soul as a nation’ (Ó Cuirreáin 2013) it is not, and can no longer be, the defining signifier among Irish nationals. In the education debate, the students are acting as ideology brokers and are acting as the driving force for changes, or advances, in what they see to be an obstacle. Blommaert (1999: 429-430) summarises an ideology broker as ‘experts, whose expertise is dragged as a subtext into another type of discourse, not a technical discourse (hence, not “expert” discourse) but a political discourse which is sometimes hard to distinguish from that of “real” politicians.’ The area of expertise of the students is their first-hand experience of first-hand a disadvantage as a result of the *pobalscoil*’s Irish language policy. These ideology brokers are the young generation of the Gaeltacht that Ó Domagáin (2013: 239) defines as having different values and qualities of the older generation speakers and they seek to adjust their environment to accommodate these differences.
McCubbin (2010: 460) writes that there is ‘the tendency to regard a language community, particularly a minority language community, as isomorphous with its traditionally associated ethnic group, such that ethnicity becomes an essential characteristic of the language community itself.’ A group that aligns with the application of Bhabha’s idea of cultural entities is the immigrant learners or new speakers of Irish who now speak primarily Irish. McCubbin (2012, 2010) explores the relationship between speaking Irish and the requirement to be Irish among participants who have acquired the language as an adult and currently use the language as their medium for work and home.

These new speakers, with diverse cultural backgrounds, add a new dimension to the Irish language. Along these lines, Townson (1999: 71) writes that

… the aim of foreign language study is not to produce a clone of a native speaker, but to help students develop intercultural literacy and fluency; students should not be encouraged to deny their own identity and to “assume” a foreign one, for if they do, they are replacing one monolinguality with another.

Language can be a cultural signifier but in the case of Irish, the language does not always come with the other perceived signifiers. Ethnic identifiers can also include physical characteristics, dress, traditions, beliefs, diet: all respected and of equal pertinence within the ethnicity. Dorian (1980: 35) comments on the use of Gaelic among fisherfolk in the North East of Scotland and how they were segregated from the wider population by not
only their language, but their profession, dress and diet up until World War I. Endogamy
was the norm and therefore the way of life was upheld with little interference. Any
association with Gaelic would automatically label the speaker as a member of the
fisherfolk community. In Ireland today, the bulk of Irish-speakers are not native speakers
and in fact there are many non-Irish nationals who have learned the language and chose
to work and engage through its medium on a daily basis. Therefore Irish language as an
ethnic identifier will no longer correspond to a native Irish speaker from a Gaeltacht area.

The participants are obviously growing up in the middle of two cultures lead by English
and Irish. These debates show a certain level of anxiety on each side of the arguments –
do the supporters of Irish feel that English will overpower their language? Do the
supporters of bilingualism feel jeopardized by the elevated status of Irish in the
Gaeltacht? Those who embrace the idea of multiculturalism live beyond the ideas of
stereotypes. In his essay ‘Beyond Cultural Identity: reflections on multiculturalism’ Adler
(1976) describes a multicultural person as ‘a new person who transcends his/her
indigenous culture’. There are other prefixes that can replace multi- for example
transcultural or intercultural which would perhaps better suit the young adults in the
Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht.

As will be presented in chapter six, the range of Irish-English language use varies from
Irish as a home language to English as a home language with various degrees of
bilingualism in between. This information only seeks to confirm the stance of Bhabha,
that there is very little evidence of a unique, stand-alone culture that can be located.
Cultural and linguistic hybridity is an active process in Ireland that is occurring not only
between Irish nationals, but immigrants to the country who are engaging with the Irish
language through education or employment. McCubbin (2010) posits that in the
education sector, for example, parents with no Irish from Ireland and from outside Ireland
are the most favourably disposed to Irish medium education. This is certainly reflected in
the ever-increasingly popular Irish-medium schools, both primary and secondary, that are
being established in non-Gaeltacht areas, schools that are regularly founded with a drive
from parents. To complement this idea of identity and speakers maintaining or shifting
identity association Myers-Scotton (2005: 63) writes:
At the same time, as many others have pointed out, every person perceives him- or herself as having more than one identity and is not always seen by others in the same identity. When a speaker of the Lwidakho variety of Luyia is at home in western Kenya, he identifies himself to a foreign visitor as a Mudakho, even if he speaks in English. If the conversation takes place in Nairobi, he identifies himself as a Luyia. If he goes to the United States, he becomes a Kenyan or an African. Our point here is that different identities also are conveyed by speaking different languages ... linguistic choices are viewed as both indices of identities and tools to negotiate inter-personal interactions ... bilingualism isn’t an automatic threat to the home language and ethnic values. Obviously, it can be a unifying force across ethnicities. Also, it can give individuals a heightened awareness of what there is about their own language that they value.

This cultural mixedness and the breaking down of boundaries is necessary for understanding the ideological tones evident in the language debates. An Daingean and the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht is no longer recognisable as a single entity, as Warren’s (2011) article seeks to explain two contrasting, simultaneous depictions of An Daingean.

4.6 Conclusion
While scholarly emphasis may vary ... the wish to illuminate social interactions through language, and vice versa, remains the driving force. It follows that, whenever either social or linguistic dynamics are especially volatile, the value of this illumination increases (Edwards 1996: 29).

Mac Giolla Chriost (2012: 406) notes that there has been a fresh dynamism increasingly apparent in Irish-language policy, and matters of language equality and rights are central to it. The aim of this chapter was to outline the sociolinguistic setting of this research project, and locate the spoken corpus within a living community. An obvious outcome of this chapter is the necessity to reassess the definitions and boundaries that have been applied to all Irish-speaking entities in light of the recent cultural philosophies. The understanding that culture as a social construct comes to the forefront in the Corca Dhuibhne context, and

... however, so much of it is so “self-evident” to members of the culture, that its perceptions and values are often regarded as being “natural” - a notion of which one is, interestingly often only disasbused when confronted with the “other” - which can, however, then appear “unnatural” (Townson 1999: 74).

Ó Baoill (1999: 189) asks ‘whether we will be in the near future promoting two languages with almost identical cultural values or hope to salvage and maintain some of
the salient cultural values nurtured and handed on to use through the medium of the Irish language. And while in 1999 this may have appeared as a preposterous suggestion, the context of this study does signpost such a possibility in the not too distant future.

… the school’s language policy can be understood as a conflict between individual and group claims, over different understandings of human rights. These are tensions between different notions of the public good and between different definitions of space/place. (Warren 2011: 9)

Even in the twenty years since the publication of Ó Riagáin’s (1992) study, the relationship between Irish and English has evolved further in the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht, in particular in relation to the cultural tourism of the area. As previously mentioned, the linguistic market for Irish in the area is high, as an economic asset that draws cultural tourism. The language has come to represent contrasting values to the population of the region. For some it is an integral part of Gaeltacht life and for others it is method to make a living via the cultural tourism either directly through teaching/hosting or indirectly through increased customers in local services. The diversity of Corca Dhuibhne is certainly not unique within the Gaeltacht regions of Ireland but each region has a unique dynamic that reflects the evolving community. The final outcome of the education debate is that the community has been forced to evolve, forced to loosen its boundaries and rethink the ideological associations towards Irish. The new, High Court approved, education policy is more inclusive, aiming to make Irish a unifying component in the community. The education of those with weaker language skills will not be compromised as a result, schemes are now in place to accommodate these speakers and assist in their language development throughout their 5/6 years at the Pobalscoil. The school’s motto is Ar scáth a chéile a mhaireann na daoine, which is a popular proverb that means ‘People exist in each others’ shadow’. Whether this evolution and shift from monolingualism towards bilingualism has an impact on the language, on a microlevel, will be ascertained by closely examining the recorded speech sample that was collected from students at the centre of this dispute.
Chapter Five: Methodology

The most fundamental challenge for sociolinguistic research is how to obtain appropriate linguistic data to analyse. (Tagliamonte 2006: 17)

5.1 Introduction

This chapter will present the methodology used in this study that evolved in order to carry out the fieldwork, collect the required data and subsequently analyse the corpus. The main issues associated with the fieldwork are addressed here: identifying the participants, gaining a knowledge of the local area and of the local dialect, the parameters for communication with the participants, recording the speech samples, the transcription process, and compiling and distributing questionnaires for analysis. There will be a brief discussion of the analytical approach but chapter seven of the thesis is dedicated to the analysis. The methodological approach of the thesis is a vital chapter to the thesis, as the fieldwork must be carried out satisfactorily for the corpus to be conducive to analysis and to therefore allow for valid and relevant findings from the field. In this regard, there is substantial pressure on the researcher to ensure a successful methodology and final fieldwork completion, and thus overcoming the ‘fundamental challenge’ quoted by Tagliamonte earlier.

The primary focus of this research project is on a corpus of spoken data gathered from secondary school students in early December 2008. As outlined in the introduction to the thesis and the research questions, this data is instrumental for a thorough understanding of CM characteristics amongst young adult speakers of Irish. The analytical conclusions will also allow for the bilingual status of the community, as represented by the participants, to be gauged on the continuum between stability and a shift towards English. There was a necessity to conduct analytical research on a current Irish-language corpus containing speech samples, ranging from informal to formal to determine the contextual use of CM. Ní Laoire (2009) and O’Malley-Madec (2001) have confirmed that CM is predominantly occurs in informal setting for Irish and CM as a characteristic of predominantly informal speech is also supported in international research (Deuchar 2005; Myers-Scotton 1993; Muysken 2000).
Two broad models of fieldwork approaches are examined namely those focused on Celtic languages: Irish corpora (Hickey 2001, 2004; Stenson 1990, 1993; Ni Laoire 2009; O’Malley-Madec 2001, 2007; Ó Duibhír 2009), Welsh (Deuchar 2005, 2006; Davies 2010) and Gaelic (Dorian 2010), and those working with teenagers (Eckert 2004; Rampton 2006). The chapter will discuss these various methods for data collection that are considered as potentially suitable methodologies, and then continue to outline the final approach adapted for this particular project. Labov (1972, 1972a, 1972b) is a pioneering figure on the topic of data collection, and the various principles and paradoxes identified by him will be highlighted. This will be coupled with the details of the researcher to overcome each paradox during the data collection process. There will be a brief summary of the systems used for gathering the data, and whether the final corpus was suitable for applying the theoretical framework. Tagliamonte (2006: 17) writes that ‘detailed individual accounts are rarely published, except in dissertation methodology chapters’ and therefore there was extensive reviewing of PhD theses (Davies 2010; Ó Duibhír 2009; Smith-Christmas 2012; Antonini 2012; Ni Ghearáin 2011; McCubbin 2011). The chapter will conclude with some retrospective comments on the methodology including shortcomings that were identified, the lessons learned by the researcher and the untapped potential of the fieldwork.

5.2 Preliminary Research into Methodological Practices

In the early stages of the project a research visit to the Centre for Research on Bilingualism in Theory and Practice at Bangor University, Wales was undertaken. During this visit it was anticipated that methodological approach of this research project would be streamlined, based on discussions and advice from the Centre’s staff. The Centre was established with funding from the Economic and Social Research Council, Higher Education Funding for Wales and the Welsh Assembly Governments and has five primary areas of research focus: Neuroscience, Experimental-Development, Corpus-Based, Survey and Ethnography, and Speech. The Corpus-based research group is of particular relevance to this project’s subject matter as they were examining CM and CS.

---

42 http://bilingualism.bangor.ac.uk/
practices in proficient speakers of Welsh-English, Welsh-Spanish43 and Spanish-English. At this early stage of the research project, there was an extensive literature review being undertaken, and the three days at the Centre allowed for detailed discussions with various staff members and gaining insight into the various methodologies of data collection and analysis.

At the time, one of the funded areas of research into bilingualism was a large project examining Welsh-English CM and they applied Myers-Scotton’s (1993, 1998, 2002) MLF to the corpus. Given that both Irish and Welsh have a similar typological structure, namely the Verb Subject Object [VSO] order, it was anticipated that similar constraints would become apparent in both Welsh-English and Irish-English CM. During the visit, the researcher presented an overview of this thesis as part of the centre’s seminar series, and although it was the very early stages of the research, there followed an encouraging discourse with the audience that offered positive comments on the topic. Overall, the trip was extremely beneficial to the project and perhaps can be viewed as functioning as an alternative to carrying out a pilot field study. The trip has also strongly influenced the methodology for data collection, as the Welsh-English corpus was recorded in non-formal surroundings (Deuchar and Davies 2009: 28) that was complemented with a participant questionnaire.44

5.3 Identifying the Field

The institute of the Gaelscoil itself is a compelling location for sociolinguistic research, especially in more recent years, as there are developing issues with bilingual or mixed language education manifesting itself as Irish-medium Gaeltacht schooling.

As mentioned in chapter four, where the research was carried out was specifically chosen as the target field as a result of the education debate. The active engagement of community members across generations in the language policy dispute proved a compelling factor that would greatly enhance the sociolinguistic perspective of the

43 The Welsh-Spanish corpus was collected from Patagonia where there is a Welsh community. Settlers moved from Wales in 1855.
44 Coincidentally during the visit, Professor Ben Rampton presented a seminar with the title “Language & Ethnicity at School: Some Implications from recent work in Sociolinguistics.” Rampton’s work (2006) was referred to during this project’s methodology on the issue of gathering data from young adults in the school setting.
research project. The final year students and potential participants were not the only members of the student body to voice their concerns regarding the language policy, however they were vocal in the dispute and actively involved in the student strike. These students, in their final year of second level education, are at a peak of their usage of Irish and it is expected that this stage of bilingualism will place their CM within the paradigm of use by balanced bilinguals. Previous research on CM has focused on young children (Mac Fhlannchadha 1999; Hickey 2001, 2004) and adults over the age of 18 (O’Malley-Madec 2001, 2009; Stenson 1990, 1993) but there is no specific examination of young adults 16-18 years of age, and this greatly augmented the potential contribution of knowledge of the thesis.

The previous work of Ó Riagáin (1992), Sjoestedt-Jonval (1938) and Ó Sé (2000) allowed for a solid linguistic and historical profile of the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht to be examined and a basis that would further the profiling of the participants’ language characteristics. These characteristics range from the language patterns within the family and community to the spoken language traits of the speakers from the early to late twentieth century. Also, the establishment by Oidhreacht Chorca Dhuibhne [Corca Dhuibhne Heritage] of the various language schemes would have directly been applied to these participants, namely Scéim na gCúntóirí Teanga [Language Assistants Scheme] which was founded in 1992. The scheme’s function, according to the Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht website, is ‘to reinforce Irish as the spoken language among young people in the Gaeltacht.’ The scheme was functioning in pre-school and primary school settings throughout the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht.45 Whether the participants benefited from these schemes was assessed by way of the questionnaire and results will be presented in chapter six of the thesis. This allowed the research to detail the effects of local language maintenance efforts, where applicable.

While it was apparent that a relatively informal speech-sample was necessary, there was a desire to assess the linguistic profile of each student to situate the CM characteristic.

45 Since the language policy dispute regarding the Pobalscoil Chorca Dhuibhne, a language assistant is now based as the school. According to the www.ancentoir.ie website, there are now language assistants in 10 Gaeltacht secondary schools and 50 primary schools.
within a sociolinguistic setting. This information would allow, for example, for the socio-spatial patterns of language use of the participants, as well as the exposure, if any, of government assisted language schemes in the area. It was therefore determined that the fieldwork would consist of two formats: the recorded speech sample and a questionnaire, which would both provide ample information to assess the CM pattern in the context of the participants’ bilingual community.

5.4 Preparing for Fieldwork

The research visit to the Centre for Bilingualism in Theory was certainly a preparatory trip for the fieldwork and functioned as a precursor for methodological preparation. It allowed for a clearer, more concise understanding of engaging with the field and the most beneficial method for gathering an appropriate speech sample. Tagliamonte (2006: 28) provides some guidelines, in layperson’s terms, for the researcher to keep in mind when designing a sample:

First, think about a compelling sociolinguistic issue. Second, think about the speaker sample that will provide the ideal data to explore it. How will you find these speakers? ... it is necessary to let the research questions guide the fieldwork techniques. In this way, the point from which everything else falls out is this: What is the sociolinguistic issue under investigation? This decision will determine the type of data of relevance, and, later on, it will influence how you will be able to get it.

With Tagliamonte’s instructions as a foundation, the process of constructing a relevant methodology will be presented.

5.4.1 The Field

The field was identified from the outset as the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht, and more specifically Pobalscoil Chorca Dhuibhne as a result of the local language tension that was outlined in chapter four. As a researcher, I was keen to increase my knowledge of the local area and to familiarize myself with the local dialect of Irish. This familiarity would aid with engaging with the participants and later with the transcription process. I reread popular Irish language autobiographies from the early twentieth century: An tOileánach (Ó Crioímhthain 2002), Fiche Bliain ag Fás (Ó Suilleabháin 1998 [1933]), Peig (ed. Ní Mhainnin and Ó Murchú 1998 and also read more recent publications: A Thig Ná Tit Orm (1998 [1987]) and Dúnmharú sa Daingean (Ní Dhuibhne 2000). These literary readings
were beneficial not only for acquiring the local dialect but also for examining CM in written forms as discussed in chapter four.

I was familiar with the area prior to embarking on this project, having visited the area on a number of occasions for work and personal reasons, primarily linked to the cultural attractions: visits to siblings attending summer college, Irish society trips and a camping holiday. A colleague at the University of Limerick from the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht lent advice about the area and was happy to discuss at length any questions or observations about the area. The benefit of this familiarity with the local area and dialect was twofold: it created a sense of familiarity with the setting of the fieldwork, both physically and linguistically, and it reduced potential nerves during the actual data collection. The notion of familiarity stemmed from Eckert’s (2000) extensive work in a high school, where she strove to blend into the setting to reduce the formality of the data collection.

5.4.2 Ethical Approval

It was necessary to address any ethical issues with the University of Limerick’s Research Ethics Committee and seek approval before undertaking the data collection. The committee must be consulted by any research proposal which involves: direct experimentation on individuals; surveys or questionnaires administered to individuals; use of data derived from individual records where individuals might be identified; and experimentation which involves animals (University of Limerick 2013). All documentation relating to the fieldwork i.e. introduction to the project and researcher, consent form and questionnaire was submitted to the Research Ethics Committee to be reviewed. The committee approved all the documentation with one recommendation: that the consent form be altered from opt-in to opt-out of participation.

Having sought the approval, and applied the recommendation of the committee, it was necessary to seek consent from the participants’ parents or guardians for two reasons: the students were being contacted through the pobalscoil administration and because the majority were under the age of 18 at the time. To this end, the bilingual information sheet explaining the aims of the project, what the fieldwork would entail and outlining how the participants’ anonymity would be maintained was used. A bilingual consent form was
used for the parental or guardian approval to partake in the fieldwork, should the student be also willing. The information sheet and consent form can be reviewed in the appendices of this thesis.

5.4.3 Initial Communication

The school principal, Pádraig Feirtéar, was initially contacted by e-mail and telephone, and the researcher then travelled to the school to speak with the principal in November 2008, upon receiving clearance from the University of Limerick Research Ethics Committee. The principal gave approval for the research to go ahead, as well as accommodating and encouraging the research project. Of course, there was always the possibility that the principal would not be willing to allow the research to take place under the auspices of the school. The Gaeltacht areas of Ireland are under constant scrutiny from academics and public bodies, and the residents can tire of this ‘fishbowl effect’ as described by Hindley (1990: 188). However, as stated above, the principal was keen for the research to be carried out. There were a number of pressing reasons that the data to be collected post-haste, reasons from both the research and the school perspective:

- It was pertinent that the language dispute was active, and still a relevant and current sociolinguistic factor.
- The sixth year students were more affected by the language policy and it was pertinent that these be the participants for the study, rather than other students within the school.
- A number of the students were actively involved in the debate and engaged in the High Court proceedings again making it necessary that they be the participants.
- There were school and state exams impending, and staff, students and parents alike were not keen on extended interruptions to class.
- The methodology was researched and prepared for the fieldwork process. Therefore the project ready to continue to the next stage: data collection.

As mentioned previously the students were in the final year at the school, a year during which the emphasis is on studying, exam results and future careers. I was sensitive to the needs of both the participants and teachers, primarily in relation to missing the minimal amount of time from class. It was agreed with the principal that the recordings would be carried out in the school’s library over the course of two days, during the school day in
December 2008. While this location was not ideal with the school bell ringing, the intercom announcements and the proximity of the main lobby, it was most convenient for the participants. The disruption caused by the recording was minimal, to the teachers’ satisfaction and the students were willing to cooperate.

After speaking with the school’s principal, it was decided that a letter would be sent to every student on the final year register for 2008/2009. The letter was in two sections; the first introduced the researcher and briefly outlined the project and; the second was a letter to opt-out of participation according to the recommendation of the university’s Ethics Committee and the school principal. All letters provided contact information, allowing the potential participants and their parents or guardians to contact me with any questions or comments. Each letter also contained the University of Limerick logo to indicate the institutional affiliation. Under the school’s data protection regulations, the letters, envelopes and stamps were supplied to the school administrators and were subsequently forwarded to the students’ home addresses. The number of letters sent out was 72 in total.

5.4.4 Working with Young Adults

There was a 7-9 age difference between myself and the participants, and while this difference is relatively small, it was decided to research this aspect to ensure a successful outcome. Eckert (2000), in her analysis of language variation at numerous high schools in America, promoted the social position of the researcher within the school setting by avoiding any association with the school authorities. It was vital that her participants regarded her as neutral to allow her to gain uninhibited speech samples during the informal interviews and ongoing observation. This was achieved by maintaining an observational approach, a presence on campus and spending time with participants outside the school setting. By the time the interviews were performed, she (2004: 79) writes:

People learned about me from their friends, learned what the interview was about, and learned my attitudes and my reactions. Those I met later already knew that I was sympathetic to adolescent concerns and that I wasn’t shocked by obscenities, sex, drugs, crime, or truancy.

Eckert’s project on linguistic variation as a social variation was on a much greater scale and allowed her months to obtain this status of a neutral adult among the student body.
With Eckert’s approach in mind, I was keen to distinguish a neutral position as a student at the university and dissociate from the school’s teachers and authorities. Therefore the intention for the data collection was to engage in only brief conversations with the students and maintain a casual and friendly demeanour.

5.4.5 Methods for Irish data collection
A review of methodologies employed to collect Irish language speech was conducted, ranging from those seeking speech samples to those requiring data for discourse analysis. Two colleagues at the University of Limerick used the sociolinguistic interview to collect data from participants (McCubbin 2011, Ní Ghearáin 2011) and this method was relevant for the data they sought. Their research projects were concentrating on adult speakers of Irish and required an active discourse with the participants rather than a specific speech sample. The formality of their interview approach did not hinder the overall corpus objective. While the sociolinguistic interview would have been beneficial in conjunction with a speech sample in this project, it was not feasible for the timeline and the level of maturity of the young adult participants. The notion of a focus group will be discussed towards the end of this chapter.

Research based natural-occurring speech, in the education domain of Ireland, has been carried out previously by Hickey (2001, 2004, 2009) and by Mac Fhlannchadha (1999) who recorded children attending Irish-medium pre- and primary schools. Hickey’s participants wore small recording devices that activated at intervals throughout the day and the recordings were coupled with observation. Mac Fhlannachadha (1999: 44-45) recorded school children in three settings: narrative, interrogative and free conversation. He was in the position of having a rapport with the young school children, as he was their class teacher. Neither method was possible for this research project giving the age group of the participants and their level of self-conscious awareness. Ó Duibhir (2009) conducted a large research project that focused on students attending Irish-medium primary school located in and outside the Gaeltacht. The research instruments utilised for his fieldwork were as follows: collaborative task for pupils (recorded with audio and video), stimulated recall exercise for a subgroup of pupils, pupil questionnaire and interviews with principal teacher and class teacher (2009: 83). His methodology was
certainly comprehensive and all encompassing but not appropriate for young adults. The extended contact with the researcher would influence the participants’ language use and responses, whereas Ó Duibhir’s younger participants at 10-12 years old would be less inhibited. O’Malley-Madec (2001, 2005) was in the position to record an informal interview with her participants as well as a formal interview that was broadcasted on Raidió na Gaeltachta. This corpus of both formal and informal speech samples would certainly have added a comparative dimension to this thesis, but unfortunately that approach was not within the project’s capacity primarily due to time restrictions.

