

The Effects of Hegemonic Support of Endangered Languages on Language Ideologies

2017

Christy Box
University of Central Florida

Find similar works at: <http://stars.library.ucf.edu/honorsthesis>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

 Part of the [Linguistic Anthropology Commons](#), and the [Social and Cultural Anthropology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Box, Christy, "The Effects of Hegemonic Support of Endangered Languages on Language Ideologies" (2017). *Honors in the Major Theses*. 177.

<http://stars.library.ucf.edu/honorsthesis/177>

This Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the UCF Theses and Dissertations at STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors in the Major Theses by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact lee.dotson@ucf.edu.

THE EFFECTS OF HEGEMONIC SUPPORT OF ENDANGERED
LANGUAGES ON LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES

by

CHRISTY BOX

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Honors in the Major Program in Anthropology
in the College of Sciences
and in The Burnett Honors College
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Spring Term, 2017

Thesis Chair: Dr. Beatriz Reyes-Foster

Abstract

Endangered languages are those that are spoken by a very small percentage of the population and are at risk of disappearing with all the knowledge and diversity they contain. Endangered languages often become endangered because the speakers and the society perceive the language as low status or of little use, and a positive change in perception of the language could aid in revitalizing the language. Institutions such as governments, businesses, and universities have recently begun supporting endangered languages in several areas, and this support could greatly affect language ideologies, perceptions of and attitudes about the language. In this research project, I intend to explore the effects on how an endangered language is viewed by both speakers and non-speakers when it is supported by linguistically dominant institutions such as business and higher education. This research was conducted in various areas of Scotland and Ireland and consists of survey data, ethnographic interviews, and participant observation. Specifically, this research aims to answer the following research questions:

- 1) What is the relationship between institutional support and language ideologies?
- 2) How do different forms of institutional support affect language ideologies?

Institutional support of endangered languages could provide these languages with validity and recognition as a language, as well as offer economic and status advantages to speakers, creating positive attitudes about speaking and learning the languages. This positive change in the way these languages are perceived could be a crucial step in revitalizing endangered languages and preserving the linguistic diversity of the world.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the many people who made this project and this thesis possible. I wish to offer my sincere gratitude to Dr. Beatriz Reyes-Foster, who took me under her mentorship as a sophomore and guided me through the extent of this project and all its challenges. This project was possible because of her tremendous dedication to her students' success, sacrifice of time and energy, and commitment to developing a young researcher through the last three years. She has influenced my work and my life in ways that will stay with me for a lifetime, and she has been the best mentor I could ask for. I would also like to thank Dr. Shana Harris and Dr. Beth Young for dedicating their time to my thesis committee and helping me develop this thesis. This project was also made possible by the staff of the Research and Mentoring Program, Summer Undergraduate Research Fellowship, Burnett Research Scholars, and Honors in the Major. Their investment of time and funding in my research and commitment to developing undergraduate students into successful researchers has provided me with so much guidance and opportunity. I would also like to thank the staff at the language boards, universities, and businesses who were willing to take the time to work with me. They were essential in developing contacts and reaching participants, and they helped me turn this project into a reality. I also wish to offer my gratitude to Dr. Amanda Groff and Dr. Joanna Mishtal, who encouraged me in my research pursuits and helped me however they could. Finally, I would like to thank my family, who supported me at every step of my research as they have through every other success and challenge of my life.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	5
Endangered Languages and Hegemony	5
Language Ideologies	6
Scottish Gaelic.....	8
Irish Gaelic	10
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	12
Participant Selection and Recruitment	12
Survey Design	13
Interview Design	14
Fieldwork and Participant Observation.....	14
Reflexivity Statement.....	15
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS.....	16
Survey Data.....	16
Interview Data.....	23
Participant Observation.....	27
Language Ideologies	32
Institutional Support.....	33
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION.....	36
CONCLUSIONS.....	40
APPENDIX A: IRB OUTCOME LETTER	41
APPENDIX B: SURVEY DATA.....	43
REFERENCES	54