The methodology that was arrived upon was to divide the participants into pairs and groups of three and allow them to engage in peer-to-peer discourse. The discourse would be recorded using a portable device and neither the researcher or a member of staff would be present, therefore encouraging the semi-formal speech sample. To assist and encourage discourse, a list of ábhar cainte [discussion topics] was provided, it was left with the participants during the conversation and their attention was drawn to the list at the beginning of each recording session. It is quite useful to provide the participants with a topic or task as a method to have a focal point for discourse to develop. In a similar approach, Ó Duibhir (2009) used a collaborative task to encourage natural-occurring, speech among the participants, as he was also eager to examine CM and CS trends in spoken Irish. The topics were compiled based on local knowledge, the time of year (Christmas) and examples from the list are as follows:

Áiseanna sa Daingean [Facilities in An Daingean]
Postanna páirte-aimseartha – an mbíonn tú ag obair le linn na bliana?
[Part-times jobs - do you work during the year?]  
An mbíonn sibh ag freastal ar an Phoenix? [Do ye go to the Phoenix?]  
Scannán atá féicthe agat le dèanai. [A film you saw recently]  
Leabhar atá lèithe agat le dèanai [A book you read recently]  
An saol sóisialta sa Daingean [The social life in An Daingean]  
An samhradh seo caité – an raibh post agat? An raibh laethanta saoire agat?  
[Last summer - did you have a job? Did you go on holidays?]  
Lá an Dreoilín – an mbíonn suim agat? [Wren’s Day - are you interested in it?]  
Ar fhreastal tú ar ceolchoirm le dèanai? [Did you recently attend a concert?]  

46 The list was provided in Irish only; the translation provided is for the purpose of the thesis only. The full list is provided in Appendix D.
The effectiveness of the *abhar cainte* will be discussed further along in the chapter, with references to the corpus.

5.4.6 The Questionnaire

The aim of the questionnaire was to collect information that would allow for a profile of each participant to be compiled. The linguistic profiles would be then utilised to form a context in which the CM was occurring. As Antonini (2012: 83) writes ‘the main advantages of such data rely on the fact that they provide a direct account of a person’s opinion, attitudes, and belief.’ It was deemed that a questionnaire would be a preferable mode to gather data rather than a direct discourse with the participants, to avoid any effort of their part to provide answers that would put them in a favourable light (Antonini 2012: 83). This information from the questionnaires adds a third dimension to the research: CM in Ireland, in the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht and within the individual participant. The data will also be cross-referenced to the speech sample of the participant, where possible, to enhance the linguistic profile. The questionnaire proved an effective method for gathering data and on the whole worked well with the participants.

The questionnaire was four pages long and written in colloquial Corca Dhuibhne Irish and followed a traditional structure previously used by Ó Riagáin (1992), Stenson (1998) and Deuchar (2002). The questionnaire format was designed for self-completion, with no input from parents or teachers. There was uniformity to the answers, most required a tick in the relevant box and spaces were incorporated into the form to allow for any additional information or comments from the participants. The uniformity in the format was deliberately designed to make its completion easy and straightforward. The questions were short and comments from the participants were optional in an effort to reduce any questionnaire fatigue that is a common side effect of questionnaire completion. This simple format also allowed for a more straightforward collation of the responses upon completion.

My thesis supervisor and a colleague from the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht reviewed a draft of the document, and subsequently alterations were made to enhance the regional dialect and include local references. The use of colloquial Irish was to detract from any sense of formality created by my presence and to promote Irish as the marked choice for
responses, and for any direct communication with myself. I also tended to engage with the students in Irish, unless a participant initiated a conversation in English. Therefore Irish was the marked choice of all interactions throughout the data collection process.

The questionnaire was formatted in three parts: the past, present and future. The first section asked general details: date of birth, where the students were born and grew up, and if a crèche was attended, primary and secondary school and which language was the medium of interaction with teachers. The second section concentrated on their situational language use and their daily or regular interlocutors within specific domains. This section would provide information to the researcher as to the level of Irish as a home language, evidence of intergenerational shift towards English and language networks in the community. There was also a question regarding the media to gauge the frequency of engagement from Go rialta, Ó am go ham to Ní dheinim [Regularly, From time to time, I don’t]. The final section sought attitudes towards language maintenance via raising children with Irish; Irish as the medium of education, and their future plans to use Irish. Myers-Scotton (2005: 69) writes that ‘when speakers live in their home country, they are more likely to maintain their L1, even if they learn another language, than if they are immigrants in another country’. By including their intentions for Irish use after secondary school, this method of language maintenance was to be examined.

The scale of language usage, rather than regularity as mentioned in the previous paragraph, was presented in five categories throughout the questionnaire: Gaoluinn amháin, Gaoluinn don chuid is mó, 50/50, Béarla don chuid is mó, Béarla amháin [Irish only, Mostly Irish, 50/50, Mostly English, English only]. The inclusion of the numerical option, 50/50, rather than the words Gaoluinn agus Béarla ar comhchéim [Irish and English equally] was an effort to diminish the amount of text and ensure the questionnaire did not intimidate the participants. To reduce the amount of questions and allow for an intuitive completion of the questionnaire, it was decided to present tables for the participant to insert their answers. An example of such a table from the questionnaire is as follows:
5.5 Data Collection

Upon arriving at the school to begin the data collection process, I spoke again with the principal to reiterate the process. Any replies to the original information sheet and opt-out consent form were passed to me at this point. It was decided that I would address the final year classes in the presence of two teachers. There was an effort over the course of the data collection to engage directly with the students as little as possible; to divert any preconceptions of the research and what was required. Antonini (2012: 124) also selected a minimal contact level with participants:

> ... direct contact with the respondents was kept at a minimum level. The reason for this approach is more easily understood when we consider the influence of the researcher on the completion of questionnaires.

This barrier was maintained throughout the process with occasional discussions after the recording session or while waiting for a participant to record. No participant enquired as to the nature of the study but this is not particularly unusual as Smith-Christmas (2012: 73) comments:

Table 5.1: The response section from Question 14 of the data collection questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gaoluinn Amháin</th>
<th>Gaoluinn den chuid is mó</th>
<th>50/50</th>
<th>Béarla den chuid is mó</th>
<th>Béarla amháin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do theaghlach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do chairde ag baile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do chairde scoile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do chairde i gclub spóirt/siamsaíochta/eile.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ainm an chlub:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múinteoirí</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa phobal i gcoitinne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final section was an indirect way to ascertain the divide within the participants regarding the language policy dispute at the school. The information collected from the questionnaire and the participant responses are presented and discussed in chapter six.
If asked specifically what I was looking for in the recordings, I would tell them that I was looking at the alternation between Gaelic and English. However, most speakers did not ask about the specifics of my study, and they simply knew that I wanted to record their natural speech for my PhD research.

All the students from the final year that were in attendance on the day were then gathered in one large classroom. There was a brief introduction followed by circulation of the questionnaires. At this point a small number of students declined to complete the questionnaire for reasons they did not wish to disclose. Disappointingly, a number of the students chose to provide little or no information on these questionnaires and were excluded from further participation as a result of their lack of cooperation. This is not a rare occurrence as Antonini (2012: 106) comments on rejecting questionnaires from her attitudinal study: Questionnaires were rejected when less than half of the whole questionnaire had been completed and whenever all information related to the socio-demographic status of the respondents were missing. While initially disheartened by the reluctance of students to participate, it was a relief to learn from the literature review that a 100% participation rate is rare. For confirmation of this, I looked to other participant-based projects and, for example, in Antonini’s (2012: 86) questionnaire survey the response rate was 50% and lower:

In the case of this study, I had a 50% return rate for the two main study areas, SC [Connemara Gaeltacht] and DON [Donegal Gaeltacht], which was ensured by the direct involvement of the directors and the teachers of the schools where the questionnaire was distributed, as well as that of all the other people who helped me distribute and collect the questionnaire. In Belfast the return rate was lower, 30%, since not all the families living in the Shaw’s Road community agreed to complete the questionnaire. Moreover, quite often, only one member of the family accepted to do it.

Ó Riagáin’s (1992) survey participation percentage highlights the external factors as well as the personal preference of the individuals that are often beyond the researcher’s influence when seeking to engage participants in a research project.

In total, there were 220 names in the sample. However, it should be noted that at least 37 persons in the original sample have to be regarded as non-applicable cases. As far as we could establish, some 27 of these were no longer resident in the study area at the time of the survey. They were mostly young people, in their twenties, who were working elsewhere in Ireland or abroad, although their names remained on the electoral register in the area within which their parents resided.
Ten persons in the original sample had died in the interval between the compilation of the electoral register and drawing the sample. Of the remaining 183 cases, 153 were interviewed. If the non-applicable cases are excluded, this is a response rate of just 84%, which may be compared with the 80.5% rate in the CLAR survey. Of the 30 uncompleted interviews, only six respondents refused to be interviewed, eight were either hospitalised or too infirm or ill to be interviewed (in fact, in five these cases interviews were attempted, but not completed) and in the case of the remaining 16 we were unable to interview the respondents despite repeated calls to their homes. There was a disproportionately high number of men in this last group because the survey coincided with a very busy period in the farming year. (1992: 19)

It was anticipated that some students would be reluctant to cooperate with the data collection owing to the pressure of the impending school and state exams that school year. Also, considering parental or guardian consent was required, parents may not have been keen for their children to be absent for any class time. A third possible reason could be that participants were uncomfortable with the research due to a lack of confidence in their Irish language ability.

On the first day of data collection, the answers provided in the questionnaires were assessed and brief profiles of the participants created. The standard demographics are presented in the following section.

5.5.1 Participant Demographics

5.5.1.1 Sex

As previously noted, Pobalscoil Chorca Dhuibhne was founded as a result of the amalgamation of two local schools: Méanscoil na Toirbhíre and Scoil na mBráithre Chriostaií, the former was an all girls school and the latter an all boys. As a result the participants are both male and female, and the genders were represented almost equally with 21 male participants and 20 female participants.

5.5.1.2 Age

At the time of data collection the participants were 16-18 years old, with the youngest participant born 3 September 1992 and the eldest born 2 March 1990. The average age across at the participants is 17 years and 9 months.\(^{47}\)

\(^{47}\) One popular topic of discussion throughout the entire corpus was eighteenth birthday celebrations.
5.5.1.3 Place of Birth

The actual question on the questionnaire was: Cén áit ar rugadh agus tógadh tú? [Where were you born and raised?], and for instances where one place was indicated, this was understood to be an answer for both. The chart indicates whether the participants were born and raised in the Gaeltacht, to highlight patterns of in-migration to the area. As is evident, the responses are balanced between those born in and outside of the Gaeltacht.

![Place of Birth Chart]

Figure 5.1: Place of Birth of the Participants

There was some ambiguity in the responses as 3 stated their place of birth as a hospital, and this also leads to 13 vague responses that could potentially shift place of birth from non-Gaeltacht to Gaeltacht. However, to transfer their categories would be speculative. Some participants also provided additional information, for example when they moved to the area, and this allows for the ambiguity to be clarified.

*I gCorcaidh ach táim ag maireachtáil anseo le 8 bliain.*

[In Cork but I’m living here for 8 years.]

*Rugadh mé i ospidéal Corcaigh ach tógadh mé i Baile an Fheirtearaigh.*

[I was born in Cork hospital but I was raised in Ballyferriter.]

Born in Germany and moved to Ireland when I was 5.

*Rugadh mé san Gearmáin. Tógadh i gcór cúig bliain ansin agus tar éis sin bhis ina chonáin in Éireann timpeall Chorca Dhuibhne.*

[I was born in Germany. Was raised there for five years then and after that I was living in Ireland around Corca Dhuibhne.]

*Rugadh mé i Cill Airne thainig mé go dtí Daingin 6 blain years ago.*

48 All written responses are represented as written, including spelling and grammatical errors.

49
[I was born in Killarney I came to Dingle 6 years ago.]

Rugadh mé in Oispéadáil Ginearálta, Trá Li agus tógadh mé i mBaile ‘n Fheirtéaraigh.
[I was born in the General Hospital, Tralee and I was raised in Ballyferriter.]

Born in Dublin grew up in Keel Castlemain Co. Kerry.

Saolioch mé i Luimneach. Tógadh mé sa Ghaeltacht.
[I was born in Limerick. I was raised in the Gaeltacht.]

Rugadh me i dTrá Li agus conaim anois i Lios póil.
[I was born in Tralee and I now live in Lispole.]

Rugadh = Trá Li agus bhios tógadh i gCeann Trá.
[Born = Tralee and I was raised in Ventry.]

29 per cent of the participants were living in An Daingean at the time of data collection, and this representation is in proportion to its status as the largest town in the Corca Dhuibhne peninsula. Relating this response to the sociolinguistic context discussed in chapter four, 10 wrote the place-name in Irish and 2 used the English name of Dingle.

5.5.2 Grouping the Participants
After close examination of the profiles, it was decided to group the participants according to geographical location for the purposes of recording. This was based on the assumption that the school was relatively small and students would already be familiar with most of the year, especially those from the home area. There was also an effort to group the participants according to the level of Irish use at home: pairing L1 speakers together, L2 speakers together, L3 speakers together and creating groups of varying levels of Irish as a home language. Over the course of the recordings, a number of students commented on the randomness of the groupings but all engaged in conversations, although some participants were obviously close friends. Over the two days of recording, a number of students were absent or wanted to attend a specific class and as a result there were some changes to the initial groupings. The breakdown of groupings and pairings across the 17 recordings is as follows: 7 male/female groups, 5 male and 5 female.

49 The participant used the inverted breve circumflex symbol throughout the questionnaire responses instead of the acute accent.
5.5.3 Recording the data
The recording proper was carried out over two full school days primarily in the school library, with a four of sessions relocated to a small meeting office due to the library being required by a teacher. The time allotted for each recording was 20-30 minutes. I used intuition regarding the length of the recording and, if students were deeply engaged in conversation, allowed the recording to continue. On the other hand if the students were disengaged or looked eager to leave, the recording was shorter. These observations were carried out, as discretely as possible, by listening at the door or looking through the window. The library had numerous doors with glass panels, so observing the participants could be done discretely. While the participants were encouraged to speak about any topic they chose, upon listening to the recordings three observations were made.

1. As Ó Duibhir (2009: 77) comments on his corpus ‘It is ... likely that some or all the teachers would have encouraged the pupils, before the researcher arrived, to use only Irish while they were working in their groups.’ During one recording, a participant, while recounting an interaction with a teacher says: Oh labhróidh mé dea-Ghaoluinn léi [Oh, I’ll speak good Irish with her] and upon first hearing this, it was speculated that the participants were encouraged to speak good Irish for the recording.

2. There were participants that were anxious about their proficiency in Irish and as a result they were anxious about the recorded discourse. In one recording a female participant comments that a fellow student was really worried about the recording because she couldn’t speak Irish and it transpires that the ‘worried’ student did not participate in the project:

Agus ansan bhí Louise ag freaking out.
Oh.
Mar nil aon Gaoluinn aici síúd.
[h]Tá really.
Yeah I know tá.
[?]  
Ni bheidh sí chomh náireach san. Agus bhíos like Louise, beidh sé fine like. [h]
[h] Braitheann sé ar cé a thagann tú isteach like.
[And then Louise was freaking out.
Oh.
Because she has no Irish.
[h] She has really.
Yeah, I know she has.
[?]
It won’t be that embarrassing. And I was like ‘Louise, it will be fine like.’ [h]
[h] It depends on who you come in with.]

3. Occasionally during the recordings, the participants displayed a level of self-awareness in relation to the language use, with a handful mentioned that they should be using *nathanna cainte* [phrases]. These instances of self-awareness normally were succeeded with a proverb or saying in Irish, followed by laughter and then the discourse would proceed as before. There was only one instance of a participant who was clearly struggling with some complex structures in Irish but he did not resort to English.

The list of discussion topics proved an extremely effective method to encourage discourse with every recording availing of the topics. Of the topics, some were more widely discussed but all were drawn upon at some stage over the two days.

The device for recording was a portable Olympus digital recorder, model VN-4100PC, and all the data was stored immediately afterwards on my personal computer. There was also a second recording device used to accommodate for any failings with the Olympus. Prior to the fieldwork at the school, the recording device was tested numerous times and proved satisfactory for the required purposes.

The students were all aware, from information provided in the initial contact letter, that the recording was carried out in absolute confidence and the information gleaned from the audio files would only be shared anonymously for the purposes of research.

5.5.4 Methods adapted to mitigate the formality of recording

‘Observations of the vernacular provide the most systematic basis for linguistic theory, but have been the most difficult kinds of data for linguists to obtain ...’ (Labov 1972b: 97). The type of corpus that was sought was an Irish language speech sample, set in a semi-formal environment, from the participants. As Wolfson (1976) notes, this setting will not produce natural-occurring speech as the setting itself is not normal, not a setting that is familiar to the participants.

It seems reasonable to accept the claim that group interaction will direct attention away from the tape recorder and the observer, but whether the effect of observation is really overridden is a moot question. For the fact is that, try as we may to distract the subject so that he forgets that he is being recorded, we do not
have the right to assume that our subjects are unconscious of observation. That the subject is well aware of the presence of the tape recorder, even in the most casual of interviews, is evidenced by the references made to it. (Wolfson 1976: 199)

Labov’s earlier reference expresses the difficulty in obtaining the relevant data, the vernacular, so therefore it was necessary to reduce formality where possible within the recording setting. Labov (1972b: 112) discusses the five key principles he identifies for fieldwork methodologies and they will be presented below in relation to the data collection for this particular research project.

• The Principle of Style Shifting: all speakers use various styles when speaking and some linguistic features do not shift along with style. O’Malley-Madec (2001, 2007) has researched the use of CM in various style situations and her research shows a dramatic decrease in CM in a formal setting. Therefore the style acquired for this project, a semi-formal sample with Irish as the marked choice, offers a new type of speech sample for CM research.

• The Principle of Attention: Labov writes that the researcher can ‘control some of the factors which cause attention to be paid to speech’ that can reduce the attention the speaker places on their speech. For example, in O’Malley-Madec’s research on CM in formal speech, the setting was a radio interview, which has the potential audience of a nation and would be considered a formal setting. By reducing the attention on the speakers, it is likely that a more casual speech sample will be obtained. In the course of preparation for data collection, a smaller recording device was selected to appear as unobtrusive and unintimidating as possible. I had very little direct interaction with the participants to avoid excessive formality that the students would perhaps feel when engaging with a university-affiliated visitor to the school. In the interest of drawing the attention from CM, the wider focus of the spoken Irish of the participants was highlighted although the CM was mentioned in the initial information sheet. It was necessary to prevent, where possible, the students from monitoring their use of English in their spoken Irish. Throughout the recordings, a number of students comment on what they suppose are required of them: Nár cheart dúinn a bheith ag úsáid nathanna cainte agus rudái anois. No? [Aren’t we supposed to be using sayings and things now. No?] (Recording 1)
• Vernacular Principle: the vernacular, as Labov (1972b: 112) writes, is ‘the most spontaneous, least studied style is the one that we as linguists will find the most useful as we place the speaker in the overall pattern of the speech community’. Here, Labov’s article shows its age as since the 1970s there has been tremendous technological developments that can allow for linguists to access the vernacular for analysis. Despite the obvious recording device that was employed for this methodology, the data contains samples of Irish as a marked choice in this semi-formal setting, with perhaps glimpses of the participants’ vernacular in some instances.

• The Principle of Formality: meeting and recording the participants in a familiar location, recording them with classmates and making every effort to maintain a casual rapport with the participants, reduced the level of formality. There were steps taken to reduce the formality of the sessions: compiling the questionnaire in the local dialect, presenting local and age-appropriate discussion topics and generally engaging with the students in a friendly and casual manner. However the overall setting of data collection itself is an official and formal undertaking, especially with the university affiliation.

• The Observer’s Paradox: ‘To obtain the data most important for linguistic theory, we have to observe how people speak when they are not being observed’ (Labov 1972b: 113). This paradox was overcome by recording the students in groups with members of the school staff and me absent from the room. While the participants were aware of my nearby location, there was a reasonable distance for them to appreciate their conversation could not be overheard.

Measures were taken, as outlined above, to minimise the effect of recording had on the speech and to maximise the potential for collecting a semi-formal, Irish language speech sample within the school setting. I am confident that each of the principles and paradoxes outlined by Labov were addressed during the fieldwork process, and the desired speech sample was therefore collected as a result.

5.6 The Completion of Fieldwork
The fieldwork was carried out and completed over two days in December 2008, on location at the Pobalscoil. The following section will present the outcome of the data
collection, and both aspects of the corpus will be closely examined in chapters six and seven.

5.6.1 The Corpus
The recordings themselves compromise of approximately 7 hours 26 minutes of recorded data, with only a small fraction deducted from the corpus due to my presence in some sections. Generally I left the group promptly at the beginning of each recording, but in recording 9 there is a 3-minute delay while waiting for the second participant to arrive. The individual speech samples range from the shortest at 15 mins 48 to the longest at 35 mins 56, and in the case of the shortest it became apparent that the male participants’ attention had waned while the longest were interrupted to conclude the session. The length of conversations averaged at 26 mins and at my discretion conversations were either allowed to continue or stopped on the basis on the participants’ apparent enthusiasm. If they were no longer engaging in discourse, as in the shortest sample, it was determined that the speech sample would be stagnant and therefore not the acquired natural type of speech that was being sought. Davies (2010: 158-159) deleted to first five minutes of each recorded session based on the idea that the ‘potential stiltedness of speech by participants in response to the recording equipment would only last a few minutes before participants adjusted to the situation. This was a move to ensure more naturalistic output from speakers.’ This approach had been considered for this project, but upon listening to the recording it was deemed unnecessary as the majority of participants adjusted to the setting almost instantly, usually after initial laughter.

The participant groupings worked satisfactorily and there were no conversations with excessive extensive pauses. There were comments throughout the recordings commenting on the groupings, some positive, some neutral and others wondering how the groupings were determined:

\[ Ansin nuair a chonacthas tú féin anseo istigh, oh bhíos like ‘oh go hiontach!’ \]
[Then when I saw yourself in here, oh I was like ‘oh great!’]

One participant even commented on the responsibility he undertook after agreeing to partake in the study, which again seeks to highlight the semi-formal nature of the
discourse. The context of the discourse is that one participants says he wants to leave and have his lunch:

\[\text{Caithfimid fanacht? Caithfimid. Caithfimid ár páirt a dhéanmh do Ollscoil Luimnigh!}\]
\[\text{[We have to wait? We have to. We have to do our part for the University of Limerick!]}\]

There is a noticeable difference between the male and female participants: female participants contribute a much greater amount to the overall data for analysis. In relation to other research projects the amount of data is appropriate for this research: Smith-Christmas (2012) recorded 10 hours to analyse Gaelic-English CS, and Davies (2010) used approximately 88 mins to apply the MLF to Welsh-English data. Therefore the size of the corpus was appropriate to meet the aim of this research project, to examine the CM of the participants as an indicator of language stability in the wider context of the bilingual community.

5.6.2 The Transcription Process
Initially the intention was to use the data programme NVivo but upon speaking with other researchers on the topic of transcription, it was recommended to use a simple Microsoft Word document, and an Excel sheet to latterly categorise the units of analysis. The transcription process was as follows: an initial listen to the full recorded conversation; listening over while doing a brief transcription and finally a close listening including stopping and starting for transcription purposes. Each recording was re-listened to and each transcription extensively revised at regular intervals over the duration of the research project. This repeated reviewing of the transcripts was to ensure a precise portrayal of the audio files as often transcription fatigue can occur where the transcriber mishears or subconsciously predicts the content of the recording.

The audio files were listened to through Windows Media Player and latterly with the programme Audacity. Audacity is an online audio editor and recorder and offers more options for listening to audio files e.g. slowing the recording speed. This programme allowed for the recordings to be revised and provided a higher quality of audio for research purposes.
Maintaining anonymity for the participants and their subject matters was important, especially in the context of working with young adults with a tendency to gossip. The names of participants are privately maintained, and all names mentioned in the data were changed with surnames deleted. The participants were aware of this aspect of the research and an awareness of the anonymity clause was evident in the recordings:

*Dúirt sí like go mbeadh sé blocked amach ainmneacha is rudait anyway.*

*Oh ab ea?*

*Yeah.*

*Oh. Buíochas mór le Dia.*

*Yeah.*

[She said like that the names will be blocked out and things anyway.

*Oh will it?*

*Yeah.*

*Oh. Thank God.*

*Yeah.*]

While the project is focusing primarily on the linguistic construction of mixed utterances, there was little necessity for a detailed transcription process. For example, pauses were not timed and any change in style or intonation was not noted beyond the standard punctuation marks. It was necessary to adhere to transcription standards to ensure uniformity across the transcripts of the 17 recordings. The following transcription conventions were adhered to:

![.]

pause and extended pause

![h]

laughter

![?]

indecipherable speech

[noise]

interference to the audio

: elongated sound

Instances of overlapping speech were transcribed separately when possible.