List of Figures

Figure 1	11
Figure 2	16
Figure 3	17
Figure 4	18
Figure 5	18
Figure 6	19
Figure 7	20
Figure 8	21
Figure 9	22
Figure 10	32
Figure 11	34
Figure 12	35

Chapter 1: Introduction

Endangered languages are languages that are spoken by a very small percentage of the population and are at risk of disappearing with all the knowledge they contain. Half of the world's 7,000 languages are considered endangered (Harrison 2007, 3-7). Loss of languages can lead to disastrous effects on peoples' lives. These effects include loss of the archive of cultural knowledge contained within languages and erosion of other areas of traditional culture. Cultural knowledge that a society has collected throughout history is contained within languages in a way that is transmitted along with the language automatically. This cultural knowledge includes information about the environment, plants and animals, places, and concepts that are designed to be transmitted within the matrix of the language (Harrison, 2007). This information has led to surprising discoveries in the past, such as an HIV drug that was discovered through conversations with a Samoan tribal leader. Living indigenous languages have been of great assistance in deciphering texts of ancient civilizations, as Yucatec Maya was used to interpret Maya glyphs and the Mixe-Zoquean language family was used to reconstruct the Olmec language (Evans, 2010). Moreover, loss of language often leads to a loss of other areas of traditional culture. As Fishman states, "[M]ost cultures reveal the 'domino principle' is in operation and when any of their main props, such as language, are lost, most other props are seriously weakened and are far more likely to be altered and lost as well" (1991:17). Conversely, the revitalization of language often accompanies the reintroduction of other aspects of traditional culture, as in the revitalization of Native American rituals, worship, dances, songs, and crafts when indigenous languages were reintroduced on reservations (Fishman 1991:18). Languages provide an important link to a valuable cultural past that may otherwise be lost

Loss of language also leads to loss of ethnic and cultural identities. When these communities are dominated by another culture, this disappearing link to their identity becomes a unifying force for a cultural identity which is being lost in the wake of a more powerful community (Fishman, 1991). Governments in the past have tried to stamp out unassimilated identities by penalizing the use of minority languages. The Russian government banned the Tofa language. Russia also refused to let children speak Ös or made them feel ashamed of the language, and the government made it a punishable offense for the Ös people to develop an alphabet for their language (Harrison, 2007). A similar tactic was used with Welsh in the United Kingdom, where schoolchildren were threatened with corporal punishment for speaking Welsh (Crystal, 2000). Many other minority languages have received similar treatment from the government of the country in which the speakers reside. Language endangerment threatens ethnic and cultural identities throughout the world.

Languages also contain styles of expression unique to a linguistic community. A common argument for linguistic diversity is to imagine a world without any given language, such as English, Spanish, or French (Crystal, 2000). If English had died, there would be no works of William Shakespeare or Jane Austen, Robert Frost or Elizabeth Barrett Browning, Stephen Sondheim or Irving Berlin. Indigenous languages contain repertoires of their own. Many cultures do not even have the benefit of writing, and their oral culture is always a generation away from death (Evans, 2010). Language loss means the loss of archives of knowledge, traditional culture, group identity, cultural expressions, and many other aspects of a society.

Several factors are commonly cited as reasons for language endangerment. Environmental and political upheaval, such as natural disasters, loss of habitat, war and violence,

can uproot groups of people and leave them with no choice but to shuffle into the dominant culture for survival, often suppressing their language in the process (Crystal, 2000). However, the most common causes are the economic and social disparities between minority language communities and the dominant culture. The dominant society usually controls access to education and better employment, requiring a mastery of the dominant language for success. This situation of less education, lower income, lower literacy, and lack of everyday conveniences for the minority language speakers makes the minority group and its language stand as a symbol for poverty and ignorance. This disparity makes the ambitious members of the community want to distance themselves from the group and the language (Fishman, 1991).

This research project explores how institutions such as universities and businesses supporting endangered languages affect how people perceive the languages. This project specifically focuses on the cases of Irish and Scottish Gaelic, as these languages are supported in some way by the government, universities, and businesses. These languages are still learned and spoken in these institutions, making them excellent languages with which to explore the effects of these institutions on perceptions.

This research was conducted through surveys, interviews, and participant observation in Scotland and Ireland. A survey, gauging change in language ideologies between the time a participant entered a language-supporting institution and the present, was dispersed to various universities and businesses for interested faculty, students, and employees to participate. Survey participants had the option to participate in an interview after the survey. During the interview phase of the research, I undertook participant observation in Scotland and Ireland to observe how the languages were used in the context of institutions and the surrounding communities.

This project showed an overall positive change in language ideologies. Respondents generally reported feeling more positive about the language currently than they did when they entered the institution. Participants expressed several reasons for this change. One factor was Gaelic languages being used in the main work of the institution, such as university classes or business communication. Another factor was the increased opportunity to speak the language with others where a speaker might otherwise use English, such as in social activities or speaking with authority figures. Additionally, institutions helped participants find a way in which Gaelic would be useful in their careers. Although the positive change in language ideologies is not uniform throughout the responses, exposure to the language within the institution did show a correlation with increasingly positive language ideologies.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Endangered Languages and Hegemony

Endangered languages are those that are spoken by a very small percentage of the population and are at risk of disappearing with all the knowledge they contain (Harrison 2007:3-7). Most languages become endangered because the dominant society views these languages as low-status and useless. Thus, the society and the speakers develop negative language ideologies (Fishman 1991:60). Gramsci's theory of hegemony maintains that those in power exert this power to spread ideologies that the society accepts and consents to until it becomes "common sense." According to the theory of hegemony, these language ideologies come from the institutions that support the ideologies (Gramsci 1999:625-629). Gramsci stated, "In acquiring one's conception of the world one always belongs to a particular grouping which is that of all the social elements which share the same mode of thinking and acting" (1999:627). In this work, Gramsci popularized the concept of hegemony, in which ideology is derived from the institutions, organizations, and life activities that create and support the ideology. In this way, groups of lower status in society accept conceptions that they do not create or assess, but borrow from the hegemonic structure (Ives 2004:80-81). Linguistic hegemony can come through any number of institutions in the hegemonic structure, such as government, education, business, religious institutions, and the media (Ives 2004:83). The hegemonic structure can influence directly, such as through government language policy and funding for education and educational resources (Ives 2004:108). However, it oftentimes influences more subtly so individuals and organizations seem to choose freely to use language in a certain way. In both cases, the hegemonic structure exerts control through power relations (Ives 2009:662). Moreover, this

control over language use often comes at a cost to the lower status groups who must conform to the imposed standards (Ives 2009:676). As Gramsci stated (1985:183-184), “Every time the question of the language surfaces, it means that a series of other problems are coming to the fore: the formation and enlargement of the governing class, the need to establish more intimate and secure relationships between the governing groups and the national-popular mass, in other words to reorganize cultural hegemony.” My hypothesis is that if these institutions support endangered languages alongside the dominant language, language ideologies will shift positively to ideologies of greater legitimacy and status of the language.

Language Ideologies

Language ideologies are attitudes about and perceptions of languages, and these ideologies play a large part in the endangerment of languages (Ahearn 2012:33). Judith Irvine explains that language ideologies are “the cultural (or subcultural) system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests” (1989:255). Linguistic anthropologists define language ideologies as “ideas about language and its place in social arrangement or its use and usability for social and political ends” (Haviland 2003:764). Language ideologies are elsewhere defined as language beliefs articulated as a rationalization for perceived language structure and use, or ideas a group holds about roles of language in social experience (Woolard and Schieffelin 1994:57). The common ground of these definitions is that language ideologies are ideas about language and its place within a society. Language ideologies are also considered “mediating link[s] between social structures and forms of talk” (Woolard and Schieffelin 1994:55). Language ideologies are capable of providing structure to everyday life and practice (Briggs 2002:493). In the past, anthropologists have

viewed ideology as a distraction from primary linguistic data, and some linguists still hold that language ideologies have little significant effect on language and speech. However, beginning with the work of Michael Silverstein in the 1980s, language ideologies have been studied as an essential element of understanding language and linguistic structure and a component that can both explain and affect linguistic structure (Schieffelin, Woolard, and Kroskrity 1998:31).