5.6.3 Preparing the data for analysis

Myers-Scotton’s MLF (2002) is based on a speech utterance that occurs intrasententially and therefore any intersentential switches to English would not need investigation. For the purposes of secondary analysis using CA, all uses of English were examined. While many of the switches and mixes are obvious, some are identifiable only by intonation. In this case it is upon my own intuition to present these based on a familiarity not only with
Irish but also with the local dialect. A more detailed outline of the unit of analysis and the process of dividing the corpus into clauses is carried out in chapter seven in conjunction with the detailed analysis of the corpus.

5.7 Retrospective Comments

Although the speech dataset and the questionnaires provided sufficient information to address the thesis’ research questions, in hindsight there are aspects of the fieldwork that could have been improved upon. The shortcomings can be attributed to inexperience and perhaps a reluctance to alter the fieldwork arrangements that were organized with the school’s principal. Over the course of the research, as the thesis was streamlined and developed, opportunities were noted for development in the fieldwork that would have contributed greatly to the project. These opportunities for development were potentially outwith the timescale and scope of the fieldwork for one researcher.

5.7.1 Shortcomings of the Methodology

The methodology allowed for a substantial corpus to be recorded that was then suitable for the application for the MLF. There were, however, a number of aspects of the fieldwork that proved problematic. These matters will be presented and discussed with examples from the corpus.

There were, at times during the recording, audio issues with participants moving away from the recording device and rendering their contribution to the discourse indecipherable. One participant in particular sat at a distance to the device, and while this in itself was not a particular problem, it coincided with background noise from outside the library that affected the recording. The recording was listened to with Windows Media and again with the audio programme Audacity with efforts to diminish the background noise. Despite these efforts, it was not possible to determine the participant’s speech utterances at certain times throughout the discourse.

There were also instances, primarily with the male participants, of walking around the recording location, the library and a meeting room, to look out the window or look at pictures. I was reluctant to supervise the students’ behaviour by looking through the window intermittently during the recording, and therefore contributing to the Observer’s
Paradox, and as a result this went largely unnoticed. When it was observed that the attention of the participants had waned, the recording was abruptly ended. Considering these two issues, it would have been beneficial to arrange the seating for each recording and to request the participants to remain seated for the duration of the conversation.

Although the recording device was tested in a conversational setting and the sound quality double-checked, the project would have benefited from a pilot study. If a pilot study containing groups of 2 and 3 participants had been carried out, it is likely that the groupings of 3 participants would not have been included in the final methodology. A shortcoming of the project is that it cannot associate the language spoken with a particular participant in every instance of the 41 participants. In the recordings, it is not always possible to identify the speaker unless over the course of the conversation, the interlocutors address each other using the vocative. In instances where there is a male and female participant it is easy to identify the participants and relate their questionnaire responses to the speech sample. This could not be carried out across the entire corpus, leaving the results at times nonspecific.

As was mentioned earlier in this chapter, there appeared to be some misinterpretation surrounding a number of the questions on the participant questionnaire. For example, question 3 was presented as follows: *Cén áit ar rugadh agus tógadh tú?* [Where were you born and raised?]. A number of the responses indicated the hospital where the participant was born indicating a literal interpretation of the initial part of the question. This would indicate that it would have been beneficial to read through the questionnaire with the participants and outline the information that was required for each question.

The transcriptions could have benefited from a second listener to review the transcriptions. For example, Davies (2010: 167) explains in detail the transcription process for his data that returned a high reliability rate:

>The transcription was completed, as with the data collection, by the doctoral students and research assistants. Each individual recording was first transcribed by one researcher, who also completed all the glossing and translation ... On a subset of the completed transcripts (22%) an independent transcription was undertaken, in order to check inter-transcriber reliability. This was done as follows. After the initial transcriber completed a transcription, a randomly-
selected 1 minute section of the recording was chosen by a second transcriber (who had not previously read the original transcript), and then transcribed as part of a reliability checking system. The relevant transcribed portions of the recording were then compared by the two transcribers to establish that both transcribers agreed on the interpretation of the speech and also on transcription conventions. Any significant anomalies were attended to by the original transcriber in the original transcript. The two transcript portions were then sent through the Turnitin plagiarism software program to provide a statistic on how similar they were: this was called the reliability score.

Unfortunately, a second transcriber was not within the project’s capacity to obtain. To compensate for not having an ‘independent transcription’ carried out on random samples from the corpus, the recordings and transcriptions were frequently reviewed and revised. The instances of indecipherable speech are primarily due to noise, overlapping speech or inaudible speech caused by whispering for example.

5.7.2 Untapped Potential of the Fieldwork
At the time of gathering fieldwork, it was my first active engagement in data collection and in hindsight there are aspects of the fieldwork that could have been conducted in a different manner. However, these retrospective comments would be an ideal fieldwork scenario that would not be possible, especially owing to time pressure, and lack of experience and confidence at the time.

Over the course of the project, and working with both the recordings and the questionnaires, there were numerous areas identified that would have greatly contributed to the impact of this research project. Considering the strong link between language attitude and language maintenance in the research, the project would have benefitted from a more closely guarded questionnaire. It may have been useful to read over the answers with each participant and elaborate on the responses. As the questionnaires stand, many were not filled in completely and some provided only minimal information. This could have been overcome by perhaps an informal group sociolinguistic interview following the recording session.

Inclusion of the participants’ perceived ability in the Irish language, both written and oral, would have been beneficial to link the practice of CM with language ability. This question, of course on a much larger scale, can relate to the question of language
proficiency in the national census as well as smaller scale studies. For example, the foundation of the Gaeltacht was based on members of the *Garda Síochána* [Police] enquiring about language abilities while many were not strong Irish language speakers themselves. And the question of self-professed language ability is a constant issue when assessing language speakers. Hickey writes (2011: 10):

> Because the truthfulness of claims concerning language competence made by individuals was not checked, over-reporting became the norm after Irish independence (post-1922) and was continued through the twentieth century and into the twenty-first.

This phenomenon of self-reporting was also examined by Ó Riagáin (1992) and he closely examined language ability and language perception. For example, participants recorded their ability as native but chose to conduct the interview in English. Reasons presented for this reluctance to engage in Irish despite a native standard included a reluctance to speak Irish with a stranger. Over the course of the recorded conversations, for example, a handful of participants discuss the level of Irish (Honours, Pass, Ordinary) they are taking for the Leaving Certificate and on more than one occasion the language proficiency does not reflect the class level in question.

During the fieldwork process, there was a reluctance to engage in discussion with either staff or students on the subject of the school’s language policy controversy, believing it to be too topical and sensitive issue. The project was carried out on the goodwill of the principal, parents or guardians and students themselves and it was important to maintain a good rapport with all involved. If the opportunity had presented itself, it would have been insightful to run a focus group on the issue with the students and staff. The topic could have also been explored by engaging in discourse with the local community outside the education setting.

---

50 Ó Riagáin (1992: 47) writes:

Since 1851, most censuses have included a question on the ability to speak Irish ... The census question itself was of the form ‘Can X speak Irish only, or Irish and English, otherwise leave blank’? (Data on those claiming to speak ‘Irish only’ have always been collected, but since 1926 they have not been published separately because the totals are too small to justify publication as a separate category. The figures for monolinguals have instead been combined with bilinguals to yield an overall estimate of the number of ‘Irish speakers’ in the community.)
The participants’ CM in other language settings could have been accessed through observing the students in classroom interactions with teacher or engaging in sociolinguistic interviews. While extended observation of the students would allow for the use of CM in various styles would greatly enhance the research, it was beyond the scope of this project. Also, a structured sociolinguistic interview with each participant would have been complementary to the recording method used and provided a contrasting formal speech sample. However, these are retrospective comments and whether they could have been carried out is unsure.

5.8 Conclusion
The quality of the data from the fieldwork is good and, given the circumstances the fieldwork, was carried out successfully. In response to Tagliamonte’s (2006: 34) recommendation that the finest sociolinguistic data comes from fieldworkers who are aware of their participants’ local interests, values and social norms, the research project was framed in the context of consultation with a colleague from the area, study of the local issues and awareness of the local dialect. Because there has been no research into CM by young Irish adults living in the Gaeltacht specifically, this methodological approach could prove useful in the future for those seeking a similar corpus. As the focus of the thesis became more distinct and more closely aligned with current research into Irish/English CM - as well as in the contexts of language shift and the situation of the Gaeltacht community - the potential for further use of the corpus became apparent. These insights will inform the approach for subsequent research.
Chapter Six: The Participant Profiles

It is thus salient to ask what mechanisms can be created to help parents who have the linguistic competence to pass Irish effectively on to their children, but who live in a context where simply speaking Irish as a parent and living in a community where Irish is one of the community languages will not suffice to produce children competent in Irish. If this is the scenario facing parents of the highest linguistic ability, strategies and support for mixed language families and for the large numbers who may be less competent in Irish are also the concern of language promotion policies. (Ó hIfearnáin 2013: 350)

6.1 Introduction

As outlined in the methodology of the present study, the data analysed in this chapter was collected in two formats: the questionnaire and the recorded speech sample. This chapter will focus on the questionnaire and where appropriate provide supplementary references to the participants’ recorded data and language competency. The complex sociospatial language patterns of the young adults will be presented and questions of attitude and identity as evident in the responses will be discussed. The aim is to derive language practices from the questionnaire, and to discuss the question of peak bilingualism and how it can be applied to the participants.

Bilingualism in itself is a term that is open for interpretation, and in chapter two some of the bilingual varieties outlined by Li Wei (2000: 4-5) were presented. Furthermore language competence is difficult to measure. While there are methods of assessment in the form of state exams, proficiency tests, qualifications in Irish there are numerous factors that must be taken into consideration. For example, although Irish is a compulsory subject for students in the Irish education system51 this does not necessarily require all students to become proficient in the language. In chapter one, it was noted that the language commissioner commented that students were often unable to engage in Irish

51 Students exempt from learning the language fall under the following categories as listed by the Department of Education (Department of Education and Skills 2012 [2005]):
• Children aged 11 years or over coming to Ireland whose education up to 11 years was received in Northern Ireland or outside Ireland
• Children aged 11 years or over and are returning to Ireland after an absence abroad of 36 months or more
• Children from abroad who have no understanding of the English language when enrolled in a school
• Children of diplomatic or consular representatives
• Children with some learning disabilities
• Children with serious sensory disability.
language conversation after 14 years in the education system. As Hickey (2011: 11) writes, ‘the level of proficiency attained with a compulsory subject in school can and does vary greatly.’ And while one would expect for students attending an Irish-medium school located in the Gaeltacht to obtain a high standard of Irish by the final year of education, the standards of proficiency do vary greatly: from native proficiency to weak language learner. This in itself was the key argument against the Pobalscoil’s language policy, that the education of those with a weaker ability in Irish was compromised. However, using Irish as a home language does also not necessarily translate into having high language proficiency.

Therefore the language profiles of the participants can indicate the age of language acquisition, sociospatial linguistic patterns, language attitudes and language intentions. The status of Irish within the Irish education system is stable but the use of Irish within the home and community has been identified as problematic (Ó Giollagáin et al 2007, Government of Ireland 2010). This question of Irish as a home and community language is a focal point of the 20-Year Strategy for the Irish Language:

While strengthening the position of the language within our education system is a key focus of this Strategy, the transmission of Irish as a living language within the family and between the generations is critically important. Our overall approach is to create a supportive framework and the opportunities in which Irish can be passed on in a natural way within households and communities. This is of special importance in the context of the Gaeltacht. (Government of Ireland 2010: 3)

The linguistic profiles of the participants will provide an opportunity to discover ‘who speaks what language to whom and when’ (Fishman 1965). This chapter is presented in two sections: the first will outline the bare data as retrieved from the questionnaires, and the second will focus on specific questions and re-examine the responses closely to identify patterns and tendencies.

6.1.1 The Questionnaire: Notes

The questionnaire consists of 23 questions presented under 3 subtitles: Cúlra [Background], Fé Láthair/ Inniu [Current/ Today] and Amach anseo [Future]. Not every
participant answered every question, for example any question requiring written comments returned low response rates and therefore there is not a consistent 41 responses for each of the 23 questions. This chapter uses charts to illustrate the responses and, when appropriate, presents the comments of the participants to develop the profiles. The questionnaire was compiled in Irish, more specifically in Corca Dhuibhne Irish, which set the marked language choice for completion. As will be outlined throughout this chapter, the responses did not reflect Irish as the marked choice with 22 per cent of the questionnaires either partially or completely using English in the responses.

6.2 Participant Demographics

The following section will present the data from the questionnaires under the numerous demographics obtained from the participants’ responses. Completion of the questionnaire gauged suitability for the second stage of fieldwork: the recorded speech sample. At this stage a number of students were excluded from further participation on the basis of either a lack of identifying information on the questionnaire (name) or puerile responses that indicated a lack of co-operation. There were also five participants who were absent from school over the two days of recording and were therefore, unfortunately, not included in the second stage of fieldwork. The total number of participants who completed both stages of the fieldwork is 41, representing 56 per cent of the year.

The basic participant demographics of place of sex, age and place of birth were presented in chapter five.

---

52 It should be noted that for 3 participants German was a prominent language within the family: for two participants German was the language of communication for all relatives outwith the home and with bilingual German/English home language. The third participant discusses her background with German in the recorded conversation:

Nuair a bhíos òg bhí mé ábalta Gearmáin a labhairt mar bhí sé mo chéad teanga, ach ah ni féidir liom é a labhairt anois.
[When I was young I was able to speak German because it was my first language, but ah I am not able to speak it now.]

German has not been included in the following charts as the focus is specifically on the relationship between the participant and the two languages Irish and English.
6.2.1 Language Acquisition

The questionnaire asks participants to respond as to what age they acquired Irish and English. There were two comments added to this question by two participants: one indicating that Irish was learned only *mar ábhar scoile* [as a school subject] and a second indicating that Irish was never acquired. One participant did not answer about acquiring Irish and upon examining the speech sample it was apparent that this participant is a very weak speaker of Irish, and the lack of answer was perhaps reflecting this rather than an oversight. The age of 3 was selected based on this age bracket for census returns. The crèche response is not relevant to all the participants as enrolment is a decision for parents, and not an obligatory part of the Irish education system. The chart below indicates the responses for both languages.

![Chart showing stages of language acquisition for both Irish and English.](image)

**Figure 6.1: Stages of Participant Language Acquisition**

The five participants who responded that the crèche or primary school was when they acquired English are not necessarily those who have Irish or German as a home language. For example, one participant responded that he acquired English at the crèche and Irish at primary school but his home language is later indicated as English. A second participant responds that he acquired both English and Irish at the crèche but the home language is later indicated as predominantly Irish. Therefore there was some varied interpretation of the question among the participants and the results offer an insight rather than an accurate representation.
6.2.2 Education

The topic of the medium of education is closely related to this research thesis, especially considering the reliance on the education system in maintaining the Irish language across the Gaeltacht areas and Ireland (Walsh 2011: 65). The questionnaire therefore included questions regarding about the language medium of preschool, primary and post-primary education of the participants in order to interpret the role of education in the language network of the participants.

The preschool question was included to ascertain if any of the participants attended a crèche that had a *cuntaoir teanga* [language assistant.] There is a scheme in place, *Scéim na gCuntaoirí Teanga* [The Language Assistants’ Scheme] that aims to help children with lower abilities in Irish attending preschools in Gaeltacht regions. This scheme started in 1992 as part of the *Clár Tacaíochta Teaghlach* [Family Support Programme], making the participants the appropriate age to benefit from this scheme, which was organised locally by *Oidhreacht Chorca Dhuibhne* [Corca Dhuibhne Heritage].

The number of respondents who attended preschool was 29 in total, with four indicating a preschool located outside the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht: Dublin, Killarney and Germany. The respondents were encouraged to include information about the preschool
however no response indicates that a cúntóir teanga was at the preschool but one response indicates a location where it was likely there was one.

_Bhí an naíonra eagraithe ag Comhar Chuman Chorca Dhuibhne agus bhí sé lonnaite ar an mBuailt._

[The crèche was operated by the Corca Dhuibhne Co-operative and was located in Ballyferriter East.]

The language of this preschool was returned as Irish only. It is likely that the participants were not in a position to indicate whether or not a cúntóir teanga was at their preschool given their very young age at the time.

The chart indicates that answers relating to the language mostly used by the teachers in the secondary school vary greatly, ranging from Mostly Irish (19) to English only (3). It is curious that students attending the same school register such a contrast in the language of the teachers. However, a closer examination into those who responded English only reveals that two participants display a frivolous attitude towards the fieldwork, particularly in the recording. The third participant also presents a flippant nature towards the questions, as it was the same participant that responded he had never acquired Irish for question four of the questionnaire. If these three responses are therefore disregarded, the responses range from Mostly Irish and 50-50. These two levels of bilingual interaction with the teachers may be the result of the teachers responding to the student’s language ability or may indicate that different teachers engage through Irish at various levels.

The responses to the question do put the language policy of the school into perspective, as it was presented in the media that the school had a strict Irish language policy despite no students indicating that the teachers use Irish only. As the Pobalscoil is an amalgamation of two previous Gaeltacht schools, it would also question the previous language policies considering the Pobalscoil caused an ideological debate. The matter of language interaction with teachers will be discussed further in section 6.3.2.
The questionnaire provided the opportunity to comment on the school, and below are some responses from the participants:

Meán scoil na Toribhirte - Gaeilge 50/50 agus Pobal Scoil Chorca Dhuibhne (bl. 5&6)-Gaeilge don chuid is mó.
[Meanscoil na Toirbhirte - Irish 50/50 and Pobalscoil Chorca Dhuibhne (yr 5&6) - Mostly Irish.]

Tá m’ábhar go léir as gaoluinn. [All my subjects are through Irish.]

Chuaigh m’ê go dtî colaiste Íde agus thaing go dtî Pobscoil Chorca Dhuibhne sa 5u blainin.
[I went to Coláiste Íde and came to Pobalscoil Chorca Dhuibhne in 5th year.]

Meanscoil na Toirbhirthe comh maith raibh a chuaigh scoil na cailini agus buachailli le chéile.
[Meanscoil na Toirhprise as well before the girls’ and boy’s schools came together.]

The comments vary from identifying the previous school to commenting on the language of interaction with the teachers.

6.2.3 Irish as a Home Language
The following chart provides an overview of the responses regarding language interaction with parents ranging from Irish only to English only. As is evident, the majority of responses indicate English only as the dominant language medium: 21 responses for mother-interaction and 16 responses for father-interaction, although this does not strictly equate to English only interaction with both parents. The chart shows that Irish as the medium of interaction with parents, in varying degrees from Irish only to 50-50, applies to 26 of the responses.
As the traditional nuclear family is not necessarily the standard living arrangement, the language interaction with grandparents and other relations was included in the questionnaire. The responses to this question would also indicate any sign of intergenerational shift or unusual familial language patterns. Again, the majority of responses indicate English only (56 replies in total), with Mostly English (27 replies) as the second highest response. One could interpret the English only responses to signify that the participant has no generational Irish language association, for example in the case of the participants who moved to the area from Germany.
The language of interaction with siblings and other relations was also included in the questionnaire and the responses again present English only as the highest return. 50-50 returned 17 responses, which was the highest 50-50 response for all the home language response.

One participant indicates that she speaks Irish only with paternal aunts and uncles, and English only with maternal aunts and uncles. Another participant with a Mostly English home language, comments that she speaks some Irish with an uncle who completed an Irish language course at University College Cork. This one response is pertinent given the majority of Irish users nationally are within the education system, even spanning across secondary and tertiary education. This response indicates a use of Irish learned within the education system but used inter-generationally by those at different stages of education.

A number of participants included additional information regarding language and family:

*Bhí ag conaí le mo sean thuismitheoirí nuair bhíos óg ach anois taim conaí le mo mathair.*

[I lived with my grandparents when I was young but now I live with my mother.]

*Bhí Bearla + Gearmánach (German an chuid is mó).*

[There was English + German (Mostly German).]
Tá i mo aonair le mo thuismitheoirí, tá gach duine eile fásta suas.
[I am alone with my parents, everyone else is grown up.]

Tá ceathrar sa clann. [There are four people in the family.]

Mo chlann amháin atá sa tigh. Tógamid scoláíri Gaeilge sa tsamhradh.
[It is just my family in the house. We host Irish students in the summer.]

I’m living with my mom and brother my father lives & works in Dublin.

Is as Luimneach agus Cill Dara mo thuismitheoirí. Níl alán Gaeilge acu.
[My parents are from Limerick and Kildare. They do not have much Irish.]

Overall, the responses to the home language presents English only as the dominant pattern. These participants, as a representation of the Gaeltacht community, confirm the status of Irish as a diminishing home language. The diminishing status of Irish, in conjunction with the disruption caused to the language stability by the school controversy, illustrate a turning point within the area. There will be a closer examination of the use of Irish in the family domain in section 6.3.1 of this chapter.

6.2.4 Language Use Within the Community

Question 14 of the questionnaire was designed to gauge the level of Irish language use within the community. Or, to use an appropriate quote from Fishman (1965), to determine ‘who speaks what language to whom and when.’ Irish as a community language is particularly relevant to the town of An Daingean, as it was included in the Fior-Ghaeltacht category on the basis of community language and not home language. This is also an area that the Government of Ireland has recognised as a domain to be developed and the 20-year plan emphasises the intent to address this issue and promote Irish as a living community language.

The Government believes that the Irish language is of particular importance for the people, society and culture of Ireland. As a spoken community language, Irish is unique to this country and is, therefore, of crucial importance to the identity of the Irish people and to world heritage. In this context, particular importance is attached to the preservation and promotion of Irish in the Gaeltacht in relation to conserving and protecting the heritage, culture and richness of the language where it remains as a household and community language. It is also recognised that the Strategy’s objective of widening the use of the language nationwide is conferred
with greater authority by the Irish language’s status as a community language in the Gaeltacht. (Government of Ireland 2010: 5)

The interaction with teachers returns the highest response for Mostly Irish by the participants. Again, this emphasises the education system as the biggest contributor towards Irish language use, both within and outside the Gaeltacht. Home use and language within the community are the two strongest domains for Irish only interaction within the dataset. The results also relate a low use of Irish among peers with no responses for Irish only or Mostly Irish for engaging with friends at school.

![Figure 6.6: Participant language use within the Gaeltacht community](image)

There was an opportunity for participants to elaborate on their language use within the community and some of the comments are as follows:

I speak Irish if they don’t say otherwise to me.

No I prefer English.

*mo chomharsan, tiománaí taxi, daoine na háite uaireanta.*
[my neighbours, taxi driver, local people sometimes.]

*Daoine a bhionn ag obair liom.* [People that work with me.]

*Rugbaí Chóirce Dhuibhne* [Corca Dhuibhne Rugby]
There are also responses from Irish-speakers that indicate a language network that concentrates on their family and friends from their home area. This would indicate a divide within the Gaeltacht, and an unmarked-choice to use Mostly Irish within the local community where they live and the marked choice to English with school friends and in the larger community. This localised use of Irish to the hometown again emphasises the marked and unmarked language use within the whole region. Ní Laoire (2012), as presented in chapter three, highlights that the unmarked choice for Gaeltacht Irish speakers shifts from Irish to English upon leaving the Gaeltacht, and for these participants the unmarked choice shifts from Irish to English when entering An Daingean. An Daingean, included as a *baile seirbhise* [service town], no longer serves these participants through Irish outside the education system. It is worth noting that this data was gathered prior to the 20-Year Strategy for the Irish Language and therefore this localised community language use of Irish may have since expanded across the whole Corca Dhuibhne region, as the strategy intended. A closer examination of language use in the community is presented in section 6.3.2 in a discussion on peak language usage and contact.

6.2.5 Engagement with Irish Language Media

Radio, television, the cinema, recordings, newspapers, books, and magazines are powerful media in the maintenance of bilingualism. Access to these media may be the main factor in maintaining one of the languages of a bilingual, especially if his other language is the only one spoken in the area. Regular attendance at foreign film programmes and the daily reading of foreign books and magazines may be the only factors in maintaining a person’s comprehension of a foreign language which he once knew. Reading is often the only contact that a person may have with his second language. It is also the most available. (Mackey 2000: 29)
The engagement with Irish language media is low, with many participants indicating no engagement at all. In the recordings, a number of conversations throw light on some issues that prove to be limiting factors with regards certain media types. One participant comments he cannot understand *Raidió na Gaeltachta* because ‘tá an canúint róthapaidh’ [the accent is too fast/ the speaking is too fast]. Another discussion comments on the unavailability of internet access in the participant’s house, which would obviously restrict access to the sites beo.ie and nosmag.com. As the programme *Aifric* was listed on the suggested topics for conversation, it is mentioned in eight of the 17 conversations. One comments that it is for younger viewers while another is surprised that her interlocutor does not watch it. One participant also discusses auditioning for the show, being shortlisted and attending workshops in Carrowroe, in the Galway Gaeltacht. Overall the low engagement levels were somewhat surprising, especially considering that the Irish language mock oral examinations were scheduled for soon after the fieldwork, as well as the actual Leaving Certificate Exam which contains written, aural and oral examinations.