Over time, cultural anthropologists have also included considerations of power relations into their analyses of language ideologies. Modern debates stem from whether language ideologies are an interactional resource or part of a shared community background rooted in social authority (Schieffelin, Woolard, and Kroskrity 1998:36-37). Linguistic anthropology has moved toward conceptualizing language ideologies and the power relations underlying them as an element that can be penetrated and scrutinized, often through interviews or textual research that reveal patterns of discourse (Briggs 2002:494). Kroskrity listed four features of language ideologies as they relate to social interaction, cultural identity, and power. First, language ideologies serve the interests of a specific sociocultural group. Language ideologies often express the stereotypes and judgements of segments of the community. Second, language ideologies are multiple in any society because of the divisions and subgroupings within a society. People may hold multiple language ideologies about the same language. Third, people may be more or less aware of language ideologies held by themselves or others. People may find some types of language ideologies more accessible, but be unaware of holding some language ideologies. Fourth, language ideologies mediate between micro-level forms of talk and macro-level social structures (Ahearn 2012:34-35).

State-Sponsored Language Revitalization and its Effects on Language Ideologies

Recent literature indicates institutional support might engender positive language ideology shifts (Barakos 2012, Gu 2014, Lockwood and Saft 2015, Snyder-Frey 2013). Barakos' work in Cardiff explains that speaking Welsh has become an advantage in the labor market in recent years, increasing its status in the institutions of business and education, but it does not explore the accompanying language ideologies (2012:178). Lockwood and Saft researched the language ideologies about Hawaiian Creole among university faculty in Hawaii and reported a positive shift in language ideologies after exposure to the language in the university, measured through interviews with 18 faculty members revealing this pattern of change through time (2015:9-10). Snyder-Frey's research indicated that language ideologies about the Hawaiian language shifted positively after its inclusion in classes in the University of Hawaii (2013:235). Mingyue Gu's research with college students in a multilingual Chinese university also explored how exposure to a language in the university over the course of student education can positively shift perception of the language. Although the language in question, Putonghua, is not endangered, it was considered useless and low-status to the students until they were exposed to its use within the university (2014:321). The literature strongly supports the idea that institutional support could positively affect language ideologies. My research explores the nature of this shift and its bearing on endangered language revitalization, specifically in the cases of Scottish Gaelic and Irish.

Scottish Gaelic

Scottish Gaelic is considered a threatened minority language, on the spectrum of language endangerment (Armstrong 2014:570). In the 2011 census of language in Scotland,

32,000 people, 0.6% of the population, could speak, read, and write Scottish Gaelic. Only 87,000 people, 1.7% of the population, reported being able to understand it. The census data show slight increases in the number of speakers in age groups under 45 since the 2001 census, but the overall number and percentage of speakers of Gaelic remain low (National Records of Scotland 2011:26-27). Gaelic has been losing preeminence in Scotland for roughly a thousand years, beginning in the 12th century when a separate dialect that came to be called Scots became prominent over Gaelic in the Lowlands. From that time, the Gaelic strongholds were the Highlands and Islands. Between the 15th and 17th centuries, the Scottish Parliament passed several acts attempting to eradicate Gaelic and replace it with English, especially among the aristocracy. This legislation was followed by the end of the Scottish Clan system and the Highland Clearances (McKinnon 2014:2). During the 18th and 19th century, the population of the Highlands dwindled due to both forcible removals and voluntary relocations to more prosperous parts of the country. The Highland Clearances are associated with a sharp decline in Gaelic culture and language (Richards 2007:7, 45-48). The historical suppression of the language and connection between Scottish Gaelic and “barbaric”, “backward” characteristics still affects language ideologies today (McEwan-Fujita 2010:38-39, 48). The Scots dialect is still much stronger than Gaelic in Scotland. In 2011, 1.9 million people, 38% of the population, reported being able to speak, read, write, or understand Scots (National Records of Scotland 2011:27-28). In the last decade, positive language policy for Scottish Gaelic has been increasing. In 2005, the Gaelic Language (Scotland) Act legally prioritized the importance of the development of Scottish Gaelic. This act was followed by the creation of Scotland’s language planning body, the Bord na Gaidhlig. Recently, the Bord na Gaidhlig invited organizations to create language

policies, and a few companies have taken up language policies through their own volition. These language policies promote the use of Gaelic alongside English in the organization (Milligan et al. 2009:192-193).

Irish Gaelic

Prior to 1922, the Irish language was also suppressed in various ways under English rule. Beginning in 1601, when the last Gaelic Irish attempt to overthrow English conquest failed, the Irish aristocratic world collapsed. English became the language of power. Irish Gaelic had no official status and was discouraged by the government. Following dispossession, plantation, and new legal and economic systems, the Irish language was no longer used by anyone with political, economic, or social power. Active suppression was compounded by famine and emigration out of poorer rural areas. Many Irish families began to believe their children should speak English in preparation for leaving the area. This conflagration of government suppression, economic constraints, emigration, and changes to the legal, economic, and education systems led to a drastic decline of Irish Gaelic. These circumstances also created a societal ideology that the Irish language was associated with poverty, ignorance, and backwardness (O'Donnaile 2014:2). The revitalization of the Irish language is primarily attributed to The Gaelic League, a movement in the 1890s to revive the language. The movement was founded upon the basis that the Irish language was central to the Irish national identity and a spiritual counter to the English way of life (Christ 2012:399). Since Ireland's political independence in 1922, state policy focused on maintaining the Irish language through bolstering the Gaeltacht areas – the areas already heavily Irish-speaking – and reviving the language elsewhere in Ireland. Irish-speaking communities have been in decline, but new speakers have increased outside of the Gaeltachts due to the public

school system offering the Irish language as an academic subject. The most recent census showed that 41% of the population of Ireland consider themselves Irish speakers, though only approximately 4% of Ireland’s population uses the language frequently outside of the education system (O’Rourke and Walsh 2015:63-64). See the table below comparing endangered language proficiency by population percentage in Scotland and Ireland.

The linguistic situations in institutions across Scotland and Ireland provide a varied and complex context in which to examine my research questions.

Figure 1

	Scottish Gaelic ¹	Irish Gaelic ²
Population percentage with some proficiency	1.7%	41%
Population percentage of frequent/highly proficient speakers	0.6%	4%

¹ (National Records of Scotland 2011:26-27)

² (O’Rourke and Walsh 2015:63-64)

Chapter 3: Research Design and Methodology

The research was conducted through surveys, interviews, and participant observation with speakers and nonspeakers of Irish and Scottish Gaelic. These countries were chosen for their prevalent support of endangered languages in institutions (Milligan et al. 2009, O'Rourke and Walsh 2015). My focus centered on the institutions of universities and business, as these are institutions with which speakers are likely to interact directly. For universities, support was defined as offering endangered language medium or advanced classes in the language. For businesses, support was defined as using the endangered language in business dealings or in the office setting.

Participant Selection and Recruitment

The identification of institutions was completed through internet research and contact with the language boards of Scotland and Ireland and other endangered language advocacy organizations. After initial contact with qualifying institutions, a pre-departure survey was sent to these institutions to gather initial data about the use of the language and identify potential candidates for full ethnographic interviews.

Participants were selected based on criteria outlined within the IRB proposal approved for exemption status. Participants were recruited through the universities and businesses via email. A link to a preliminary survey was sent to the appropriate authority within the university or business, which was communicated within the institution to participants upon the approval and cooperation of the appropriate authorities. This preliminary survey had an option to leave contact information for an ethnographic interview. In addition, participants for both the survey and interviews were recruited in person during participant observation at these institutions.

Participants included anyone involved in the institution as a faculty member, student, or employee, including both speakers and non-speakers of the endangered language.