In the questionnaire there was an option to comment on which other activities they were involved in encouraged the use of Irish. Some of the comments are as follows:

*Díospóireachtaí* [Debates]

*Díospóireachtaí, Amharclann na nÓige* [Debates, Youth Theatre]

![Graph showing participant engagement with Irish language media](image)
The debating would also fall within the education system as there is a popular national debating competition organised by Gael Linn for secondary schools across the country. Gael Linn is an organisation founded in 1953 to foster and promote the Irish language in secondary level education.

6.2.6 Future Use for Irish

It seems obvious that the motivation for acquiring the first language is more compelling than the motivation for learning a second. For once the vital purposes of communication have been achieved, the reasons for repeating the effort in another language are less urgent. In the case of simultaneous childhood bilingualism, however, the need for learning both languages may be made equally compelling. This may not be so for the person who becomes bilingual as an adult. Yet, a need or desire of the adult to master a second language may be strong enough to enable him to devote the necessary time and energy to the process of becoming bilingual. (Mackey 2000: 34)

The final page of the questionnaire was compiled to gauge the participants’ intention for using Irish in the future and their attitudes towards raising children with Irish and education for Gaeltacht students. As Mackey’s reference presents, a speaker should be compelled enough to maintain a language, particularly when the domain of education is no longer available.

The first question asked about the capacity in which they will use Irish after the Leaving Certificate exam, there were four answers that the participants could choose from: with family, with friends, work with Irish or no plan to use Irish. There is a high response rate for ‘No plan to use Irish after the Leaving Certificate exam’ with 39 per cent selecting this answer.
However looking ahead to the following questions regarding raising children through Irish points to some inconsistencies: one participant with no plan to use Irish after school, indicated that he would like to raise children mostly through Irish 'to preserve the language'. And six responses indicating 'no plan to use Irish' also selected the 50-50 response for raising children bilingually with Irish and English. These inconsistencies could be attributed to a hasty completion of the questionnaire, questionnaire fatigue (although it was short with primarily multiple choice options) or perhaps misinterpretation of the questions.

The next four questions were on the issue of raising children through Irish and on the preferred language medium for the education of their children. The responses allowed me to gauge attitudes and language loyalty within the group towards to the language. These questions in particular are indicative of intention, an intention that may or may not come to fruition. As is evident in the table, there is a strong intention for bilingually raising children and their bilingual education. Most of the participants wrote comments to support their responses and those responses are listed following chart. Although listing all the responses may seem superfluous, it is worthwhile appreciating the wide range of responses of the group ranging from language maintenance to practical reasons. I have categorised the responses according to the overt motivation/sentiment of the participant.
Responsibility towards the Irish language:

_Mar togadh mé le Gaeilge agus is teanga eagsuil é._
[Because I was raised with Irish and it is a unique language.]

_Mar caithfear an teanga a coimead beo_
[Because the language needs to be kept alive]

_ mar is muintir na Gaeltachta muid_ [because we are the people of the Gaeltacht]

_Tá ár teanga naisiúnta tabhachtach a spreagadh agus tá sé deacair a bheith go maith ag caint tri Gaeilinn nuair nach raibh sé agat i ndairire roimh an bunscoil._
[It is important to encourage our national language and it is difficult to be good at speaking Irish when it hasn’t been seriously acquired before primary school.]

_Teastaionn uaim an teanga a choimeád beo_ [I want to keep the language alive]

_Tá sé tabhachtach an teanga a choimeád beo._
[It is important to keep the language alive.]

_Ionas go mbeadh sé cabhrach dóibh ar scoil + an gaeilge a choimeád_
[So that it would be helpful for them at school and to preserve Irish]

_Mar ar an ait atá mé ag fasa suas agus imirt leis an Geatlach_
[Because of the area where I grew up and I play for the Gaeltacht]
Mar go ba maith liom go mbeadh Gaeleann acu
[because I would like for them to have Irish]

Cun e a comáid beo [To keep it alive]

Mar tá an teanga gaeilge á mharú amach agus toisc gur togadh mé féin leis an teanga
[Because the Irish language is dying out and because I was raised with the language]

Bilingual Advantage:

Because I never had the chance of Irish at home and growing up in a Gaeltacht area it would be easier for them.

Beidh sé níos éasca. [Because it is easier.]

Ba mhaith liom a bheith go maith ag an dhá teanga
[I would like to be good at with both languages.]

Tá an Gaelainn úsáideach ar scoil. [Irish is useful at school.]

Tá go maith chun Gaeilge agus Béarla a bheith ag duine.
[It is good for a person to have Irish and English.]

Ionas go mbeadh sé cabhrach dóibh ar scoil +an gaeilge a choimeád
[So that it would be helpful for them at school and to preserve Irish]

Dheanfaidh sé go maith dóibh é a fhoghlaím roimh dul ar scoil.
[It would be good for them to learn it before attending school.]

Ba mhaith liom iad a togáil le Germánach freisin.
[I would like to raise them with German also.]

Mar cheapaim go bhfuil an Gaeilge mar buntáiste móir sa lá atá inniú ann
[Because I think that Irish is a great advantage today]

Is dóigh liom go bhfuil sé tabhtacht [I think it’s important]

Chun go mbeidh siad abáite e a labhairt go maith
[So they would be able to speak it well]

Language Appreciation:

Cím an gaoluinn iontach atá ag ma chairde a thógadh le gaoluinn.
[I see the great Irish that my friends who were raised with Irish have.]
Mar is maith liom an gaeilge agus beidh sé deas iad a thabhairt suas le gaeilge  
[Because I like Irish and it would be nice to raise them with Irish]

Is maith liom é [I like it]

Mar tá se go maith [Because it is good]

Ambivalence:

n’fheadar [Don’t know]

Dont know

Dont know

Preference for English or another language:

No, Because they are not going to this school

Tá an Beárla níos fear a bheith ag mo paistí mar beidh sé ina usáid níos mó agus tuigeann daoine eile é ar fud an domhain  
[English would be better for my children to have because it is used more and people all over the world understand it]

mar nil se ana thactacht e a comaid i a chlann  
[because it is not very important to keep it in the family]

Mar tá Bearla usaid níos mó [because English would be more useful]

Nios oiriúnaí don todhcaí [more relevant for the future]

German

The second set of comments is in response to the language medium of education for the children in the future. As mentioned in chapter five, the debate over the language was deemed to be too sensitive to be overtly questioned and therefore this question was an indirect method to gain insight into their opinions regarding language and education. The comment rate was 61 per cent and again the comments reflect the various viewpoints and opinions of the participants on this topical issue. I have similarly categorised the responses according to the overt motivation/sentiment of the participant.
Responsibility to the Irish language:

Mar creidim gurb é an taon sli gur fheidir é a choiméad beo. (Total submersion)
[Because I believe it is the only way to keep it alive (Total submersion)]

Tá sé tabhachtach an teanga a choiméad beo.
[It is important to keep the language alive.]

Mar beidh sé mar teanga dúchasach acu. [Because it would be their native language.]

Mar go bhfuairas fein an oideachas ceanna tríd gaeilge
[Because I received the same education through Irish] (Irish Only)

Bilingual Advantage:

Caighdeán ard oideachas tíd Gaeilg, deiseanna maith do daoine le Gaeilge.
[A high standard of education through Irish, good opportunities for people with Irish.]

Fuair mise gaoluinn den chuid is mó agus tá sé cabhrach i ábhar áirithe.
[I got Irish mostly and it is helpful in certain subjects.]

Because they can have an understanding of both Irish & English.

Mar faigheann tú breis pointí chun a bheith ag usaid an gaeilge.
[Because you get extra points as a result of using Irish.]

Caithfidh Gaelann a bheith agat chun post a fháil i TG4 nó faoinse etc.
[You need Irish to get a job in TG4 or Foinse etc.]

Chun an teanga a bheith acu [To have the language]

Tá sé deacar an córás a athrú nuair atá anachtrannaigh agus nuair nach labhrann do thuismitheoirí gaelainn chun cabhair a thabhairt duit ach tá sé iontach é a bheith agat.
[It is difficult to change the system when there are a lot of foreigners and when your parents don’t speak Irish to help you but it is great to have it.]

Chin a bheidh dar ablata Geailge a leart freisin
[So they will be able to speak Irish as well]

Go mbeadh dhá sli acu chun é a dheanamh [So they would have two ways to do it]

Tá pointí breise a dul leo na hábhar a dheanann tu trí gaeilge
[There are extra points for those who do subjects through Irish]
Ba cheart deis a thabairt dos na hénne
[Everyone should be given the opportunity] (50/50)

Ambivalence:

Dont know

Don’t know

Preference for English or another language:

ni thaitionn an gaeilge liom [I don’t like Irish]

Gearmánach [German]

Tá sé níos oiriúiní don todhcaí [More relevant for the future]

Irish as a Linguistic Obstacle:

I have terrible Irish

Mar thagann daoine ó tír ete do dtí air tír
[Because people from other countries come to our country]

Tá sé decair e a dheanamh trí Gaeilge [It is difficult to do it through Irish]

Beidh sé níos éasca [Because it is easier] (Mostly English)

The comments present a range of attitudes and supporting factors amongst the participants towards Irish ranging from simply not liking the language to a responsibility to keep the language alive. These questions in particular allows for a better understanding of the language debate over the school’s policy. In chapter five the ideological debate was summarised but an obvious void in the discussion is the opinions and voices of the actual ideological brokers: the students. While not all the students of the Pobalscoil were directly involved in the High Court Proceedings, the debate directly or indirectly affected the students and the environment.

There is a particular response however that is particularly progressive and inclusive, namely Ba cheart deis a thabairt dos na hénne [Everyone should be given the opportunity]. This sentiment lies at the root of the ideological debate: that those with
weaker language skills require assistance in order to flourish in Irish-medium education. The actual outcome of the High Court proceedings focuses on this exact issue and the provisions that are now in place reflect a more inclusive approach to education in Corca Dhuibhne. The *Pobalscoil’s 2011-2013 Irish Language Plan* (2011: 5-6) outlines a language support system for students that includes the following services: Special Irish Language Course for Primary School entrants, Irish Language Scholarship Scheme, The *Droichead* Programme (for junior cycle students), School Language Assistants and the Homework Club. Essentially the outcome of the proceedings aligns the school with its motto *Ar scáth a chéile a mhaireann na daoine* [People exist in each other’s shadow].

The final question on the questionnaire was related to medium of education for Gaeltacht students. The results returned a majority in favour of 50-50 Irish-English bilingual education. This language choice could be influenced by the language dispute that was, at the time, ongoing. There were three comments added by participants to this question, despite the question requiring a multiple-choice response only. The responses indicate a sense of choice, promoting Irish-medium education as an option rather than the situation these students themselves are in with *Pobalscoil Chorca Dhuibhne* being the only secondary school available (without incurring a lengthy commute). The responses are listed as follows:

* An teanga ba mhaith leis an scolaira a leabhart. [Whichever language the student wants to speak.]

* Tá sé deas é a bheith agat ach nil sé in aon tíortha eile nó fiú in ár tír, nil sé ciallmhar é a dhéanamh trí Gaelainn muna bhfuil Gaeilge á dhéanamh agat. [It is nice to have it but it is not in any other country or even in our country, it doesn’t make sense to do it through Irish unless you have Irish.]

* Beidh rogaithe aige. [They will have choices.]
The first section of this chapter presented the bare data of the questionnaires to convey the context of the participants’ language profiles. The responses present the disparity of language backgrounds combined with insights into language interaction and language maintenance. It is worth noting in the comments that there are some fundamental problems with Irish orthography and morphosyntactical errors but the written sample is beyond the scope of this thesis.

6.3 Discussion and Conclusion

The questionnaire responses provide vital information for the sociolinguistic understanding of the participants, and to undertake a domain analysis. Over the course of the chapter, it has been shown that participants with a strong Irish home language background are in the minority. Despite a strong home language, the language use outwith the home does appear to be problematic. Irish within the general public and with friends at school is not an active language network for most of the participants. This is evidence of a compartmentalised language use and a high level of bilingualism. The young adults of this research project are all bilingual speakers with contrasting degrees of Irish and contrasting degrees of interest in using and maintaining the language.
There are two particular areas of the questionnaire responses that will be discussed further: examining the intergenerational shift and consequential intentions for Irish as a home language, and the notion of peak language usage and exposure.

6.3.1 Intergenerational Shift

Ó hIfearnáin (2013: 354-355), in relation to Irish speakers in the Múscrai Gaeltacht, comments that:

It is noteworthy that 72 of the 84 informants in the cohort reported that their fathers spoke fluent, native Irish, while only 65 reported that ability for their mother. Although too small to show a conclusive pattern, this is in keeping with a general sociolinguistic trend for male conservatism and female innovation in language change and shift, but also points to commonality with data from a 2005 Gaeltacht-wide survey of 970 senior cycle school pupils, 46 of whom were in the Múscrai region that found that 45% of fathers and 38% of Gaeltacht mothers had fluent Irish and that fathers were more likely to be from the immediate area than mothers.

As outlined in Ó Giollagáin et al (2007) the use of Irish as a home language is in decline in the Gaeltacht, and the Government of Ireland has made efforts to combat this decline, a number of which are outlined in chapter one. There are also more local efforts in Corca Dhuibhne that aim to assist parents with raising children bilingually: Tús Maith; Scéim na gCuairteoirí Baile. The matters raised by Ó Riagáin’s (1992) study of the area include the matter of families with one parent not being an Irish speaker. As Ó hIfearnáin states above, varying degrees of Irish language use at home do not equate to children being proficient in Irish, and this corpus of data confirms this. For example, one speaker with Irish as a home language is one of the weakest speakers in the group with grammatical and vocabulary problems that will be discussed in section 7.4.1.

To examine this matter of intergenerational shift, the participants with Irish as a medium of language with parents or grandparents are examined further. In order to ensure a level of Irish-English bilingualism, those who responded with Irish only, Mostly Irish and 50-50 will be the focus of this section. Mostly English responses were not included as this could be interpreted as the cúpla focal mindset presented by Walsh (2012: 335-336) and does not strictly indicate any substantial level of Irish competency. English only responses were also excluded.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Maternal grandmother</th>
<th>Maternal grandfather</th>
<th>Paternal grandmother</th>
<th>Paternal grandfather</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CG1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG6</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG7</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG9</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG10</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG11</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG12</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG7</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG8</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: Participants with Irish language usage with Parents and Grandparents

The table above represents all the participants who engage with parents or grandparents using any substantial degree of Irish. This informs that at least 19 of the participants, 46 per cent, have some degree of Irish as a spoken medium with parents or grandparents. As is evident, there are some patterns to be observed: Irish use with both parents and all grandparents, both parents and maternal or paternal grandparents, one parent and related grandparents, and use of Irish restricted to grandparents.
In terms of inter-generational shift towards English, there are only two participants who display a shift with their Irish use at home/family skipping a generation to exclude Irish as the medium of communication with the parents. Irish as a home language is no longer the norm in Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht, as the participant profiles confirm, and there are examples of intergenerational shifts from Irish to Irish-English bilingualism in the home. Encouragingly, there are five examples of both parents using Irish in the home despite only one parent coming from an Irish-speaking background, an exogamous trend that was noted by Ó Riagáin (1992). Ó Riagáin noted in particular that many women moved into the area for marital purposes, and it was not expected or necessary for them to learn or improve Irish. This is a general Gaeltacht phenomenon however and not limited to Corca Dhuibhne, however this occurrence is beyond the scope of this chapter. While one can speculate as to the motivations for raising children with Irish, optimistically it could be posited that the community dynamic both encourages and aids the decision of parents. There are also examples of families who have not sought to promote Irish as a home language: six examples of Irish use directed at one parent, with five indicating the father as the Irish-speaker and one indicating the mother.

Another facet of the home or family language is the interaction with siblings, siblings living either within the family home or independent of the family. Of the 19 participants using Irish with parents or grandparents, the language interaction is the same level of Irish with siblings in 12. However, seven indicated a contrasting level of Irish use with siblings, for the majority this contrast is a lower level of Irish. For example, participant BG8 uses Irish only and Mostly Irish with parents and all grandparents but mostly English with siblings. Of the remaining 22 participants, two indicate a higher level of Irish language use with siblings, which could be related to matters of education, for example helping with homework.

The 19 participants, who used Irish to some degree at home/with family, were reviewed to gauge the rate of intention to use Irish as their home language in the future. 18 responded that they intended to raise their children with levels of bilingualism from Irish only to 50-50, and therefore the intention to maintain Irish as a home language in some capacity is strong with these participants.
Of the remaining 22 participants, who have no use of Irish with parents or grandparents, 11 indicate they would like to raise children with some degree of Irish. This is a positive intention for future use as a home language, and if followed through, would be a language shift towards Irish as a home language. In total 34 of the participants, 83 per cent, responded positively to using Irish to raise children and this includes responses ranging from Irish only to Mostly English. 29 of the participants, 71 per cent, indicated Irish only, Mostly Irish or 50-50 that equates to a concerted effort to have Irish at home.

6.3.2 Peak Bilingualism and CM

The idea of peak language usage and exposure is formed on the basis of two assumptions:

- The students are at a peak of their language education in the state education system.
- Exposure to Irish in the form of opportunities for language use, either as marked or unmarked choices, is at an optimal peak while attending an Irish-medium school located in the Gaeltacht.

While Li Wei (2009: 4-5) provides an extensive list of bilingual speaker categories, I would argue that there is a lack of emphasis on the external factors contributing to bilingualism. The nature in which each language is acquired is prominent in the terminology with each suggesting different kinds of proficiency (Spolsky 1998: 45). As is the distinction of skills associated with language learning: reading, writing, speaking and understanding (Spolsky 1998: 46). The traditional categories of speakers offer a snapshot classification of a speaker that summarises their method of acquisition and/or their language skills. To this end, the idea of peak bilingualism is drawn primarily on the sociolinguistic factors and the speaker’s competency is irrelevant. The term can be used in conjunction with a speaker classification from Li Wei's (2009: 4-5) listings and this would further strengthen the snapshot categorisation of a bilingual speaker.

The idea of peak bilingualism developed from the drastic decline in Irish language speakers at the end of state education. This decline results in speakers, for the most part, not actively engaging in Irish and their Irish language then being confined to ‘cúpla focal’ Walsh (2012: 335-336). As discussed in chapter three, these cúpla focal are used as tools
of implication, implying that the speaker has a grasp of the Irish language but is not willing to converse in Irish at that time, due to a lack of proficiency. This implies that at one stage there was a higher level of proficiency, i.e. at the final stages of state education, but by choosing to not use Irish upon leaving school the level of proficiency diminished.

Peak bilingualism can be applied to a speaker in relation to a specific time (snapshot) or a wider timeframe e.g. a decade. This wider timeframe allows for peaks of bilingualism to be identified. To consolidate this idea the participant’s intentions for future use of Irish can highlight potential peaks: 17 intend to maintain Irish with family, six will maintain Irish with friends, eight plan to work with Irish and 16 have no plan to use the language upon finishing school. Based on these intentions alone, 39 per cent are at a peak of usage as they indicate no plan to use Irish after school. Those who indicated a desire to work with Irish or use Irish as a home language are likely to reach subsequent peaks in language usage in their futures.

One aim of developing this term of peak usage and exposure is to highlight that even within the context of the Gaeltacht, the majority of the participants rarely engage in Irish only discourse. In the first instance, the medium of education within the school will be closely examined. The background information to the school, detailed in chapter four, would predict a high return for Irish-only interaction with teachers, however as indicated in the section 6.2.2 this is not the case. The following chart represents the language used with teachers in the pobalscoil.
The range of responses gives insight to the medium of education, and to clarify the question asked *Cén teanga is mó a úsáideann na múinteoirí i do mheánscoil?* [Which language do the teachers mostly use in your secondary school?] The question was loosely termed to allow for the participants to interpret it as which language the teachers use when teaching or which language to teachers use when interacting with students. Obviously the range of responses is surprising given the language policy dispute outlined in chapter four. It should be reiterated that the two individual schools that came together in 2007 also claimed to follow an all-Irish medium programme. A reference to Ó Riagáin’s (1992: 66) work in Corca Dhuibhne, previously mentioned, can cast light on this factor and diminishes the sense of surprise at the responses:

... as regards post-primary schools, all of which are centred in An Daingean, only 29% of respondents in any area across the region with children of that age claim that they are following all-Irish programmes.

A closer look into the home language of the participants will highlight some issues raised in previous studies of teaching L1 and L2 speakers simultaneously, previously discussed by Hickey (2001) when analysing immersion education in Ireland. She writes that a balance must be achieved between addressing the language needs of L2 learners and the equally urgent needs of L1 minority language children for active language support and enrichment. In the following table the responses of the participants with any balanced or
higher level of Irish use with parents/grandparents are outlined in comparison to those with English only as a home/family language. It is apparent from the table that language interaction with teachers does not essentially shift depending on the level of home bilingualism therefore confirming that a balance is not necessarily present between addressing the language needs of L1, L2 and L3 speakers within the school. The breakdown of these results certainly shows a level of compromise by both students and teachers. For example, the female participant CG12 who uses Irish only with parents, grandparents and siblings, and displays one of the highest levels of proficiency in the recorded sample, engages with the teachers bilingually and her response indicated 50-50 Irish-English.

![Figure 6.12: Participants’ Language Interaction with Teachers divided according to home language](image)

Interaction within the community displayed little interaction with Irish outside the education and family setting, and therefore this does not constitute a significant domain for language use with this group of participants. It can therefore be posited that, with the exception of those who engage in Irish only interaction at home, the participants rarely speak Irish only in the Gaeltacht setting. The responses all indicate the contrasting levels of bilingual interactions of the participants; therefore the concept of monolingual Irish interaction is alien to the majority of participants.
6.3.3 Conclusion

Overall, the data from the questionnaires portrays these young adult speakers as individuals residing in a bilingual context with very few engaging in monolingual Irish interactions. This chapter has aided in further understanding the school debate and sheds light on the sentiments of the ideology brokers actively involved. Although chapter four provides a summary of the ideological debates, the responses of the participants display the disparity of opinion and interest in this particular cohort.

Bhabha’s (2005) idea of cultural hybridity is confirmed within this setting with the vast majority using bilingual Irish-English speech when interacting. Another factor is the lack of motivation to speak Irish outside the education setting with 16 of the participants not motivated to continue using Irish after the Leaving Certificate exam. This is in stark contrast to those who feel the need to maintain the language stating their concern for the language in their comments. Concern has been raised that L2 speakers are learning Irish from L2 speakers (Ni Laoire 2012), however, a greater concern should be that the majority of these Gaeltacht young adults are not exposed to Irish only domains, as supported by the questionnaire responses.

The idea of peak bilingualism allows for a categorisation of a speaker that indicates external factors. Ó Domagáin (2013: 239), referenced in chapter three, discusses the younger generation that missing certain values and qualities as a result of the evolving dynamic of the Gaeltacht. By default he defines them as not good speakers but this chapter sought to emphasise the factors influencing their speech (Gardner-Chloros 2009: 43-43; 2009a: 98-99). To this end, the traditional image of a ‘good’ speaker is virtually impossible given the shifting sociolinguistic context of the Gaeltacht, and speech with CM as promoted in the participants’ interactions can equate to ‘good’ Irish.
Chapter Seven: Data Analysis

We are yet to understand why people who were brought up with the same family language background, in the same location, attending the same schools and with similar extended social networks can have very diverse profiles with regard to language proficiency in both the minoritised and dominant languages and even have opposing attitudes and practices within their linguistic repertoires. (Ó hÍearr Ó Maonaigh 2013: 350)

7.1 Introduction

This chapter is divided into three sections: the first will examine seven recorded datasets from the corpus and attempt to identify the matrix language for all the examples of intrasentential CM. The second section will analyse the remaining corpus as a unit and discuss features of the speech sample. Finally there will be a discussion on the analysis findings including a secondary analysis of the corpus and concluding remarks.

The aim of this close linguistic analysis will determine if Irish-English CM is a case of ‘classic’ CM as defined by Myers-Scotton (2002). Classic CM is associated with two major extralinguistic factors: proficiency and stability (Myers-Scotton 2002: 111-112) in a language contact situation. Myers-Scotton (2002: 110) writes that classic CM occurs between speakers who have sufficient proficiency in one of the participating languages to use it as the sole source of the morphosyntactic frame of bilingual CPs. The alternative to classic CM is composite or covert CM that indicates languages in a state of flux and presents itself in the form of convergence between the two languages in question. The MLF is applicable to the insertion mode of CM only, and is a well-researched framework that has successfully been applied to language pairs, for example Deuchar (2006) and Davies (2009) working with Welsh and English.