Eligible participants were first screened by qualifying institution. A qualifying institution for this research is a university or business that includes Scottish Gaelic or Irish Gaelic in daily use. To screen eligibility, the survey asked whether the participant is 18 years or older, what language besides English they are most commonly exposed to, and whether this exposure took place in a university, business, or both. Participants who indicated they do not meet these qualifications were informed on the survey that they are not eligible and the survey closed.

Any participant meeting these requirements was included in the final sample study. Only completed and submitted surveys were used in the final data. Participants were allowed to skip questions on the survey and not answer every question.

Survey Design

A quantitative survey was administered online using Qualtrics, a software program for internet-based surveys. The purpose of this survey was to collect data on the change in perception of the endangered language from the point the participant entered the institution to the present day. The survey also collects data on how the institution uses the endangered language and what kinds of language use affect the perception of the participants the most. Most questions used a one-to-ten rating form or asked the participant to check options that apply. The survey had two optional sections at the end. First, there was a comment box where the participant could include any additional comments they had on the research topic. Second, there was an option to include contact information (first name and email) if they wished to participate in an

ethnographic interview. Overall, I collected 25 survey responses prior to departure for fieldwork. Participants who wished to advance to the interview stage were contacted via email and arrangements were made with them as to how they would like the interview to take place, with the options of both remote and in-person interviews.

Interview Design

The ethnographic interviews explored how the participants perceive the endangered language and how that perception has changed over their participation in the institution. Interview participants were recruited when they provided optional contact information on the survey, and the interviews were carried out either remotely or on-site. The interviews asked participants to describe their use and ideologies of the language and exposure to the language in earlier life and then at the institution. Participants were then asked to compare and contrast different aspects of use and ideologies. I completed four ethnographic interviews of 30 to 60 minutes in length.

Fieldwork and Participant Observation

Participant observation explored how the endangered language is used in the institution and how the use of the language is perceived in this setting. For this section of the research, I visited a total of three universities and two businesses in Scotland and Ireland. The businesses were both in the tourism industry, as these businesses were the most accessible and the most amenable to my observation. Participant observation took place upon invitation of university and business officials. While on-site, I observed how the language was used on the campus or in the business. I was also able to observe the linguistic situation in the surrounding community to provide additional context. As there are differences in language ideologies not only in the

institution, but also in the communities and regions in which they operate, the participant observation in these communities further informs the regional differences of language ideologies in institutions.

I undertook research fieldwork in June and July 2016, visiting multiple sites in Ireland and Scotland, which provided me with participant observation data and local knowledge of the language situations. Over the course of my research, I collected 25 full survey responses and four ethnographic interviews. I also visited three communities in Scotland and three communities in Ireland where I collected data. I collected participant observation data and analyzed regional changes in language situations across most major regional divisions in Scotland and Ireland (i.e. West Ireland, East Ireland, Northern Ireland, the Scottish Highlands, and the Scottish Lowlands).

Reflexivity Statement

I have studied linguistics and languages for several years, including studying Latin, Italian, Spanish, German, and Hebrew. I became interested in endangered languages mainly through the Hawaiian and Cherokee languages. However, my ancestry is Scottish and Irish, and I grew up with Celtic influences from my family. This experience led me to study Scottish and Irish Gaelic in my ancestors' homeland, where I already had some familiarity with the cultures and the languages.

Chapter 4: Results

Survey Data

The survey portion of the research yielded 25 responses, 22 of which were full responses. These responses included 21 speakers and 4 non-speakers. Of these respondents, 19 were exposed mainly to Scottish Gaelic, 5 to Irish, and 1 to Welsh. Data also showed that 23 respondents were exposed to the language at a university and 3 respondents at a business. The survey gauged both language ideologies at the time the respondent entered the institution and current language ideologies. Three questions gauged the overall change in positivity or negativity.

Responses to question: I think about this language more positively than I did before entering this institution.




Figure 2

The responses were largely positive, but several indicated no change in positive feelings toward the language and two respondents indicated feeling less positive about the language than they did before entering the institution.