The chapter will examine features of assimilation while constantly situating the analysis with previous Irish-English CM research presented in chapter three. There will be particular attention focused on loanwords within this corpus. While these loanwords may not be applicable to the national Irish lexicon, it will be supported that they are actively functioning as loanwords by the participants at the time of data collection. As the data will display, often the loanword is within the local speech repertoire concurrently with
the official Irish word or term coined found in a terminology database. This forges a link to Ni Ghearán’s (2011) work that focuses on the use of Irish terminology by those living in the Gaeltacht.

The analysis will show that in mixed utterances the ML is always Irish in the case of balanced bilinguals, with Irish being the dominant code with English morphemes integrated and occasionally assimilated accordingly. The CM practices of weaker speakers often functions as a communicative strategy and this strategy will be a secondary focus of this chapter and will discuss in particular the use of calques or loan translations.

There have been previous studies concentrating, to various degrees, on the Irish language spoken in the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht (Sjoestedt-Jonval 1938; Ó Sé 2000; Hickey 2011) but none focus primarily on the practice of CM. As outlined in chapter three, there are already English components or elements established in the Irish language lexicon but this does not strictly signpost imminent language death. As discussed previously, the introduction of English nouns into Irish, for example, serves to accommodate new terms to the language and does not indicate diminished language proficiency. A close examination of the spoken language and identification of the dominant ML in mixed clauses can allow for the level of convergence between the two languages to be determined. As Myers-Scotton’s MLF proves, a consistent base language is reflective of a stable language community. To incorporate the contrasting abilities of the participants, the distribution of Irish, or English, as the base language will be presented.

The analysis will initially draw on seven recordings: incorporating all the various levels of language abilities and usage, both at home and within the community. The aim of selecting these particular datasets is to emphasise and incorporate the disparity of language abilities within the corpus. It will also present the language practices associated with language acquisition stages (L1, L2, L3), and highlight any contrasting results, should they become apparent. As a number of the recordings involve three participants, it was not possible to present the data according to individual speakers in all instances. In a
number of the conversations the speaker is identifiable, for example when there is a male and female participant, however as this cannot be carried out across the full corpus, therefore analysis is presented primarily per recording. This close examination will be followed by a secondary analysis of the corpus to discuss loanwords and stance portrayed by CM and CS.

To conclude the chapter, the analysis will be summarised and the theoretical findings reviewed. The status of Irish, as identified within the corpus, will then be located along the continuum between bilingual stability and an active shift towards English. This pattern of CM is also influenced by the sociolinguistics factors presented by Muysken (2000) and the analysis will reflect upon this link in light of the recent disruption to the language balance in Corca Dhuibhne. Any indication of convergence towards English will be related to research in the field on the topic of Irish-English creolisation (Ní Laoire 2013).

7.2 Notes on the Analysis Procedure
Over the course of discussing the conversations in detail, the process of identifying the ML will be presented. However, prior to this analysis, some notes on the procedure are necessary to emphasise the methodology involved and explain the approach to analysis, prior to engaging the MLF.

• In the case of indecipherable pieces of text, the whole clause was deducted from the analysis. The rationale for this being that the indecipherable text could affect the ML of the clause.
• In instances where the clause consisting only of Yes or No, and variations (all conversations contain a heavy use of yeah) these were deducted on the basis of their being universal in both Irish and English. Their status as loanwords in Irish is well documented by Ó Duibhir (2009), Stenson (1990, 1993) Ó Malley-Madec (2005).
• Utterances containing only exclamations, for example Ow, Ugh, Ha? Hm, Oh!, ha etc. were also deducted from analysis based on their mutual significance in both Irish and English. Utterances combining an exclamation and yes/no, were also discounted, for example Ew no, Oh yeah.
• Due to the nature of the speech sample, there are many instances of interrupted speech, especially in the conversations between three participants. These incomplete, interrupted clauses were deducted from the analysis.
• As with the approach adopted by Davis (2009) previously mentioned in chapter two, extended complex clauses will be divided into simple clauses where feasible. Feasibility is based on the presence of sufficient morphemes to determine the ML rather than leaving clauses as ambiguous.
• Loanwords from English that have been established by previous researchers will be acknowledged. These include, but are not limited to, the following: No and Yes/Yeah (Ó Siadhail 1973), yeah, no, so, okay, just, like, right (Ó Duibhir 2009: 115) and the discourse markers well, like, just, so, right, alright, now, really, then, but, I’d say, you know\(^{53}\) and both positive and negative variations of know (O’Malley-Madec 2001: 267).\(^{54}\)
• Reduced clauses are very common in the speech samples and they were analysed for ML where possible. An example of a reduced clause is: ‘when are you coming? Next week.’ ‘Next week’ is a reduced clause and the full clause would be ‘I am coming next week’.
• In the translations provided there are instances of necessary contextual interpretation, and circular brackets within the square brackets represent these cases. For example, *chonaic sí cosúil leis an* chaplin [she saw like the chaplin (she looks like the chaplin)].
• English words within Irish clauses were double-checked for their presence, or listedness, in three sources: the definitive Irish-English dictionary *Foclóir Uí Dhónaill* (1977) available at http://breis.focloir.ie/ga/fgb/, the terminology database www.focal.ie and the newly launched (2013) English-Irish dictionary at www.focloir.ie. Words included in any of these dictionaries will be defined as loanwords, if the definition matches the context. For example, the word *marquee* is

---
\(^{53}\) Two of the discourse markers identified as loanwords here, ‘alright’ and ‘really’, will be discussed further along in the chapter and their status as an adjective within the corpus.
\(^{54}\) Discourse markers could be considering content morphemes in the MLF and would therefore not affect the ML in a mixed clause. However, despite their lack of ‘listedness’ (Deuchar 2006: 1988) in any Irish-English dictionary, they have been long established in the Irish language lexicon. Since the publication of O’Malley-Madec’s 2001 research, the use of English discourse markers has continued, the corpus for this project can only confirm their status of loanwords considering their heavy presence.
used four times in one recording in the context of using a marquee as a venue but
upon checking the sources for listedness there is only one entry for marquee. The
terminology database’s one return for marquee is for the field of computer science
therefore marquee, in this context, does not meet the criteria for loanword. Another
example is the word locker, *locar*, which has two entries on www.focloir.ie:
*taisceadán* for a lockable cupboard and *locar* for storage on a boat, therefore the use
of *locar* when discussing the school lockers is not a loanword.

A further discussion of the status of loanwords will be continued in the concluding
discussion of this chapter.

7.3 Analysis of Individual Recordings
The following section contains the detailed description of each of the selected recordings. Each recording will be briefly introduced and a summary of the participant profiles provided.

7.3.1 L1 Dataset - Irish as a Dominant Home Language
This speech sample took place between two participants, one male and one female, who
both use Irish as the dominant home language. Both speak Irish only with the mother and
Mostly Irish with the father, and the language for interaction with other family members
is either Irish only or Mostly Irish except for the male participant who interacts with his
siblings using Mostly English. Therefore, although Irish is the dominant language, there
is an element of English in the language of the home. Both were living in Lispole, a
village located 8km outside An Daingean, and their Irish language network is primarily
associated with family and education. The male participant also uses Irish when
interacting with the general public. Both display positive attitudes towards Irish in their
questionnaire responses, and indicate a positive intention for maintaining Irish within the
family domain in the future.

The word count of the transcription is 4,573 and this was separated into 590 clauses.
These were then separated according to the language of the clause: English, Irish, Mixed
or Neutral. The chart below provides the number of clauses for each category and there
are a large number of English clauses. This is a result of extensive CS to English throughout the discourse, and the participants actually reflect on their use of English during the discourse. This runs contrary to Stenson’s (1990: 169) observation that switches between sentences are relatively rare however this pair of participants have the highest rate of English only clauses.

![Image](image.png)

We’ll tell her we were talking mostly English and do it again. Yeah. We, oh my god, I didn’t even notice we were talking English for loads of it. […] *Fiche nóimead* gone sure, that’s gone fast. [Twenty minutes gone sure, that’s gone fast.]

![Figure 7.1: Distribution of language in Clauses (Recording 8)](image.png)

The neutral clauses consist of, primarily, proper nouns within reduced clauses, with the verb implied in the answer rather than appearing in the answer. However given that the proper noun is the only element provided, it is categorised as neutral.

The Mixed clauses, 123 in total, are further examined to determine the ML of each. The clause should contain a ML of Irish or English but occasionally the ML will be ambiguous. The final category is a clause that does not contain sufficient morphosyntactical information for the ML to be determined.
Irish was supported as the ML of 108 of the clauses: with the word order being from Irish and English functioning as content morphemes and EL islands. Throughout the discourse, there were many examples of reported speech and these create EL islands within the clause. The following are some examples from the discourse:

\[
\text{agus dúirt sé like ‘can I borrow it please?’} \\
\text{say-PAST he} \\
\text{[and he said like ‘can I borrow it please?’]}
\]

\[
\text{Chuaigh sé go dtí an debs le Sinéad.} \\
go-PAST he to the with \\
\text{[He went to the debs with Sinéad.]} \\
\text{Agus bhiomar ansan agus thit rud mór paint all over} \\
\text{be-PAST-1PL there fall-PAST thing big} \\
\text{[And we were there and a big thing of paint fell all over]} \\
\text{Agus tá like, oh my god, tígh like class acu.} \\
\text{be house at-them} \\
\text{[And they have like, oh my god, a like class house.]} \\
\text{An fuair tusa text?} \\
\text{Q-get you-EMP} \\
\text{[Did you get a text?]}
\]

Like nil, tá sí alright like just tá sí ana-two-faced or something. \\
\text{neg-be, be she be she very} \\
\text{[Like she’s not, she’s alright like just she’s very two-faced or something.]} \\

There were five clauses determined to have English as the ML during the discourse, and the clauses are as follows:

\[
\text{Agus Eimear like, do you know, that was kind of random. [And Eimear …]} \\
\text{Fiche nóiméad gone sure, that’s gone fast. [Twenty minutes gone sure …]} \\
\text{agus I was like ‘shit’. [and I was like ‘shit’.]} \\
\text{Is it like a meeting room or rud éicint? [… or something?]} \\
\text{Agus Grainne like, do you know, that was kind of random. [And … ]}
\]
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These Irish language components are functioning as content morphemes in each clause: conjunction, NP and a discourse marker. The examples that begin with the conjunction *agus*, it could be suggested, are cases of CS as in each example there is a definite shift to English.

Within the discourse there are nine examples of ambiguous clauses that cannot support either Irish or English wholly as the ML. These clauses contain morphemes in both languages however there is still not sufficient information for a ML.

Dj very good *i ngach aon ceann*. [Dj very good in every one.]

*Chomh* funny. [So funny.]

*Agus* fucking Darragh. [And fucking Darragh.]

These three are short clauses, and all are reduced clauses and therefore contain no verb that would allow for identification of the ML. The first example is quite interesting at the NP *Dj very good* contains the Irish word order so could have an Irish ML, although without a verb co-indexing the noun it is a tentative ML. The third example contains the NP in the English word order but the use of expletives within NPs in Irish, as discussed by Stenson (1990: 171), are regularly placed in the prenominal position. The Noun-Adjective order of the NP in Irish is not a set rule with some adjectives occurring prenominally, for example *sean* [old] in *seanbhean* [old woman]. A contextual analysis, gauging the language sequence, can aid in speculating a ML.

Oh my god, *bhi sin* brilliant.

**Dj very good *i ngach aon ceann*.** [very good DJ in every one.]

But it was really funny.

Jeez.

*Bhí* ah Conor *le* Sinéad. [Conor was with Sinéad.]

Conor?

You know

Oh, Conor.
Oh my god.  
*Chomh funny.* [So funny]

*Ar chuala tú mar gheall ar Aisling [h] agus Máirtín?*  
*Ach dúirt sí nach bhfuil sé fior so.*  
**Ags fucking Darragh.**  
[Did you hear about Aisling and Martin?  
But she said it’s not true so…  
And fucking Darragh.]

In context, the first and third examples can be attributed to Irish utterances but the second example is likely an English utterance as it is echoing the earlier sentence: but it was really funny.

The remaining six clauses could not be analysed within the MLF, due to their complex construction. The following are examples from these clauses:

`ansan bhí sé ag cursing aris oiche an debs.`
`then `be-PAST' he `cursing`
[then he was cursing again the night of the debs.]

But ón outside you wouldn’t think it was that nice like.  
[But from the outside…]

Yeah, I know her ón betting office. [Yeah, I know her from the betting office.]

`‘Cos tá sé cairde maith le Paddy`
`be he `friends `good with`
[because he is good friends with Paddy]

`Ní bionn odds maith air `either.  
`Neg be-HAB` `good on-him`
[There aren’t good odds on him either.]

The first example contains the verbal suffix *-ing* which is a system morpheme and although the word order is Irish and the English content morphemes *curs(e)* and *debs* indicate Irish as the ML, it cannot be supported. The verbal suffix should be the common suffix for assimilation *-ail* to support an Irish ML, and as Stenson (1991: 173) comments, this method of assimilation is widely used and therefore this instance is unusual. The
following two examples contain primarily English morphemes and adhere to the English language word order however the presence of an Irish preposition and article, combined in the prepositional pronoun, in both contradicts English as the ML. The preposition *ón* [from the] functions as a system morpheme in both instances and disrupts the ML of the clause.

The final examples are ambiguous due to a lack of system morphemes: the first of the two while can be successfully translated to English as ‘cos he is good friends with Paddy’ is missing a morpheme in the Irish version. In instances of classification in Irish, the preposition *í* must be used and the noun for friend would appear in the singular, therefore the utterance should read: ‘Cos tá sé ina chara maith le Paddy. This example is therefore a form of loan translation from English, particularly the use of plural rather than singular for *cara* [friend], and despite the noun-adjective agreement from Irish; an Irish ML cannot be supported. The final example appears to adhere to Irish as the ML, but closer inspection indicates that the adjective *maith* does not agree with the plural noun from English - odds. The adjective should change to plural to maintain agreement between the two, therefore the Irish ML does not uphold in this utterance.

Overall, this recorded conversation shows a dominant pattern of ‘classic’ CM. Although there are a handful of clauses that show English as the ML and clauses that are beyond the scope of the MLF, the vast majority supports Irish as the ML. This conversation also presents a large amount of CS but the analysis does highlights that a heavy use of CS still does not indicate a compromised bilingualism or Irish.

### 7.3.2 L1 Dataset - Bilingual Home Language

The two male participants in this group have Mostly Irish as a home language, but only in relation with one parent (mother for one, father for the other) and English only or Mostly English with the other parent. Outside the education system, neither displays any strong use of the Irish language with their friends or the general community. They both engage in Irish language media in a similar capacity, although still only from time to time, and both plan to continue speaking Irish with family after the Leaving Certificate. Despite the
similarities in Irish language acquisition, the two participants displayed contrasting abilities in the language.

The transcription totaled 1,945 words as a result of some extended pauses but one participant contributed a greater amount to the conversation. When separated to clauses, the total came to 246 clauses. These were then categorised according to the language of the clause: English, Irish, Neutral or Mixed.

![Bar chart showing distribution of language in clauses](image)

**Figure 7.2: Distribution of language in Clauses (Recording 2)**

As is evident from the chart above, there is very little CS between English and Irish in this speech sample, with only 13 clauses in English and 5 neutral clauses that primarily consist of proper nouns. The majority of the conversation is in Irish. The mixed clauses account for 24 of the total and these are re-examined in an effort to determine a ML of either Irish or English.

The mixed clauses, for the vast majority, indicate that Irish is the ML with English restricted to content morphemes and EL islands. In particular, there was extensive use of discourse markers throughout the conversation. The following examples all have an Irish language ML accord to the word order and content/system morpheme principles of the MLF.
agus arra díirt an, am, an fear liom go raibh alán bad habits agam.
say-PAST the the man with-me that be-PAST many at-me
[and arra the man said to me that I have a lot of bad habits.]

Tá an steamroom agus jacuzzi níos fearr.
be the and better
[The steamroom and jacuzzi are better.]

Yeah tá na scrums deacair.
be the-PLU difficult
[Yeah the scrums are difficult.]

Cén saghas costume atá agat?
Q-the type REL-be at-you
[What type of costume do you have?]

Oh, thá mo license agam alright.
be my at-me
[Oh, I have my license alright.]

The Irish ML is supported in 22 of the 24 mixed clauses. One of these clauses is problematic, rather than lacking sufficient information, and will now be examined.

Bhíos ag ah coasting an iomarca agus, arra sin é anyway.
be-PAST-1SG coasting
[I was ah coasting too much and, arra that’s it anyway.]

In this example, the word order is Irish concluding with an Irish/English discourse marker. The word coasting is problematic: the verb coast can function as a content morpheme, the -ing system morpheme should be in Irish, -áil, to adhere to the Irish ML. The presence of –ag in partitive use is co-indexing the suffix of the verb which needs to be in Irish to have an Irish ML. Therefore the ML is unidentifiable.

D’éirigh or ah b’fhéidir, give it up, ah give it up ah, an bliain seo caite mar rise-PAST maybe the year last because
bhíos ag fáil bréan leis.
be-PAST-1SG getting tired with-it
[Gave or ah maybe, give it up, ah give it up ah, last year because I was getting sick of it.]
The above example has neither Irish nor English ML due to the lack of pronoun at the beginning of the utterance. The participant switches to English to relay the message of the utterance but while switching this key component is missing. This example displays a lack of language ability by the speaker and as a result the required language proficiency is not present for the MLF to uphold. This instance of CM aligns with MacFhlannchadha’s (1999: 54) communicative strategies as to why weaker speakers engage in CM: restructuring. The speaker turns to English having twice failed to communicate his message.

One speaker was more competent in Irish in this recording but despite the varied linguistic abilities, the large amount of Irish language clauses and the Irish ML in mixed clauses reflects a stable bilingual competency and a case of ‘classic’ CM.

7.3.3 L2 Dataset - Mostly English as a Home Language
The participants in this dataset are two male participants, both of whom have a bilingual home language, with English being the stronger of the two languages. One however indicates the he speaks Irish only with his maternal grandfather, despite speaking Mostly English with his mother. This is a strong indicator of an intergenerational shift from Irish to English. This participant also responded that he acquired Irish before the age of 3, indicating that it is a home language. Their primary linguistic domain for Irish is with friends at sports or clubs, and one participant also highlights his use of Irish within the education system.

The conversation between the two students was continuous, with very little extended pauses. The transcription totaled 2,995 words and was divided into 569 clauses to be then assessed for the ML of each mixed clause.
As is outlined by the chart above, Irish was the main language of this conversation with very little CS to English. The neutral clauses are mostly proper nouns and without further content in the clause, they could be either English or Irish.

The mixed clauses were then analysed further in order to determine the ML. Of the 40 clauses, 32 contained Irish as the ML. In the first instance, all clauses containing English as content morphemes, easily identifiable, are presented. These clauses primarily contain English discourse markers and nouns. The following are some examples from the discourse:

*An bhfuil tú alright?*

*Q-be you*  
[Are you alright?]

*Níl puinn sa Daingean boy.*  
*Neg-be not much in-the*  
[There’s nothing in Dingle boy.]

*Chewing gum an ea?*  
*COP*  
[Chewing gum is it?]
*Tá sí* mad.
*be she*
[She is mad.]

*Arra bhí* meal, *b-, béile breá againn* anyway *tar éis an cluiche.*
*Be-PAST* meal nice *at-us* after the
[Arra we had a lovely meal anyway after the game.]

In the examples above, there are examples of English content morphemes and EL islands. In the first example, the word *alright* is functioning as an adjective and therefore a content morpheme. This word is also found within the corpus acting as a discourse marker and is treated as an established loanword in Irish as recommended by O’Malley-Madec (2001). ‘Chewing gum’ here is an EL with the system morphemes in the clause consisting of the Irish copula.

The remaining clauses were determined to be ambiguous due to a lack of syntactical information to identify any ML. For example:

*Níl* clue boy.
*neg-be* 
[I have no clue.]

The first example is problematic due to the lack of a prepositional pronoun that is necessary to complete the clause for an Irish ML. All the morphemes are content morphemes in this format, from both Irish and English, and therefore no ML can be identified without further information. The word *clue* is an example of a homophonous diamorph with the Irish language word being *cliú*.

The remaining seven ambiguous mixed clauses consist of reduced clauses are presented in context to determine a likely ML, for example:

*Tá sé curtha leathtaobh an ea?* [It’s put aside is it?]
*An bhfuil?* [Is it?]
*I gcomhair coláiste.* [for college]
*Caite agam.* [spent it]
*Oh, caite agat?* [oh, you’ve spent it?]
Alright.
Ar ah na vodkas I suppose.
Eye of the Tiger, cad é sin?
Match Dé Sathairn Eoin.
Tú ag dul?

[alright]
[on the vodkas I suppose]
[Eye of the Tiger, what is that?]
[Match on Saturday Eoin]
[You going?]

These examples, presented in context, indicate Irish as the likely ML. The context indicates correct usage of the copula (first example) and a tendency to reduce clauses at the question point of the conversation. Tú ag dul? in the final example is lacking the Q-PART be: an bhfuil? which in English translates as ‘you going?’. Overall, this dataset is a case of ‘classic’ CM, reflecting stability within the bilingualism and also a strong level of proficiency.

7.3.4 L2 Dataset - English Only as a Home Language
This recorded speech set was a conversation between three male participants. They were grouped together as their linguistic profiles indicated similarities: English only is the language of interaction at home, education is the primary source for Irish language interaction and all three have no plan to use Irish after the Leaving Certificate. One participant responded that he engages with the teachers through English only.

The transcription contains 2,298 words and contains numerous extended pauses, in all a total of 438 clauses. The distribution of languages throughout the clauses is provided in the following chart:
The category of neutral clauses, 22 in total, consists of proper nouns only. As is evident from the chart, CS to English was relatively low at 80 clauses, mixed clauses are also low at 51 and the dominant clauses accounting for 287 clauses are Irish language clauses. Of the mixed clauses, 51 in total, 30 are identified as having Irish as the ML. In these examples, the content morphemes are English; some are assimilated into Irish by the addition of a suffix, for example the content morphemes consisting of verbs.

*Ar mhaith leatsa dul ag dossáil Stephen no?*

*PART-COND good with-you-EMP go-VN dossing*

[Would you like to go dossing Stephen no?]

*Bhuel bim ag tomás-, ag tiomáint like [h] ag buildeáil agus ag feirmeoireacht.*

*be-HAB-1SG driving building farming*

[Well, I am dri-, driving like [h] building and farming.]

*Beidh mé ag dul ag innealltóireacht, ag déanamh mo project.*

*be-FUT me going engineering doing my*

[I’ll be going engineering, doing my project.]

*Tá tú up-to-date, an bhfuil?*

*be you Q-be*

[You are up-to-date, are you?]
Within the discourse there are 21 examples of ambiguous clauses, and it is the lack of syntactical information that restricts from determining the ML. These ambiguous clauses are consistently reduced clauses where the verb is implied in the context of the utterance. However, for the purposes of the MLF, the verb is pertinent in assessing the ML.

There is an example of clause with English as the ML, and it is as follows:

\[
\text{Déardaoin is it? [Thursday is it?]} 
\]

This clause is a simple with the content morpheme from Irish and the remaining system morphemes from English. There is a second clause that contains only a single Irish language morpheme.

\[
\text{It’s } a:h \text{ Niamh’s page. [It’s on } a:h \text{ Niamh’s page.]} 
\]

While the word order is English, particularly the NP, the inclusion of \textit{ar} which is a system morpheme because it is a preposition is pointing towards Irish as the ML. Therefore, because one ML is not evident based on both assessments, word order and the language of the system morphemes, the ML cannot be identified. This is in contrast to ambiguous where the ML could be either.

Finally there are problematic clauses within the discourse, as will be explained, the problems arise from syntactical errors in Irish, and are symptomatic of weakened proficiency.

\[
\text{Tá sé joke.} \\
\text{be it} \\
\text{[It’s a joke.]} \\
\]

\[
\text{Tá sí chaplin.} \\
\text{be she} \\
\text{[She’s a chaplin.]} \\
\]
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Chonaic sí cosúil leis an chaplin.
see-PAST she with-the the
[She looks like the chaplin.]

Cé mhéad nóiméad a beidh tú ar orals?
Q many minute REL be-FUT you on
[How many minutes will your oral be?]

The first two examples contain English as a content morpheme but the incorrect construction is used for the Irish elements. The copula is required for both clauses to be a morphosytactically correct Irish utterance. These samples are calques or loan translations and this is a sign of convergence towards English. This is a common site for error in the Irish language, as discussed in chapter three. The third example is using the incorrect verb and tense to describe how someone looks. And the final example also contains a malconstructed VP. The translations are based on the context in which the clauses occurred. The Irish verb caused some problems throughout the discourse. Another issue was with the verb responses as evident in the following examples:

An raibh tú ag féachaint ar a:h Desperate Housewives?
Q-be-PAST you watching on
Nil.
neg-be
Ar chonaic tú aon rud ar an teilifíseán?
PART-PAST see-PAST you one thing on the
Nil.
neg-be
[Were you watching ah Desperate Housewives?
No.
Did you see anything on the television?
No.]