Responses to questions:

Blue: *On a scale of 0 to 10, with 0 being the most negative and 10 being the most positive, how would you rate your overall perception of the language when you entered this institution?*

Orange: *On a scale of 0 to 10, with 0 being the most negative and 10 being the most positive, how would you rate your overall perception of the language currently?*




Figure 3

These two questions compared the respondents' perception of the language when they entered the institution to their current perception of the language. The trend was still largely positive, with a significantly larger percentage of people rating very positive feelings toward the language currently compared to their perception of the language at the outset. However, 4 respondents rated their current perception of the language negatively in the 2-3 range where only 1 rated their past feelings negatively.

These questions broke down the effect by language.

Responses to question: I think about Scottish Gaelic more positively than I did before entering this institution.




Figure 4

Responses to question: I think about Irish Gaelic more positively than I did before entering this institution.




Figure 5

The survey also asked about the services available from the universities and businesses to support the language.

Responses to question: Please indicate which of these policies or services you are aware are available at this university.




Figure 6

In addition to the listed options, there were also two text responses about the services available. The first response listed events outside of class taught through Gàidhlig. The second response listed social activities using Gaelic and a language buddies system. The language buddies system was later explained to be a system at the university that pairs two speakers together to converse in Gaelic.

Responses to question: Please indicate which of these policies or services you are aware are available in this business or organization. Check all that apply.



Figure 7

There was one text response in addition to the listed responses. The response listed bilingual policies and articles of association and a Gaelic book collection aimed at all ages and interests.

Next, the respondents were asked which policies would be most effective at improving their perception of the language.

Responses to question: Please rate the following policies in terms of which you would find most effective at improving your perception of the language, with 1 being the most effective and 6 being the least.




Figure 8

One respondent chose “other” for their #2 choice of most effective policy and specified it would be social activities in Gaelic and the language buddies system. One respondent chose “other” for their #3 choice and did not specify a policy.

The same question was then asked of people exposed to the language in a business or organization.

Responses to question: Please rate the following policies in terms of which you would find most effective at improving your perception of the language, with 1 being the most effective and 6 being the least.




Figure 9

In this question, the options for the sixth place all listed “other” with no policy specified.

A final question asked for additional comments on their perceptions of the language. The complete list of responses are as follows:

- “It is only of use in the college, it is of no use daily in Irish society, improving teaching of languages that are actually relevant i.e. used internationally would be a better use of resources, not trying to teach a language that is used rarely if at all.”
- “Regarding the last question placing different policies in order of importance, for our organisation bi-lingual ability for staff as a requirement is absolutely essential in certain

roles, community officer dealing directly with Gaelic speakers and Gaelic themed projects for example, while for other roles, admin officer, basic knowledge and an interest in learning the language would be desired.”

- “The language is in dire straits as a community language. Education at a tertiary level, Gaelic in the media and official status can only do so much. Radically different policies and action are required to support Gaelic as a community language. Without Gaelic in the community, we are 'fiddling while Rome burns', as I think Fishman has already stated.”
- “The language exists in a context which is precarious, on the one hand where it is the daily medium of communication and teaching, but on the other where the university (with a bilingual policy) fails to 'recognise' this and tends to communicate only in English, thus weakening the status of the language.”
- “I am a native Gaelic speaker, whose second language is English (learnt English when I first went to school), so some of the questions are not so relevant as they might be for those who learnt the language.”
- “I always liked Gaelic because it wasn't institutional. Hearing exam info and formal discourse in it puts me off it.”
- “I love it.”

Interview Data

Interviews were undertaken with four participants, a mixture of Scottish Gaelic and Irish Gaelic speakers.

All interview participants regarded a social circle to speak the language with as a significant factor in changes of their language ideologies. One participant defined the social group as at least two other speakers. A Scottish Gaelic speaker regarded the influence of older speakers as influential in language ideology change. In the university setting, as older students used the language more or less, so would the younger students. Another speaker stated that a social group that included native speakers to converse with helped in improving opportunity, confidence, and fluency. An Irish Gaelic speaker similarly stated that native speakers, usually from the Gaeltacht, would bond with new speakers and sometimes take them to the Gaeltacht to visit. The participant believed students' attitudes would change positively once involved in these social circles.