These examples highlight the lack of verb agreement in the response to both questions. As previously mentioned, the Irish verb system is echoic, responding to a question with the same verb. Therefore the two responses above should be: bhí and ní fhaca. The participant consistently uses nil and its positive counterpart tú throughout the discourse,

55 Joke is an established loanword now: jóe according to the focloir.ie online dictionary, and is another example of a homophonous diamorph.
illustrating a characteristic of his speech rather than a single-occurring mistake. There are also clauses where the conditional was not used despite the context of the clause:

\[
\text{Ar fuair tusa text?} \\
\text{PART-PAST get-PAST you-EMP} \\
\text{Nil.} \\
\text{neg-be} \\
\text{B’fhéidir gur cheap si gur [.] gur am [.] tháinig Mary leis,} \\
\text{Maybe that think-PAST she that that come-PAST with-he} \\
\text{is dóigh liom} \\
\text{COP opinion with-me} \\
\text{[Did you get a text?]} \\
\text{No.} \\
\text{Maybe she thought that, that am Mary would come with him, I think.]
\]

The discourse also contains examples of using the -s morpheme in English to pluralise an Irish noun:

\[
\text{Tiomáint tractóirs. [Driving tractors.]
}\]

This English language morpheme -s, although a system morpheme, is functioning to add content to this reduced clause rather than systemic contribution. In this instance, this morpheme therefore does not affect the ML. Myers-Scotton (2014, personal communication) comments on this particular use of system morphemes:

\[
\text{Affixes such as plural marking are not the type of morpheme that must come from the ML. They just add content. The key is that the grammatical elements that must come from the ML are all ones that don't have much (or very little) meaning; they are first and foremost “grammatical”.
}\]

Despite the grammatical errors arising from a lack of Irish language proficiency, the Irish language is a strong dominant in the mixed clauses although there is some evidence of convergence towards English in the form of loan translations.

7.3.5 L3 Dataset - English and German as a Home Language

The three participants, two male and one female, are L3 learners of Irish with German and English as L1 and L2. The female participant, however, indicates in the discourse
that she no longer speaks German. The three have varying abilities in Irish and from the recording it is understood that they were each preparing for different levels of Irish for the state exam: honours, pass and foundation. None of the participants provide evidence in the questionnaire to support any substantial engagement with Irish language outside the school setting. All three responded that they engage with the teachers 50-50 and one indicated that she reads the newspaper *Foinse* from time to time. The female participant does plan to use Irish professionally after the Leaving Certificate.

The recording was short, at 1,471 words, with some extended pauses within the dialogue. There is also extensive intersentential switching to English between the interlocutors. The English within this recording was primarily as a result of weaker Irish language ability, and often English was used to reiterate, explain or query something. Examples of such switches are in the presented below:

*An mbíonn sibh ag freastal ar an Phoenix?*
*Q-be-HAB you-PLU going to the*
[Do ye go to the Phoenix?]
O:h, are you, do you go to the Phoenix?

*Is féidir liom Gear, well Geármáin a tuiscint mar tá mo a:m seantuismitheoir*
*COP can with-me German understand be my grandparents*
*Geármáinigh.*
*German-people-PLU*
[I can understand German because my grandparents are German.]
Really?
Cool.
What does *seantuismitheoir* mean?
[h]
What does *seantuismitheoir* mean?
Grandparents.

The amount of English clauses in not strictly indicative of a weakened ability in Irish, for example in the conversation between two L1 speakers also contained a high amount of English only clauses. And, of course, all the participants are at least bilingual and therefore English is always a default language for communication.
In the first instance, the transcription was divided into clauses for further analysis. There are 242 clauses in total, which were then divided according to language: Irish, English, Neutral or Mixed. As is outlined in the table below, there were less English language clauses (94) than Irish language clauses (118), and a total of 22 mixed clauses. A closer examination of the Irish language and mixed clauses will lead into the identification of the ML where possible. As the direction of CM is always unidirectional, as previously discussed in relation to the literature of Irish-English CM, therefore the English language clauses require no further examination at this point. The Irish language clauses will be examined for calques and English morphosyntactic structure.

![Figure 7.5: Distribution of language in Clauses (Recording 17)](image)

The neutral clauses, 8 in total, are clauses consisting of proper nouns only: *Muse, Eels, Cheryl Cole* for example, that are applicable to both languages. The mixed clauses are then re-examined to determine a ML. Of the 22 mixed clauses Irish was identified as the ML for 15, the English morphemes consisting of content morphemes and EL islands.

\[
Tá an am bowling alley ana-daor.
\]

*be the very*

[The bowling alley is very expensive.]
Am, is maith liom gach saghas ceol ach an ceol heavy metal.
COP good with-me every type music but the music
[Am, I like all types of music except heavy metal music.]

Cá bhfuair tú an piercing?
Q get-PAST you the
[Where did you get the piercing?]

Is maith liom am ceoltóirí rap.
COP good with-me musicians
[I like am rap musicians.]

The recording contains two examples of a mixed clause with an English ML, and it is the same clause repeated:

What does seantuismitheoiri mean? [What does grandparents mean?]

There are then 7 mixed language clauses that are problematic for the framework and they will be discussed presently. The issues arise are primarily due to lack of grammatical constructs, English operating as a system morpheme and English morphosyntactic structures. The first example is a clause where the prepositional pronoun is lacking the suffix indicating the third person. The example is provided in the context of the conversation:

Mark loves heavy metal. Is breá le heavy metal.
COP like with
[He loves heavy metal.]
What?
You do!
I listen to it sometimes.

While the English in the clause is functioning as content morphemes, the lack of pronoun renders the clause incomplete. However, a ML could be proposed as Irish but this cannot be sufficiently supported. Other examples of indeterminable ML clauses are as follows:

Like an chuala tú 50 Cent’s amhrán nua?
Q-hear-PAST you song new?
[Like did you hear 50 Cent’s new song?]
Tá siad indie ó am, ó Meiriceá.
be they from from
[They are indie from am, from America.]

Tá tú ceann metal.
be you head metal
[You are a metal head.]

Tá sé an old man’s pub.
be it the
[It’s the old man’s pub.]

So, an bhfuil sé roulette agus am poker nó an bhfuil sé am like the one-armed
Q-be it and or Q-be it
bandits?
[So, is it roulette and am poker or is it am like the one-armed bandits?]

The first example is a mixed clause with a problem concerning the structure of the clause, primarily the word order. The possessive ‘s is a system morpheme, more precisely a bridge system morpheme, from English but could be permitted within an EL if the word order of the ML was maintained. However the correct structure for this case of possessive should be ‘amhrán nua 50 Cent’, therefore avoiding the inclusion of the English possessive morpheme. The final three examples display examples of loan translations from English ‘Tá tú ceann metal’ although following the structure of an Irish NP with an English adjective as a content morpheme where the copula is required in Irish. The copula is necessary for all three clauses in Irish. This is perhaps one of the more common sites for convergence by weaker Irish language speakers. The final example of this group is a calqual use of Irish; it is problematic in that the morphosyntactic structure is English. This use of loan translations is known as Béarlacha as outlined in section 3.4. Given the speaker’s Irish proficiency, this is a trait of a weak bilingual rather than balanced.

The overall analysis of this conversation shows that Irish is the dominant ML with a higher than average rate of clauses indicating convergence towards English. Although throughout the conversation there were some language obstacles that were overcome by switching and calqual clauses, the high rate of Irish usage and substantial Irish ML mixed
clauses is encouraging by these weaker speakers of Irish. In this instance the association of the MLF with language competency that MacSwan (2005a: 19) presents as a criticism.

7.3.6 L1 and L2 Dataset: Varied Levels of Bilingualism as a Home Language

The participants in this group have various levels of Irish-English bilingualism as a home language, ranging from Mostly English with both parents and Irish only with both parents to different languages associated with each parent (English only with mother and 50-50 with the father). The three participants, two female and one male, responded in the questionnaire that the Irish language was acquired before the age of three, with one participant responding that English was not acquired by her until primary school. This participant’s responses indicate a pertinent linguistic profile in relation to Irish as a home language: she speaks Irish only with her parents and grandfathers, and English only with her grandmothers. She further comments that she speaks Irish only with her paternal relations and English only with her maternal relations. This reflects a positive intergenerational maintenance of the Irish language, despite one from each pair of grandparents using only English. In comparison, the male participant uses Mostly Irish with the paternal grandfather but 50-50 with his father, indicating an intergenerational decline in language use.

The conversation between the three participants was constant, although the male participant was lesser involved in the discourse. The transcription totaled 5,651 in total, the longest transcription of the corpus and was divided into 591 clauses, and then further categorised according to the language of the clause. The chart presents the figures for the four language categories.
As is evident from the information above, there was very little CS between English and Irish throughout the discourse, with 10 clauses in English and the vast majority of clauses in Irish at 453. As with the neutral clauses in the previously presented in this chapter, these 20 were primarily reduced clauses of single proper nouns. The number of mixed clauses is 100 and these were re-examined in order to determine the ML, between English, Irish or Ambiguous. The further analysis identified Irish as the ML in 83 of the clauses. The English morphemes consisted of content morphemes and EL islands, the content morphemes consisting mainly of discourse markers and nouns. The following are some of the clauses with Irish ML:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{agus ansin bhi } & \quad \text{oran} \text{ a} \text{ mac \ linn} \quad \text{f} \text{ein} \quad \text{gan, gan an} \quad \text{then be-PAST on-us go out with-us self-EMP without, without the} \\
\text{mhu} \text{inteoir like chun cleachtadh a d} \text{h} \text{e} \text{anmh ar symmetric spinnaker du} \text{inn f} \text{ein.} \quad \text{teacher to practice PART doing on to-us self-EMP} \\
\text{[and then we had to go out on our own without, without the teacher like to} \quad \text{practice on symmetric spinnakers ourselves.]}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{T} \text{á s} \text{é i bhf} \text{ad n} \text{íos deacra \ na \ an cúrsa level four.} \\
\text{be it much more difficult than the course} \\
\text{[It is much more difficult than the level four course.]} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ni th} \text{éim \ sa \ Droichead r} \text{o-mhinic actually.} \\
\text{Neg go-HAB-ISG in-the very-regular} \\
\text{[I don’t go to the Droichead too often actually.]} \\
\end{align*}
\]
Agus thug sí amach an am, an an passport agus yeah díradar ‘alright grand’.

[And she took out the am, the passport and yes they said ‘alright grand’.]

Bíonn sí addleáite uaireanta.

Be-HAB she addled sometimes

[She’s addled sometimes.]

The second example contains the English adjectival phrase ‘level four’ as an EL that is adhering to the Irish language word order of the phrase, and the postnominal position of adjectives in NP phrases. However, the following variation of the EL within a clause is encountered twice in the discourse, and these clauses are more complex. The following clauses have been identified as mixed clauses but the ML cannot be identified based on the word order and the morpheme principles of the MLF.

Dhein Mairéad level, level dó?

do-PAST

[Mairéad did level, level two?]

Yeah, I’d say go bhfuil sí level dó anois.

tag be she two now

[Yeah, I’d say she’s level two now.]

Well, tá sé an-éasca anois like, sure thugaim amach an méid sin leibhéal trís.

be it very-easy now give-PAST-1SG out the amount DEM level three

[Well, it is very easy now like, sure I give out so many level threes.]

So b’fhéidir go mbeadh ort a:m like múineadh do leibhéal a haon

Maybe that be-COND on-you teach to level PART one

conas jibing a dhéanamh nó rud éicint mar sin.

Q-ADV PART do or something

[So you might have to teach level one how to do jibing or something like that.]

The two examples containing level dó, while both appear to have Irish as the ML, are lacking a system morpheme that is necessary for the ML to be Irish. In the Irish language there is a particle used with non-adjectival numerals, -a, therefore the clause should read ‘level a dó’ for Irish to be the ML. Therefore the ML cannot be identified in either. The third example also contains an issue with the word level, this time appearing in Irish leibhéal. In this instance the number is succeeding the noun and although in Irish it
contains the -s morpheme in English, therefore pluralising the term. This additional morpheme is present to merely add content to the clause, however if it were excluded the Irish language form would already indicate plurality owing to the leibhéal being in the genitive plural. Therefore the superfluous nature of the morpheme and the lack of any particle indicate a certain level of convergence towards English. The final example contains the verb jibing that, as discussed earlier, is the English verb without the Irish suffix, therefore going contrary to Irish as the ML.

There are ten instances of ambiguous clauses, of which the reduced clauses will now be presented contextually. The final three clauses that cannot be determined as Irish ML, English ML or Ambiguous are as follows:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{ni raibh aon adults ann just bhi s é go hiontach.} \\
\text{neg be-PAST one in-it be-PAST he great} \\
[\text{there were no adults there just it was great.}] \\
\text{agus bhi an craic h an-mhaith na air a tháinig an gangs isteach.} \\
\text{be-PAST the very-good when PART come-PAST the in-ADV} \\
[\text{[and the craic was great with the gangs came in.]}}
\end{align*}\]

I dunno like though, leis an, you know, an whole saghas troid a bhi \\
in-it with the the the type fight PART be-PAST \\
\[\begin{align*}
\text{ann le Anna agus gach rud} \\
in-it with every thing \\
[\text{[I dunno like though with the, you know, the whole kind of fight that happened with Anna and everything.]}]
\end{align*}\]

The first two examples have content morphemes that do not agree with the system morphemes that support the noun in the singular. The first example is a common mistake made in the Irish language, but the second example is unusual. The final example, although it contains a large EL island of content morphemes, it is the position of ‘whole’ that affects the ML. While the prenominal position of saghas is one of the accepted adjectives in this position, ‘whole’ should succeed the noun. Therefore the clause does not meet the first principle of the MLF, the word order principle, and a ML is therefore unidentifiable.
Overall the analysis of this conversation returns only a minority of problematic clauses, 9 from 590, thus indicating a strong stability for the Irish language among these young adults of contrasting levels of home bilingualism.

7.3.7 L1 and L2 Dataset: Irish only and English only as Home Languages

The final recording for close analysis took place between two female participants, both from the village of Ceann Trá, and with one participant having Irish only as a home language and the other with English only. Both intend to maintain their use of Irish after school by speaking the language with family or speaking it with friends. The standard of Irish was high, and the conversation flowed with the transcript containing 3,893 words later divided into 498 clauses.

As the table indicates, there was little CS to English with 42 clauses in English. The mixed clauses comprised of almost 20 per cent of the dataset with 99 clauses. 73 of these clauses were determined to have Irish as the ML, owing to the English mixes consisting of content morphemes or EL. Some examples are as follows:

\( \text{agus bhí Seán like ‘alright look, an bhfuil cead agam dul?’} \)
\( \text{and be-PAST Q-be permission at-me go-VN} \)
[and Seán was like ‘alright look, can I go?’]
Bhiomar, bhíomar just taobh istigh den doras agus chas Louise orm agus be-Past-1PL side inside of-the turn-PAST on-me dúirt sí ‘Oh yeah!’ like that.
say-PAST she

[We were, we were just inside the door and Louise turned to me and she said ‘Oh yeah!’ like that.]

agus bhí sí like, bhí sí ag caint le Louise agus ag tabhairt amach di mar be-PA she speaking with giving out to-her because

ní raibh an tionscnamh dáanta aici nó rud éicint i gcomhair ag science.
eg-be-PAST the do-PP at-her

[and she was like, she was speaking to Louise and giving out to her because she didn’t have the project done or something for ag. science.]

An bhfuil sé alright?
Q-be he
[Is he alright?] Just tabhair dom an jacket.
give-IMP to-me the
[Just give me the jacket.]

In the dataset there are three examples of mixed clauses with English as the ML, and the three are presented here:

then she was like to Caoimhe oh am, I’d say go raibh Cáit ag a baile go luath an that be-PAS at her home early Q-PART raibh?’ be-PAST?
[...that Cáit was at home early, was she?]

I was like ‘Laoise éist do bhéal!’ Louise listen-IMP your mouth
[...‘Louise be quiet!’]

and I was like ‘oh níl sé againn’ neg-be he at-us
[... ‘oh we don’t have him’]

While the second and third examples are English MLs with Irish ELs, not uncommon for reported speech, the first instance is unusual. While it is reported speech, it could also be perceived as a full switch to Irish and therefore application of the MLF need not apply.
Finally, there are 21 examples of ambiguous clauses where the ML cannot be determined due to lack of morphemes or violation of the word order or content/system morpheme principles. The following examples from those classified as ambiguous that are reduced clauses will be presented contextually to determine if a ML can be indicated based on the preceding speech utterances.

Aifric?
Céard a cheapann tú faoi?
Q REL think you about [What do you think of it?]
Oh an clár I suppose.
DEF-SG programme [oh the programme …]

I know, credit card mo mháthair.
my mother [I know, my mother’s credit card]
níl fhios aici fós. Neg-be knowledge at-her yet [She doesn’t know yet]
Gach uile lá téim ar itunes like, oh yeah Beyonce oh go on so.
Every single day go-ISG on [Every day I go on itunes…]
Oh Joyce!
Shock móir. [Big shock]

Even though anois níl sé ach ceithre céad ochtó is it?
ADV neg-be it but four hundred eighty [now it’s only 480…]
Well don medicine?
for-the [well for medicine?]
Medicine yeah.
Agus an aptitude test. [and the aptitude test]

N’fheadar ach táim chun triail a bhaint as Corcaigh mar ní theastaíonn uaim dul go dtí Gaillimh.
Tá sì roifhada.
Oh yeah but Luimneach no?

These examples from the reduced clauses all show a tendency towards Irish as the ML given their well-formedness and contextual implication of the missing aspects. For example, in the first instance the verb think is implied from the question with I suppose
functioning as a discourse marker. The following example however the ML cannot be determined owing to the system morpheme *ag* not being indexed in the verbal suffix.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Agus ansan bhí} & \quad \text{Louise ag freaking out.} \\
\text{then be-PAST} & \quad \text{freaking out.}
\end{align*}
\]

[And then Louise was freaking out.]

Overall, this dataset displayed a high use of Irish, with the Irish language determined as the ML in the majority of the mixed clauses.

7.3.8 Summary of Analysis on Specific Datasets
By analysing the specific datasets that took place between speakers of Irish, with various levels of Irish as a home language from L1 with Irish only to L2 with English only, it has been highlighted that CM is not a characteristic of a particular speaker profile. CM, in this semi-formal setting of the fieldwork as discussed in chapter five, is a universal characteristic of spoken Irish. The percentage of mixed language clauses varied across the seven datasets but there was no example of a dataset without CM. While the analysis showed some examples of convergence, for example the presence of loan translations from English instead of availing of the Irish copula and the incorrect verbal responses that contradict the echoic verbal system of the Irish language. These issues, however, are confined to weaker speaker, which is not the intended bilingual for the MLF.

7.4 Analysis of the Remaining Corpus
The remaining ten datasets will be discussed as a whole in this section of the chapter. The procedure was the same as for the individual datasets however there is not as much emphasis placed on the participant profiles as garnered from the questionnaire responses.

Prior to discussing the remaining conversations of the corpus there are some notes on the recordings that will present some issues that needed to be overcome when examining the remaining conversations.

7.4.1 Notes on the Corpus
Recording 6 took place between a male and a female participant, however the male participant had a weak standard of Irish. During the process of identifying clauses, there
were many instances of the female participant finishing his clauses and sentences and these are not included in the analysis as they are complete clauses across speakers. Also due to major grammatical errors, although the clauses can be understood in context, they often do not make sense when presented out of context. The following are two examples from the transcription:

_Bhí sé an och, yeah, bhí sé an am is féarr san [.] Agus a:m níor,nár dúirt le Sine Mór go raibh, go raibh mé ag dul go dtí Al-, Albain._
_Bhí sé ag léim suas san aer agus an cinéal caint a bhí aici ‘cén fáth, cá, an bhfuil am rugbai am nios féarr- Níos féarr ná scoil? Agus dúirt mé ‘yeah’. [h]_

[It was the och-, yeah, it was the best time in the [.] And a:m didn’t, didn’t Sine Mór say, say that I went to Sc- Scotland. He was jumping up in the air and the type of talk she had ‘why, where, is am rugby am better- Better than school? And I said ‘yeah’. [h]]

_An bliain in anur-, i ndiai-, an bliain seo caite i ndiaidh an term tá mé ag dul go dtí ah cóit céanna ah an bliain seo agus is ah mar an bliain seo caite ní raibh, an bliain seo caite ní raibh aon clue faoin spéir agam go raibh Máire, ah Ní Máire san cóit céanna._

[The year las-, afte-, last year after the term I am going to the same place ah this year and and ah this last year I didn’t, this last year I didn’t have a clue that Máire, Máire was in the same place.]

Both examples display issues with noun/pronoun agreement, tenses of the verbs and calques from English. Despite these grammatical issues with Irish, the coherent mixed clauses that are present in the transcript were analysed along with the rest of the corpus for a ML. While nerves regarding the recording device, or perhaps the interlocutor, could account for some language performance issues, the level of proficiency is low. In this instance we can refer to the communicative strategies of CM by weaker speakers identified by MacFhlanncadh (1999: 54), namely restructuring and circumlocation. On examining the participant’s linguistic profile in the questionnaire, it transpires that Irish is a home language for this participant, responding the he uses 50-50 when engaging with his father and paternal grandparents. As will be mentioned in the previous chapter, Ó
hIfearnáin states that parental proficiency does not necessarily equate to child proficiency (2013: 350) and this participant confirms this observation.

There are a handful of instances of clauses from languages other than Irish and English, namely French and Spanish. These clauses are excluded from the analysis at this point, but will be discussed further along in the chapter in the secondary analysis of the whole corpus. Any clauses that contain content morphemes from other languages will also be excluded from the analysis, for example:

\[\text{Nó beidh sè ag titim amach sa pantalones.}\]
\[\text{Or be-FUT he falling out in-the}\]
\[\text{[Or he’l be falling out of his pants (Spanish).]}\]

\[\text{An raibh tú ag féachaint air? Ar like ceisteanna, don bhéaltirail fraincis.}\]
\[\text{Q-be-PAST you looking at-it? At questions, for-the oral test French.}\]
\[\text{Oh no.}\]
\[\text{No? Like tá hochtó hocht dèanta againn agus an rang eile tá like fiche cúig. Tá \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ Be eighty eight done with-IPL \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ the class other be twenty five. Be mé fucked ansan like.}\]
\[\text{me then}\]
\[\text{[h]}\]
\[\text{Agus document freisin.}\]
\[\text{Ha?}\]
\[\text{An document freisin.}\]
\[\text{Oh yeah.}\]
\[\text{[Were you looking at it? At like questions, for the French orals.}\]
\[\text{Oh no.}\]
\[\text{No? Like we have done eighty eight and the other class have like twenty five. I’m fucked then like.}\]
\[\text{[h]}\]
\[\text{And a document as well. (French)}\]
\[\text{Ha?}\]
\[\text{And the document as well.}\]
\[\text{Oh yeah.}\]

The use of languages other than Irish and English within the discourse is limited to very few participants and does not greatly interfere with the corpus.
7.4.2 Analysis of the Data

The ten transcriptions were divided into clauses amounting to 4,037 clauses. The clauses were categorised according to language and these categories are presented in the chart below:

![Figure 7.8: Distribution of language in Clauses (Recordings 1, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16)](image)

The overwhelming majority of clauses are in Irish, including loanwords established by their ‘listedness’ status or the supported research of Ó Duibhir (2009) and O’Malley-Madec (2001). There are examples of clauses with English as the ML and some of the clauses are listed below:

*Airgead* I always get. [Money I always get.]

*agus* she’s so funny [and she’s so funny]

and he was like ‘*fuairis cúl!*’

\[
\text{get-PAST-ISG goal}
\]

[and he was like ‘I got a goal!]"

It’s *deacair* like [It’s difficult like]

I don’t know *fós*. [I don’t know yet.]
The examples all contain Irish functioning as content morphemes, with one EL and therefore the ML of English is undisputable.

The clauses that were identified as having Irish as the ML, were adhering to the MLF and in total there are 383 Irish ML clauses, indicating a strong dominant ML throughout the 10 recordings. There are very few clauses that are problematic and some are listed below with brief discussions.

\[
\text{Caith sé overboard.}
\]

\[
\text{Throw-IMP him} \quad \text{[(Throw him overboard.) (He threw it overboard.)]}
\]

In this example, the word order is English on the basis of a loan translation. The correct Irish form would be \textit{Caith overboard é} or \textit{Caith sé overboard é}. Therefore this example fails the word order principle and further contains the incorrect Irish pronoun. This example is indicative of convergence towards English.

\[
\text{agus bhí an ah tears ag teacht síos an aghaidh.}
\]

\[
\text{Be-PAST the coming down the face} \quad \text{[and the tears were coming down the face.]}\]

Above the ML in Irish is probable but a closer examination highlights that the noun, even as a content morpheme in English, is not agreeing with the definite article. Therefore there is no asymmetry between the two languages and no ML can be identified, as a result of an incorrectly constructed utterance.

\[
\text{So James agus Tom tá siad best friends.}
\]

\[
\text{be they} \quad \text{[So James and Tom are best friends]}
\]

This final example again is an example of a loan translation, as the Irish language would call for the copula in this instance. \textit{Is} best friends \textit{iad James agus Tom}. As is evident in the translation, it transfers to English correctly but the lack of copula is the problem.
Among the Mixed clauses, 114 were returned as ambiguous, primarily due to lack of syntactical information or an ambiguous word order that could be Irish or English. Based on the analysis of the individual recordings, the ML can be speculated based on the contextual examination of the clause. To this end, the causes for ambiguity are classified under the following headings with examples from the corpus:

Reduced clause
The reduced clause can allow for ML to be speculated based on a contextual examination of the clause. The following example highlights this case:

An mbíonn tú ag freastal go dtí an pictiúrlann?
Sa Daingean?
Yeah.
Nó Trá Lí.
No. An mbíonn tusa?
Sa Daingean...hm: No.
Le Colm. **Do boyfriend.**
[Do you go to the cinema?
İN An Daingean?
Yeah.
Or Tralee.
No. Do you?
In An Daingean...hm: No.
With Colm. **Your boyfriend.**]

The verb is implied in the question do you? and therefore the clause *do boyfriend* assigned a speculative ML.

A lack of components
The earlier analysis of seven recordings has highlighted that a common cause of ambiguity is the lack of components from either English of Irish. The following example highlights this error:

*An mbeidh turkey I suppose?*
*Q be-FUT*
[Will be turkey I suppose?]
This clause is lacking a prepositional pronoun if Irish was to be the ML: An mbeidh turkey agat? [Will you have turkey?] If the question function was not present there would be a stronger case for English as the ML Beidh turkey I suppose. [There’ll be turkey I suppose.]

**Insufficient Information**
In this instance the clause cannot be supported as a reduced clause due to a lack of relevant contextual information. The clause itself is usually ill-formed with a series of content morphemes, as in the following example:

Crazy timpeall you know really. [crazy around you know really]

The preceding clause asks cad a bhí ar siúl agat? [what were you doing?] which cannot be aligned as a related clause.

**Code-switching within a clause**
There are instances whereby the clause contains an obvious switch between Irish and English rather than an EL site.

An bhfuil sé a:m supposed to say something? [Is it a:m …]

The ML cannot be identified given the obvious switch from Irish to English.

While the minority of clauses are loan translations, indicating a convergence towards English, Irish is the ML in the majority of clauses and therefore determined as the overall dominant ML.

**7.5 Discussion and Conclusion**
The chapter has focused on the application of the MLF to the corpus, and on identifying the ML is the mixed clauses. In this following discussion, a number of characteristics of the corpus will be presented and discussed in relation to previous research. These are all
related to the extended, and increasingly intense, language contact with English. There will also be some discussion on the corpus from both a macrosocial and microinteractional level, and these perspectives will complement the linguistic analysis that was carried out. The points of discussion are carried out primarily on the corpus as a whole, taking into consideration what Smith-Christmas (2012: 39) writes:

In looking at the conversational context as a whole, and not just isolated examples of code-switches, the analyst is in a stronger position to make postulations about what the code-switching means within a particular conversation. It is this analytic vantage point that will inform the discussions of the Gaelic-English code-switching that form the core of this thesis.

This overall analysis will complement the research previously outlined in the chapter and will pay particular attention to aspects of the corpus that the MLF does not provide for.

7.5.1 Loanwords

ten Hacken (2009: 399) asks two questions in relation to dictionaries: what does a dictionary say about a word and what does a dictionary say about a language. This issue is pertinent to minority languages, considering the current pressures from dominating languages, and in the case of Irish it is English that currently places pressure on the language to adapt and evolve. In the earlier chapters, it was presented how the introduction of new terminology traditionally coincided with major social changes within Ireland. However, since the mid-twentieth century a terminology committee has been working to ensure the Irish language is in a position to cope with new terminology. The question of terminology and Irish-language speakers was previously discussed in relation to the use of terminology (Ní Ghearáin 2011).

The MLF, as of 2002 revised version, does not engage in the discussion of loanwords, and considering the most uses of English in this corpus can be identified as a content morpheme with no affect on the ML, it is understandable why an guide to loanword identification is absent. Myers-Scotton (2002: 153) writes:

Elsewhere I have argued that, from a synchronic point of view, there is no need to make the borrowing vs. codeswitching distinction ... My reasoning is twofold.
First, a single model (the MLF model) can cover all singly occurring elements from the Embedded Language in the Matrix Language frame; that is, both established borrowings and singly occurring codeswitching forms largely are integrated into the morphosyntactic frame of the recipient or Matrix Language. With no evidence to the contrary, the same processes seem to be involved ... Second, the same model can cover phrase-level stretches of Embedded Language material, Embedded Language islands. The bottom line is that a model that can cover all Embedded Language forms within the bilingual CP arguably is superior to one that cannot.

Researchers, however, continue to make the definition between loans and codeswitches, and the work of Deuchar (2006: 1988) has been referred to in defining the difference between the two for Welsh-English data based on the word’s inclusion in a dictionary. This method was adopted for this corpus and each word was referenced against two dictionaries and one online terminology database. Often only spelling assimilates the loanwords that are present in these dictionaries, resulting in minor deviation to the pronunciation. The following words are examples from the corpus that were transcribed as English until their listedness altered their status to loanword: joke: jóc, clue: cliú, party: páirtí, casino: casino, canteen: ceaintín, boot: biút, jeep: jíp, quad: cuad. Given the use of these words, especially páirtí and cliú throughout the discourse, it is obvious that the new dictionaries are reflecting current trends in the spoken language. Upon enquiring to the online dictionary www.focloir.ie regarding the sources for the new additions to the Irish lexicon, the following response was provided:

In order to ensure that the Irish translations provided were both natural and in common currency, all of the ‘everyday language’ was translated without the use of any sources – the Irish translators were asked to provide the forms that they themselves use or have heard. After the translation phase had been completed, Foclóir Gaeilge-Béarla (Niall Ó Dónaill) and the English-Irish Dictionary (Tomás de Bhaldraíthe) were both used by our editors to ensure that there were no omissions in the words and phrases provided by the translators. (Duffín 2013, personal communication)

Prior to the launch of www.focloir.ie on 24 January 2013, with substantial updates on 18 December 2013 and 19 June 2014, there was no modern Irish language dictionary available with Ó Dónaill’s dictionary published in 1977. It also became apparent that although the participants were using ‘loanwords’ in their discourse, and primarily
adhering to the word order of Irish, that there was a self-awareness of using an ‘English’ word. The following is taken from the corpus, recording 16:

Am, yeah. Oh an bhfuil sibh ag dul go dtí am party le Síle, cóisir le Síle, sorry.

O-be you-PL going to with party with

[Am, yeah. Oh are ye going to Síle’s party, Síle’s party, sorry.]

And although the corpus predates the launch of www.focloir.ie, these words were certainly established within this speech corpus. The transition from switch to loan takes various amounts of time, for example this data was collected in 2008 and the words were considered switches until the online dictionary confirmed their status in 2013, if adhering to Deuchar’s (2006: 1988) listedness approach.

What becomes apparent is that the lexicographers assimilate the word accordingly, either phonetically or orthography, to justify its presence in the dictionary. At the beginning of this section are two questions asked by ten Hacken (2009: 399) and in response he (2009: 417) writes that:

A dictionary does not describe a language, but give information. This information is used to solve problems. The user consults a dictionary to answer particular questions. It is not the dictionary, but the user who answers these questions. The dictionary only provides information.

Therefore the presence of newly established loanwords in Irish answer a certain questions: does the dictionary use in vivo approaches to compiling the lexicon, is the Irish language version of an English loanword composed by top-down ideologies. To the dictionaries’ advantage, Ní Laoire (2012) observes the CM is in written form and this presents the lexicographers with a clean slate to compose the word suitably for inclusion in the Irish language dictionary.

7.5.2 Discourse Markers

The widespread use of discourse markers have been previously researched by O’Mally-Madec (2001). Within the MLF, discourse markers are considered content morphemes and therefore do not affect the identification of the ML. Their function is often to
maintain the flow of conversation and they are primarily associated with informal speech in Irish (O’Malley-Madec 2001: 271) and that there is a scale of permissibility for the discourse markers across style dimension. This is supported by the heavy use, especially by the female participants, across the corpus considering the informal setting of the recording, as well as the familiar interlocutor.

Despite their unofficial status as loanwords, not included in any of the three reference sources, the decision was to include them as loanwords during the analysis. The rationale was twofold: O’Malley-Madec’s (2001: 271-272) research supported their status as loanword due to their being ‘acquired by younger speakers from older speakers (that is by virtue of living in this particular speech community) and are not the immediate product of the contact of these two speakers with English’. The second reason is their metalinguistic status: often used for hedging, emphasis, pause filling, confirmation or a precursor to the succeeding information, and therefore have little impact on the overall structure of the clause.

The list of discourse markers recommended by O’Malley-Madec (2001) consists of *you know* (and variations), *you see*, *now*, *then*, *just*, *I mean*, *yes*, *yeah*, *okay*, *sure*, *by dad*, *right*, *because*, *so*, *I’d say*, *no*, *but*, *alright* and with the exception of *by dad*, which is somewhat dated, all these discourse markers appear in the corpus. These are all supported by Ó Duibhir’s (2009) doctoral thesis that presents the seven most used English words in his corpus as: *yeah*, *no*, *so*, *okay*, *just*, *like* and *right*. He (2009: 115-116) provides a list of the 25 most used English words in the corpus and these are used much more frequently than others, for example 535 uses of *yeah*, 121 uses of *right*. The next most used English word is *’cos/because* at 37 uses in his data. In light of the content of the corpus gathered for this research project, a number of discourse markers are recommended for the status of loanword based on their extensive and widespread use across the whole dataset. The list is as follows: *although*, *anyway*, *though*, *kinda*, and *I suppose.*
There also has been a shift in the use of *alright* and *really* from discourse markers to adjective and adverb/adjective, although the use of *really* as an adverb is primarily associated with one speaker. Examples are as follows:

\[ Bhí sé just chomh te like. Tar éis cúpla lá then tánn tú alright. \]
\[ be-PAST he so hot After few day be-DIA you \]
[It was just so hot like. After a few days then you’re alright.]

\[ ‘Cos is ceathrar really random sinn like. \]
\[ COP four people us \]
[‘Cos we’re a really random (group of) four like.]

As opposed to their position of discourse marker, that is still widely used in the corpus:

\[ Tá só, tá píosaí de suimiúil alright \]
\[ be it, be pieces of-it interesting \]
[It is, pieces of it are interesting alright]

\[ ‘Cos, theastaigh uaim, like ní raibh aon fonn amach orm really. \]
\[ Want-PAST from me neg be-PAST any desire out-on-me \]
[‘Cos I wanted, like I didn’t really want to go out really.]

Initially it was expected that the adverbial function of *really* as a would trigger an English adjective in the speaker based on the examples:

\[ Like, tá só really annoying though. \]
\[ be he \]
[Like, he’s really annoying though.]

\[ Fuair a lot really messy though, bhí like gloiní briste gach áit. \]
\[ get-PAST be-PAST glasses broken every place \]
[A lot got really messy though, there were like broken glasses everywhere.]

\[ Tá seo really cool actually. \]
\[ be DEM \]
[This is really cool actually.]

\[ Bhí só just really plain but bhí mo bhróga like am, bright bán dearg agus corcra. \]
\[ be-PAST it be-PAST my shoes pink and purple \]
[It was just really plain but my shoes were like am bright pink and purple.]
Bhios                just kind of really plain like.
be-PAST-1SG           [I was just kind of really plain like.]

However the are more examples of really preceding an Irish adjective than an English one. Again, this use of the word was restricted to one speaker and as is evident in the examples, she frequently used strings of English discourse markers. This would imply a level of convergence towards English within the speaker, particularly given the semi-formal setting of the data collection combined with Irish as the marked choice.

Considering there is literature published on the subject of English discourse markers in the Irish language lexicon (Ó Duibhir 2009, O’Malley-Madec 2001, Hickey 2009) their absence from any Irish language dictionary is noted. While in section 7.5.1 loanwords from the corpus were collaborated in the online dictionaries for Irish.

7.5.3 Nouns in the Plural Form
The pluralisation of nouns by adding the -s system marker was surprisingly present in the data. Stenson (1993: 115) writes about this phenomenon, and the use of English plural nouns, over twenty years ago and indicates that this was already evident in the early part of the 21st century.

The borrowing of English plural forms with borrowed nouns is very widespread in contemporary usage, more so than S-J’s \(^{56}\) comments suggest was the case at the beginning of the century. She notes that the words that she cites are all recognized as foreign, which I take to mean they are unassimilated borrowings. In general this is true today; however, two points should be noted. First, the -s ending is used even when the noun has undergone some degree of phonological assimilation: shorthorns /ʃaːrtərnəs/, stories /ʃtəriːs/, families /fæməliːs/. Second, de Bhaldráithe cites a limited number of cases where the -s plural seems to have spread to native words: e.g. ceannaí ‘hawkers’, gadaí ‘thieves’, sméaras ‘berries’. This usage may represent a minimal incursion of English inflectional morphology in the Irish noun system, although it remains extremely limited.

Stenson’s research has presented the method of pluralising nouns, especially English nouns by adding the Irish suffix -eanna, -anna. However, the most popular form of

\(^{56}\) Sjoestedt-Jonval (1938).
English plural nouns in the corpus is the bare form, with no assimilation. The following contain examples of this feature of the corpus:

*D’fhéadfaimis seats agus rudai eile like ...
  can-CON-IPL things other
* [We could get seats and other things like ...]

Well, chun a, chun am deoch a fháil sna bars caitheann ...
  to to drink get in-the-PL must
* [Well to, to get a drink in the bars you have ...]

duírt siad chuir sinn a:m na masks air féin
  say-PAST they put-PAST us the-PL on-him self-EMP
* [they said we put the masks on himself]

nuair a geobhaimid na torthaí ó na mocks beidh gach éinne á rá ‘oh no’ like
  when PART get-FUT the-PL results from the-PL be-FUT every person saying
* [when we’ll get the results from the mocks, everyone will be saying ‘oh no’ like.]

Like dul chun féachaint ar na coiní agus na seals or whatever in ionad ostán
  go-VN to look on-the-PL the-PL instead hotel
  big
* [Like go to look at the rabbits and the seals or whatever instead of a big hotel]

The ‘extremely limited’ case of using the -s suffix to Irish nouns occurs during the dataset, although it is still a limited occurrence. Some examples of this characteristic are listed before, note that whether *leaid* in the recordings occurs in Irish or English: *leaid* or *lads*, is difficult to determine due to close pronunciation, its listedness status and it being a homophonous diamorph.

Sure ní gheobhaidh na leaid s aon present d’aon duine.
  neg get-FUT the-PL any for any person
* [Sure none of the lads will get a present for anyone.]

*Ní dhíoladar as na tacsais ag dul ó an Daingean go dtí Quinn’s
  neg pay-PAST-IPL for the-PL taxi going from the to
to [They didn’t pay for the taxis going from Dingle to Quinn’s]

*Agus beidh mo deirfiúrs eile ann.
  be-FUT my sister other there
[And my other sisters will be there.]

_Agus beidh just na, na cupais a bhionn agat, plaisteach nó rud éigint is dócha._

[And it’ll be just the, the cups you have, plastic or something I hope.]

_\textsc{is dóigh caithfidh go bhfuil do freagra ...}\_

[COP opinion must-FUT that be your answer]

[I suppose your answers are ...]

There is a similar feature in Irish that is noted in Ó Sé’s (2000) comprehensive study of the Irish spoken in Corca Dhuibhne, some examples of this feature are: _cínios_ [diaries], _sneáidios_ [ants] and _scoláiríos_ [students] (2000: 89-92). Ó Sé notes -_ios_ as a method for pluralising a noun, however based on pronunciation in the recordings, this is not the suffix on Irish noun, it is the English suffix -s. He does not indicate any use of the use of English -s to pluralise an Irish noun. Here is an example of active convergence towards English supported by evident from a speech sample despite the MLF categorising plural markers as content morphemes and therefore permissible in either Irish or English.

7.5.4 The Vocative Case

There is a significant absence of the vocative case used throughout the entire corpus. It appears that the instances where it is used is consistently towards the beginning of the discourse and perhaps used ironically to ‘break the ice’. Irish is not the first language for most of the participants so it is expected that there would be a certain amount of shyness to be overcome in the conversations. The use of the vocative is almost used ironically throughout the dataset, with participants also using it when impersonating teachers. This matter will be developed when discussing stance in section 7.6.5.

_An raibh tú ag féachaint ar Ros na Rún aréir? [h]_

_Q-be-PAST you watching at last night_

_Ní bím ag féachaint ar Ros na Rún in aon chor. An raibh tusa a Mhicheál?_

_Néar be-HAB-1PL watching at at all Q-be-PAST you-EMP a Mhicheál?_

_PART VOC_

_Ní rabhas, no._

_Q-be-PAST-DIA-1PL_

[Were you watching Ros na Rún last night?]
I don’t watch Ros na Rún at all. Were you Micheal?
I wasn’t, no.

Bhí, sár chluiche a bhí agat though a Choilm.
[Yes, you had a great game though Colm.]

An bhfuil aon sprioc agat i gcomhair an bhliain nua Shane?
[Do you have any aims for the new year Shane?]

Tóg go bog é anois Pól.
[Take it easy now Pól.]

The vocative in Irish does not always alter the noun but it does require the noun to be preceded by -a in both singular and plural forms. Ó Sé’s (2000) study does not comment on this characteristic, implying that this is a development since the end of his fieldwork in the early nineties. The diminished use of the vocative is a sign of convergence towards English, but not a sign of a threatened language. For example, the Russian vocative case was lost in the course of historical development and in Modern Russian the vocative case is retained only in the word for God for all other words the nominative case is used (Kent 2010: 36).

7.5.5 CM and CS as a Communicative Strategy

The aim of applying the MLF to the dataset was to determine if Irish-English CM was a classic case with a dominant matrix language. There are other methods of examining CM and CS, for example examining the corpus on the microinteractional basis, conversational analysis and this allows for CM as a communicative strategy to be presented.

During the process of transcription, it became apparent that participants had contrasting attitudes to engaging with the fieldwork, despite agreeing to do so. One conversation in particular highlights a strong attitude from one participant. The conversation (recording 13) was recorded in two parts: the researcher stopped the conversation initially as a result of extended noise that would interfere with the recording and asked the participants to return. The second part began as normal. There is extensive CS in the first part and
looking at the micro-interactional the influencing factor, namely one participant’s attitude, is obvious:

Ábhar cainte. X factor. [Topics for discussion.]
What are you doing?
She’ll listen to this after so I’ll wreck this.
I hate this like. I don’t want to talk in Irish. I don’t like this language Irish. [h]
Labhraimís i Fraincis so, Louise.
speak-IMP-1PL in French
[We’ll speak in French so, Louise.]
Sorry?
We’ll speak French so.
I can’t speak French either. I can barely talk English girl.
[h]
25 minutes, what? I don’t think so. Fucks sake.

The second part of the recording commences as follows:

Thosnaigh an comhrá, thosnaigh!
start-IMP the conversation, start-IMP
Bhí gach duine ag caint Gaeilge so ba chóir dúinn.
Be-PAST every person speaking Irish COP-COND ought to-1PL
Yeah.
[Start the conversation, start!
Everyone else was speaking Irish so we should.
Yeah.]

Initially the participant has a defiant attitude towards speaking Irish and the first part of the conversation, after initial CS, eventually switches completely in English. The second part however starts with a change in mindset, illustrated in the extract above. It is strange that the participant agreed to being involved in the project but continued to be uncooperative during the recording process. It is encouraging that during the break period, perhaps after speaking with friends, the participant decided to cooperate completely. This example of CS was quite surprising however there are other samples of CS throughout the corpus. There are examples of CS to Spanish and French by one group of participants.
Je m'appelle Michael, j'ai dix-huit ans. J'aime bien sortir le weekend avec mes amis.
Me llamo Donnie, ah.
Que tal Donnie, me llamo Ronan.
Hablamos el espanol con el
No tengo pantalones.
[h]
No tengo pantalones.
[h]
Cú bhfuil do pantalones?
[h] En casa de une chica.
[h]
In a girl’s house.
En casa tu, tu, tu madre. [h]

The subject matter, however, is indicative of the silly nature of the discourse between three male interlocutors. The recording itself, while predominantly in Irish, contained many instances of impressions of teachers and the participants at times whispered to avoid being recorded. Mac Fhlanncadh (1999: 52) presents this use of CS as switching for resistance which as he writes:

... when the individual switch to English and make it obvious that by speaking English, they are breaking the Irish speaking monolingual norm of the school, yet they do eventually align to the Irish norm of the school.

Obviously the resistance, in both instances of switching to a language other than Irish, is against the setting of the recorded conversation, and as Mac Fhlanncadh writes, they do eventually align to the expected norm.

7.5.5 Stance towards the Irish language
While working with the recordings of the participants, it became apparent that they would often refer to what was expected of them, in terms of Irish language. As outlined in chapter five, the participants were aware that they were required to speak Irish however there seemed to be a stance regarding ‘good Irish’ and ‘their Irish’. Therefore while the recording session was semi-formal, with a familiar interlocutor and in a familiar location, there was a level of self-awareness as a result of the recording device (Wolfson 1976: 199) and Irish as the marked choice for the setting.
Traditionally the presence of CM indicates a marked choice of informality (Ó Domagáin 2013, Ní Laoire 2012, O’Malley-Madec 2001). As reviewed in section 3.9, Ní Laoire (2012) confirms O’Malley-Madec’s observation by commenting that fluent bilinguals will often not draw upon CM when in instances of formal discourse: radio interview, television interview, public meeting. The low levels of CM in each recording however would suggest that their use of CM is a characteristic of their H variation of Irish. This use of CM in relation to the H variety indicating formality emphasises a pattern that was previously refuted (Ní Laoire 2012, Ó Domagáin 2013, O’Malley-Madec 2001, 2007). This introduction of CM into the H variety links to the evidence in chapter six that the participants are not exposed to Irish-only interactions and therefore their idea of a H variety reflects this.

7.5.6 Conclusion
Over the course of this chapter, the classic case of CM as identified by the MLF has been confirmed, for the majority, with the Irish-English dataset. This was confirmed through a close analysis of the corpus and a clause-by-clause examination of the entire transcriptions. The status of classic CM is indicative of stability within the bilingual community and language proficiency of the speaker. Despite the widespread shift towards English within the Gaeltacht and the diminishing numbers of L1 speakers of Irish, this is a positive result. However, there are some elements of language contact that are the result of extended language contact, namely a heavier use of discourse markers, the English pluralisation of nouns and the diminished use of the vocative. By examining previous research, it shows that these are developments that are adhering to a trajectory.
The use of *really* as an adverb/adjective is exclusive to one speaker, and therefore cannot be considered a new characteristic of spoken speech in Irish as supported by this corpus.
Chapter Eight: Conclusion

The core meaning that we might extract from these is that a speech community comprises people who are in habitual contact with each other by means of speech which involves either a shared language variety or shared ways of interpreting the different language varieties commonly used in the area. (Mesthrie et al 2005: 38)

8.1 Outcomes

This thesis does not propose to directly answer why bilinguals CM in their speech pattern, as it is understood that bilinguals CM because they have two languages at their disposal. Over the period of the twentieth century to date, Irish speakers have shifted towards universal bilingualism, and with this the increased likelihood that a speaker will use English in some part of his/her daily is clearly responsible for the increase in CM (Stenson 1993: 121). The research does however propose to understand the use of CM given the sociolinguistic reality of the Gaeltacht, and further assesses what the CM pattern can tell us about the influence of English on Irish. On this note, the idea of peak bilingualism and peak exposure was presented in chapter six, and seeks to convey that the majority of participants are rarely exposed to monolingual Irish domains. Evidence from the language practices observed in the fieldwork, and in profiling the data, suggests that the speakers do not have any extensive domain of usage where an unmixed variety of Irish dominates, being limited to interactions with particular family members or teachers. These are obstacles that immersion education in the Gaeltacht must overcome as noted by the Department of Education and Skills in their 2013 Review of Education in the Gaeltacht:

This linguistic diversity in Gaeltacht schools presents a considerable challenge to the development of clearly defined policy options at a national level and for Gaeltacht schools. This linguistic diversity impacts on the ability of the school and of those parents who are Irish-speaking to foster a strong usage of Irish within school and in the home and community, particularly where Irish speakers are in a minority of the community. 104 of the 135 primary schools in Gaeltacht areas report that they teach through Irish. 19 of the 26 post-primary schools report that they teach through Irish. (Government of Ireland 2013: 3)
However, it has been pointed out by Ó Riagáin (1992) that the teaching through Irish does not always equate to teaching exclusively through Irish. This lack of monolingual domains does increase the use of CM, and in the case of weaker speakers, does contribute to a compromised ability in Irish. This sentiment is echoed in Mac Donnacha, Ní Chualáin, Ní Shéaghdha and Ní Mhainín (2005) who compiled data gathered from educators and parents of students attending school in the Gaeltacht. The report states:

In ainneoin, áfach, nach bhfuil brú ag teacht ó thuismitheoirí fhormhór na scoileanna imeacht ón teagasc trí Ghaeilge, feiceann na príomhoidí agus na múinteoirí Gaeltachta gur gá forbairt a dhéanamh ar an ról teanga agus oideachais atá a thug tuismitheoirí Gaeltachta má tá na múinteoirí, mar oideachasóirí, le hoidreas den scoth a chur ar fáil trí Ghaeilge do dhaltáí Gaeltachta. Tá sé seo fior ach go háirithe i gcás scoileanna atá lonnaithe sna ceantair sin ina bhfuil an Béarla in uachtar mar dheaglaí agus, arb i an fhadhb is mó dar leis na príomhoidí ‘nach bhfuil Gaeilge á labhairt sa bhaile ag na daltaí’ agus gurb é an tacaíocht is mó a theastaíonn ó na scoileanna ‘ná spéis na dtuismitheoirí sa bhaile’. (2005: 2)

[Despite, however, that there is no pressure coming from parents from most of the schools to end teaching through Irish, the Gaeltacht principals and teachers see that there is a need to develop the language and education role of the Gaeltacht parents if the teachers, as educators, are going to deliver top-class education through Irish to the Gaeltacht students. It is true especially in the case of schools located in regions where English is stronger as the home language that the biggest problem is, according to the principals, ‘that Irish is not being spoken by the students at home’ and that the most important support the schools need is ‘the interest of the parents at home’.]

While Ferguson (1959: 249) comments that there should be more focus on the mixed language rather than the standard variety or language, and uses the word ‘intermediate’ to describe the mixed variety, this thesis argues that intermediate is the incorrect term. Intermediate has connotations of temporality, implying the mixed language is merely a stepping-stone towards the High or Low language, or simply between two varieties. This presumption of temporality is also noted by Mac Fhlanachadha (1999: 55) who determines the use of CM as a communicative strategy en route to proficient language acquisition. In the case of Irish, the practice of CM has been noted as a trait of informal speech (L) (Ni Laoire 2012, Ó Domagáin, O’Malley-Madec 2001, 2007) and by default the un-mixed speech is indicative of formality. The formal or H variety of Irish carries
associations of authenticity and legitimacy that represent a ‘good language’ in an ideal and abstract concept. Ó Domagáin (2013: 239) views CM as a characteristic of a young generation who have grown up in a Gaeltacht environment that has changed since the ‘good’ older speakers acquired Irish. The linguistic findings of this thesis show that CM is a trait across L-H varieties, based on the presence of CM in a semi-formal speech sample. It should be reiterated again that this CM is by competent speakers that is used within a stable differentiation between languages rather than CM for a communicative strategy.

The question of cultural identity was key to the contextual setting of the project, and the demographic of the participants. Bhabha (2005) has presented this idea of cultural hybridity and it is most pertinent to the Irish situation. The English influence is, today, unavoidable and as the profiles of the participants display, English is embedded within the sociospatial linguistic networks of these young adults. The L1 speakers within the group have two distinct language patterns: Irish at home and within the local community [village], and English at school and with most friends not from the same local community. This evidence aligns itself with Ní Neachtain’s (2012) data where she notes the shift towards bilingualism rather than diglossia in her participants.

The debate at Pobalscoil Chorca Dhuibhne only highlighted this fact. Again reminiscent of the phrase used by non-Irish speakers resident in the Gaeltacht areas: ‘We’re in the Gaeltacht too, though we have no Irish!’ (Ó Gadhra’s 1989: 12). The monolingual English-speakers of the Gaeltacht areas are often forgotten, set aside while the emphasis of research is on the remaining native speakers of Irish. If the trajectory of decline continues, the monolingual English-speaking population will be in the majority (this is already the case is some areas) and it is possible that there will be an increase in language disputes and more demands made to accommodate the ‘minority speech community’ of the Gaeltacht. The outcome of the school debate, that was lead by young ideology brokers from the school, is a more inclusive and comprehensive language policy that should encourage Irish as the community language in Corca Dhuibhne.
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While the declining number of L1 speakers of Irish is active, it is necessary to recognise the signs of language death, (Deuchar 2006: 16) by examining the spoken language of individuals. And this was carried out by this thesis.

When people speak, they inevitably convey much more than their words and sentences articulate ‘literally’, and a great deal gets expressed much more indirectly, with different aspects of the communicative stream drawing on a wide range of unstated assumptions that often vary in apparentness to their interlocutors – assumptions about activities, manners, relationships, people, places, the past, the future, etc. These unstated assumptions are developed through social experience, and to the extent that they provide a baseline for the explicit part of an utterance to make sense – and to the extent that they are unquestioned by the recipients – they can be analysed as tiny pieces of taken-for-granted social structure. (Rampton 2006: 24-25)

The approach of this thesis has provided a linguistic analysis of the CM speech, characteristic of the young adult participants in a semi-formal setting. Each marked and unmarked choice of a speaker is a result of a series of factors, national, regional and individual factors that are unique to each speech community and each speaker. To better understand these factors, a complementary sociolinguistic contextual framing of the corpus was carried out on both a national (chapter one) and local (chapter four) scale. These contextual factors can influence the pattern of CM that is engaged by speakers and Muysken (2000) and Gardner-Chloros (2009, 2009a) highlight the pertinence of sociolinguistic factors.

The participants’ stance towards the Irish language, according to the corpus, is that of a language consisting of nathanna cainte and seanfhocal [phrases and proverbs] associated with older speakers, primarily teachers. This stance lines up with Ó Domagáin’s (2013: 239) categorisation of ‘good speakers’ as an older generation. Assessing this stance has allowed me to conceptualise ‘the processes of indexicalisation that are the link between individual performance and social meaning.’ (Jaffe 2009: 4)

8.2 Contribution to the Field
As its older speakers die out and as the number of Irish native speakers declines compared to the L2 learners whose variety of the language has acquired a particular cachet among the young, there is a possibility of accelerated change in
the language, and a pressing need for more study of these changes in Irish. 
(Hickey 2009: 685)

This research project is contributing to a better understanding the status of Irish within the Corca Dhuibhne Gaeltacht, and this understanding can be extended to the other Gaeltacht areas of Ireland. The successful application of the MLF has proved that the Irish-English CM observed among the participants, for the vast majority of instances, is indeed a case of ‘classic’ CM. This status confirms that there is language stability in the young adult speech community, despite the presence of CM in their speech repertoire. The linguistic and sociolinguistic approach of this thesis proved complementary in aligning the research at such a critical time in the cycle of the Irish language. The thesis aimed to mirror Deuchar’s work on Welsh-English bilinguals. ‘We shall demonstrate that a careful analysis of the structural nature of bilingual speech can be used to determine whether or not the linguistic conditions favouring language shift or language death can be found’ (Deuchar 2006: 15-16). Therefore despite concerns from Irish language researchers (Ó Giollagáin et al 2007; Ní Laoire 2012; Ó Cuirnéáin 2013) that the language is forming a mixed form that is a compromised variation of Irish, this thesis confirms the contrary. The data from this project’s corpus has demonstrated that CM, within the boundaries of the MLF, indicates stability and not a compromised variety. It is important to reiterate that the CM analysis in the chapter seven primarily examined utterances by speakers with reasonable levels of proficiency, with examples of CM indicating compromised structures highlighted in the text. The compromised variation of Irish, An Nua-Ghaeilge (Ní Laoire 2012), would be labeled ‘composite’ and not ‘classic’ CM (Myers-Scotton 2002) and is present in ‘learner bilinguals’ and indicates an active shift towards English. The case of this ‘mixed’ Irish, rather than CM’ed Irish, would not be upheld by the MLF and in this instance perhaps MacSwan’s (2005) Minimalist Approach would be a more appropriate framework for analysis.

As the MLF has not previously been applied to an Irish-English corpus, this project supports its universality among language pairs, even those with a typological distance between them.
8.3 Areas for future research

There are some issues raised by Ó Riagáin’s research (1992) that could be further investigated with the data collected for this project. One such area is the high proportion of in-migrants who were married women and how their linguistic relationship to their spouse would affect the home language. It is likely that some of the parents and grandparents of this project’s participants were involved in Ó Riagáin’s survey. As outlined in chapter six, a number of participants speak Irish to one parent, primarily the father and the paternal grandparents. Ó Riagáin’s (1992: 59) survey sought responses for the Irish language competence of the respondents’ parents and spouses, and this would allow for a generational overview of language shift to be presented.

A certain focus that is beyond the scope of this research project would be a comparison in the language styles of males and females. Certainly the female participants spoke more than the male participants in mixed-sex recordings and according to the volume of clauses in single-sex groupings. It would be pertinent to the study of female figures as carriers for intergenerational language acquisition. This would be complementary to the work of Hickey (2011) who discusses the contrast between female and male speakers.

The corpus itself would be a beneficial addition to the Corca Dhuibhne dialect study of Ó Sé (2000), particularly given the absence of younger participants from his extensive and lengthy study of the spoken Irish. Already in chapter seven, there were some characteristics of the spoken Irish that were not evident in his work, indicating the ongoing development of Irish as a result of language contact with English.


Making systematic comparisons between CS in different language combinations and different contexts is the best way to elucidate the contribution of typological factors on the one hand, and sociolinguistic ones on the other, to the patterns of CS in different communities. So far, only a few such comparisons are available. On the whole, researchers base their discussions of CS on their own data, collected in a single community, and do not have access to comparable data sets from other communities.
Considering there are at least two other doctoral theses (Ó Duibhir 2009; Ó Domagáin 2009) focusing on CM between Irish and English it would worthwhile investigating future collaborations in this area. This collaborative work would allow for the in-depth comparison of sociolinguistic factors, loanwords and CM across varieties and styles. There is also the work Smith-Christmas (2009, 2012, 2013) on CS between Scottish Gaelic and English, and given the close relation between Irish and Gaelic, a comparative analysis could address contribute to a previously under-researched area of Celtic linguistics.
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Appendices
Appendix A

Tá an togra seo dírithe ar úsáid agus ar mhéascadh na Gaeilge agus an Bhéarla i gcaint na ndaoine óga i gCorca Dhuibhne. Beidh ceistneoir le lionadh ag na daoine óga agus déanfar comhrá, thart ar 20 nóiméad, eatarthu ar ábhar ginerála a thairfeadh. Roghnaíodh scoláire Phobalscoil Chorca Dhuibhne toisc go bhfuil siad ag freastal ar mhéánscoil Ghaeltachta, ach go bhfuil an-éagsúlacht sa chúlra teanga atá acu (cuid acu a labhraíonn an Ghaoluinn ó bhí siad ina leanaí óga, cuid acu a d’fhoghlaím ar scoil i agus araile). Tá tograí cosúla leis seo ar siúl timpeall na cruinne –An Bhreatnais agus an Béarla sa Bhreatain Bheag, teanga labhartha daltaí scoile i Londain agus sna Stáit Aontaithe, mar shampla.

Bheinn buíoch dióta ndearfái liom an dtabharfai cead dom labhairt le do pháiste féin, nó a mhalaírt:
Is iad seo a leasana a coinniollacha a bhaineann leis an rannpháirtíocht thuasluaite:

Tugaim / Ní thugaim cead an t-eolas sa cheistneoir a úsáid le haghaidh taighde agus/nó teagaisc amháin (foilseacháin acadúla agus/nó tuairiscí san áireamh) faoi choimnioll nach luafadh ainm an scoláire ná aon eolas eile a thabharfadh le fios cé hé/hí.

Tugaim / Ní thugaim cead don taighdeoir, Guinevere Darcy, an comhrá taifeadta a úsáid.
Mar choimnioll ní bheidh tagairt d’ainm an scoláire sa taighde as seo amach.

Tugaim / Ní thugaim cead don taighdeoir sleachta ó na sonraí a úsáid ina cuid oibre scriofa agus/nó labhartha, gan a thuilleadh ceada ón rannpháirtí uaimse.

Tá sé de cheart agat taraingt siar ón gconradh rannpáirtíochta seo ag am ar bith, agus bainfear gach eolas agus faisnéis a bhaineann leis scoláire den taighde dá tháirse.

Bheinn buíoch dióta an fhóirm seo a shíniú ag a chur ar bpríomhoide.

Ainm tuismitheora/caomhnóra:

Ainm agus rang an scoláire:

Seoladh:

Síniú tuismitheora/caomhnóra:

Dáta:

Má tá fonn ort dul i dtaighmháil le duine neamhspleách faoin staidéar seo is féidir teagmháil a dhéanamh le:
Cathaoirleach, Coiste Eítice Taighde na hOllscoil,
f/ch Oifig an Leasuachtaráin Acadúil agus Cláraitheora, Ollscoil Luimnigh, Luimneach.
Guthán: 061 202 022
The project is concentrating on the use and mixing of Irish and English in the speech of young people in Corca Dhuibhne. The young participants will complete a questionnaire and have a twenty minute conversation between them, based on general topics, recorded. The students of Pobalscoil Chorca Dhuibhne were chosen because they are attending a Gaeltacht secondary school and there is a great variety in their language backgrounds (some have been speaking Irish since they were young, others have acquired it at school, etc.). Similar projects are taking place all over the world – Welsh and English in Wales, the spoken language of school students in London and America, for example.

I would be very grateful if you could inform me whether you would/would not prefer your child to participate.

The following are the conditions of participation:

- **I consent / I do not consent** that the information given on the questionnaire can be used for research and/or teaching purposes only (including research publications and/or reports) subject to strict preservation of the anonymity of the student.

- **I consent / I do not consent** to also hereby give complete permission to the researcher, Guinevere Darcy, to use the recorded conversation on condition that there will be no reference to the name of the student in the project in the future.

- **I consent / I do not consent** to give the researcher permission to present excerpts of these data as part of her work in written and/or oral form, without further permission from me.

You have the right to revoke your agreement to participate in this study and to remove all of your data from inclusion at any time as a result.

I would be grateful if you could sign this form and return it to the principal.

Name of Parent/Guardian:

_______________________________________________________

Name and class of the student:

_______________________________________________

Address:

_______________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________

Signature of Parent/Guardian:

__________________________________________

Date:

_______________________________________________________

If you have concerns about this study and wish to contact someone independent, you may contact:

The Chairman of the University of Limerick Research Ethics Committee,
c/o Vice President Academic and Registrar's Office, University of Limerick, Limerick.
Tel: 061 202 022
Tá taighde ar siúl sa scoil atá dírithe ar nósanna teanga na scoláirí agus mar sin tá a gcuid rannpháirtíochta de dhíth ag an taighdeoir, Guinevere Darcy, ó Ollscoil Luimnigh.

Is iad seo a leanas na coinníollacha a bhaineann leis an rannpháirtíocht thuasluaite:

Cead a thabhairt chun an t-eolas sa cheistneoir a úsáid le haghaidh taighde agus/nó teagaisc amháin (foilseacháin agus/nó tuairisci san áireamh) faoi choinnioll nach luafaí ainm an scoláire ná aon eolas eile a thabharfadh le fios cé hé/hí.

Cead iomlán a thabhairt don taighdeoir, Guinevere Darcy, an t-eolas a baint leis an gceistneoir agus cómhrá taifeadta a úsáid. Mar choinnioll ní bheidh tagaírt ar ainm an scoláire sa taighde as seomhtmlú.

Cead a thabhairt don taighdeoir sleachta ó na sonraí a úsáid ina cuid oibre scríofa agus/nó labhartha, gan a thuilleadh ceada ón rannpháirtí.

Tá sé de cheart agat tarraingt siar ón geonradh rannpháirtíochta seo agus an t-eolas ar fad a bhaineann leis an scoláire a bhaint amach as an staidéar ar bith.

**Muna bfhíl tú ag iarraidh le do pháiste/i páirt a ghlacadh sa taighde seo sínigh agus seol an fhoirm seo ar ais don phríomhoide.**

**Ainm tuismitheora/caomhnóra:**

**Ainm agus rang an scoiláire:**

**Seoladh:**

**Síniú tuismitheora/caomhnóra:**

**Dáta:**
CONSENT FORM

Research is being conducted in the school on language practices of the students and their participation is required by the researcher, Guinevere Darcy, from the University of Limerick.

These are the conditions of the participation:

To consent that the information given on the questionnaire can be used for research and/or teaching purposes only (including research publications and/or reports) subject to strict preservation of the anonymity of the student.

To also hereby give complete permission to the researcher, Guinevere Darcy, to use information from the questionnaire and the recorded conversation on condition that there will be no reference to the name of the student in the project in the future.

To give the researcher permission to present excerpts of these data as part of her work in written and/or oral form, without further permission.

You have the right to revoke your agreement to participate in this study and to remove all of your data from inclusion at any time.

If you do not want your child/children to participate in this study please sign and return this form to the principal.

Name of Parent/Guardian:  

Name and class of the student:  

Address:  

Signature of Parent/Guardian:  

Date:  
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The research project is looking at the spoken language of young adults in a bilingual community (Irish/English in this case). The participants will be asked to complete a questionnaire and to be recorded in conversation with another participant. The conversation will be between 20-30 minutes long based on general topics. The students of Pobalscoil Chorca Dhuibhne were chosen as they are a school that is located in the Gaeltacht. The research is unique to Ireland but similar studies are underway around the world- Welsh and English in Wales, the spoken language of young adults at school in London and the spoken language of young adults at school in America. The names of the students will be concealed and their names will be known only to the researcher, Guinevere Darcy.

On signing the consent form the student agrees that he/she understands what is involved with his/her participation in the study. The participant has the right to revoke their agreement and to remove all of their data from inclusion at any time.

If you have concerns about this study and wish to contact someone independent, you may contact:

The Chairman of the University of Limerick Research Ethics Committee,  
c/o Vice President Academic and Registrar's Office,  
University of Limerick,  
Limerick.

Tel: (061) 202022
Appendix C

Ollscoil Luimnigh
University of Limerick

Cúlra

1. Inscne: □ fear □ bean

2. Dáta Breithe: ____________________

3. Cén áit ar rugadh agus tógadh tú?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

4. Cén t-aos a bhí agat nuair a bhí an Ghaoluinn ar do thoil agat?
   □ 3 bliana d’aois nó níos óige.
   □ bhíos sa naíonra/creche.
   □ bhíos ar bhunscoil.
   □ bhíos ar mheánscoil.

5. Cén t-aos a bhí agat nuair a bhí an Béarla ar do thoil agat?
   □ 3 bliana d’aois nó níos óige.
   □ bhíos sa naíonra/creche.
   □ bhíos ar bhunscoil.
   □ bhíos ar mheánscoil.

6. Más i naíonra/creche a bhí, cén teanga is mó a d’úsáid na stiúrthóirí ann? Cuir tic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gaoluinn Amháin</th>
<th>Gaoluinn den chuid is mó</th>
<th>50/50</th>
<th>Béarla den chuid is mó</th>
<th>Béarla amháin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
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8. Cén bhunscoil a d'fhreastailís uirthi? _______________________________________
9. Cén teanga is mó a d'úsáid na múinteoirí sa bhunscoil? Cuir tic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gaoluinn Amháin</th>
<th>Gaoluinn den chuid is mó</th>
<th>50/50</th>
<th>Béarla den chuid is mó</th>
<th>Béarla amháin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. Cén teanga is mó a úsáideann na múinteoirí i do mheánscoil? Cuir tic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gaoluinn amháin</th>
<th>Gaoluinn don chuid is mó</th>
<th>50/50</th>
<th>Béarla don chuid is mó</th>
<th>Béarla amháin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. Aon eolas breise féin meánscoil? Ar fhreastailís ar níos mó ná meánscoil amháin?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gaoluinn amháin</th>
<th>Gaoluinn den chuid is mó</th>
<th>50/50</th>
<th>Béarla den chuid is mó</th>
<th>Béarla amháin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Do mháthair
D’athair
Máthair do mháthar
Athair do mháthar
Máthair d’athar
Athair d’athar
Do dheirfiúr
(cuir tic do gach deirfiúr)
Do dheartháir
(cuir tic do gach deaftháir)
Gaol eile?

13. Aon eolas breise fé do theaghlach? Cé a bhí ina chónaí libh?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
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**Fé láthair / Inniu**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gaoluinn Amhán</th>
<th>Gaoluinn den chuid is mó</th>
<th>50/50</th>
<th>Béarla den chuid is mó</th>
<th>Béarla amháin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do theaghlach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do chairde ag baile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do chairde scoile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do chairde i gclub</td>
<td>spóirt/siamsaíochta/céile.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ainm an club:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múinteoirí</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa phobal i gcoitinne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Aon eolas breise? An labhrann tú Gaoluinn le duine/scata nach bhfuil ar an liosta?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

16. Cé chomh minic is a dheineann tú n’a rudaí seo? Cuir tic leo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Go minic</th>
<th>O am go chéile</th>
<th>Ní dheinim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Féachaint ar cláracha Gaoluinne ar TG4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Éisteacht le Raidió na Gaeltachta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Foine</em> a léamh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Misneach</em> a léamh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An t-alt as Gaoluinn san <em>Irish Times</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris/ Nuachtán eile?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ainm na hírisí/an nuachtáin:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dul ar <a href="http://www.beo.ie">www.beo.ie</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dul ar <a href="http://www.nosmag.com">www.nosmag.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. An mbíonn tú gníomhach le heachtraí eile a sheidhmíonn trí Ghaoluinn? Céard iad?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
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18. An bhfuil tú chun an Ghaoluinn a úsáid i ndiaidh na hArdteiste?

☐ Bead fós á labhairt ag baile le mo mhuintir.
☐ Bead fós á labhairt le mo chairde.
☐ Ba mhaith liom an Ghaoluinn a úsáid i mo chuid oibre.
☐ Níl sé ar intinn agam an Ghaoluinn a úsáid i ndiaidh na hArdteiste.

19. Ar mhaith leat do chuid páistí a thógáil le Gaoluinn?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gaoluinn amháin</th>
<th>Gaoluinn den chuid is mó</th>
<th>$50/50</th>
<th>Béarla den chuid is mó</th>
<th>Béarla amháin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Maidir le do fhreagra thuas: cén fáth gur roghnaigh tú é?
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

21. Cén teanga is fearr leat d’oideachas do pháistí amach anseo?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gaoluinn amháin</th>
<th>Gaoluinn den chuid is mó</th>
<th>$50/50</th>
<th>Béarla den chuid is mó</th>
<th>Béarla amháin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Maidir le do fhreagra thuas: cén fáth gur roghnaigh tú é?
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

23. Cén teanga, an dóigh leat, is ceart a cur ar fáil do scoláirí Gaeltachta san oideachas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gaoluinn amháin</th>
<th>Gaoluinn den chuid is mó</th>
<th>$50/50</th>
<th>Béarla den chuid is mó</th>
<th>Béarla amháin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naíonra/creche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunscoil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meánscoil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ú leibhéal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Institiúid Teicneolaíochta, Ollscoil, srl.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aim: _____________________________________________________________
Sín: _____________________________________________________________
Dáta: _____________________________________________________________

Go raibh maith agat as ucht é seo a lionadh isteach.
Appendix D

Ábhair Chainte

Is féidir caint faoi do rogha rud ach tá le seo liosta d’ábhair más gá leo.

· Áiseanna sa Daingean.
· An tOireachtas.
· Postanna páirt-aimseartha – an mbíonn tú ag obair le linn na bliana?
· Ros na Rún.
· An mbíonn sibh ag freastal ar an Phoenix?
· Scannán atá feicte agat le déanaí.
· Leabhar atá léite agat le déanaí.
· An saol sóisialta sa Daingean.
· An samhradh seo caite - an raibh post agat? An raibh laethanta saoire agat?
· Aifric
· Cén duine is fearr leat san X Factor?
· An Nollaig - céard is gnáth leat a dhéanamh ar an lá?
· Lá an Dreoilín – an mbíonn suim agat?
· Cén ceol is fearr leat?
· Ar fhreastal tú ar ceolchoirm le déanaí?