Two participants noted the importance of business support of the language as influential. For university students, this means language ideologies are most likely to change when economic opportunities based on language use are available after university. An Irish speaker related how students' attitudes would change toward the language once they figured out how it would be useful for their career. For business employees, this means that exposure within the business is likely to result in an increased feeling of usefulness of the language.

Two participants mentioned discouragement of native speakers upon encountering the language in an institutional environment. An Irish speaker noted that native speakers who have not had to use the language as an academic language sometimes begin to like the language less as they have to use it in a new way. A Scottish Gaelic speaker also discussed that native speakers did not like being questioned about their language use departing from established grammar. In fact, when questioned about changing perceptions of Scottish Gaelic speakers, this participant

stated she now pictures speakers as defensive about grammar and language. This discussion may account for some of the responses indicating more negative language ideologies over time, such as with the participant who commented, “I always liked Gaelic because it wasn't institutional. Hearing exam info and formal discourse in it puts me off it.” In this way, institutional support can in some cases be detrimental to language ideologies.

Interview participants discussed various aspects of who was interested in the language and for what reasons. Both Irish and Scottish Gaelic speakers noted that international students showed significant interest in the languages. An Irish Gaelic speaker noted that international speakers are sometimes more interested in learning the language than native Irish students. One of the Scottish Gaelic speakers interviewed was an international student of the language and had originally become interested in the language as a hobby. Another Scottish Gaelic speaker, native to Scotland but learner of Gaelic, stated he had originally become interested in Scottish Gaelic through his interest in traditional music, which seemed more authentic to him. Both participants noted they had come to an institution that taught Scottish Gaelic to make their language goals attainable.

Participants went on to discuss the institutional support that is available at their institution. A diploma in Irish is available at one university for various focuses, such as medicine, journalism, and business, allowing students to show their Irish language qualifications to future employers who might require such language skills. An Irish speaker explained that the language can be useful for a number of careers, such as becoming a doctor in a Gaeltacht area or a journalist in an Irish language media company. Irish is also important for obtaining a job in the Irish government, as some government jobs favor Irish speakers. A Scottish Gaelic speaker noted

that students from their Gaelic program go on to careers such as teaching, media, and community development. There are competitive programs available in both Irish-medium and Scottish Gaelic-medium education for teachers. The participant felt faculty and staff were more willing to speak with learners at the university than people in a native community would be, allowing learners to better develop their language skills within the institution than they might elsewhere.

Another Scottish Gaelic speaker discussed the policies they felt were helpful to developing their language skills and language ideologies. Their past exposure had been courses at another university in beginner Gaelic and Gaelic literature. Their exposure at this university was different from past exposure because Gaelic was the medium of instruction, complete immersion in the language, and a focus on Gaelic used in daily interaction instead of only in class. They expressed that the immersion was overwhelming for the first couple of weeks, but over time confidence and fluency increased until they were comfortable even doing public speaking in Gaelic. They were also able to participate in social activities in Gaelic, such as a Gaelic choir. The substance of study also helped them develop language skills, as classes were available on their interests in traditional music. Another Scottish Gaelic speaker stated the explicit language policy at the university of speaking Gaelic at every opportunity helps to overcome the tendency for students to switch to English in interactions. They explained that if there was even one English speaker among the group, the group would switch to English. Students are also used to addressing non-native Gaelic speakers in English, so this policy helps overcome that tendency when addressing learners who are not native speakers of Gaelic.

The interview participants made largely contrasting statements about how the society viewed and participated in the language. Scottish Gaelic speakers explained the context of the

language in several ways. A participant explained that teachers preparing for Scottish Gaelic-medium education had to be prepared to debate their work with others, as politics plays a bigger role in Gaelic-medium education than it does in English-medium. Communities and lawmaking bodies are more likely to question devoting resources to Gaelic medium education than English-medium education. A Scottish Gaelic speaker noted that even some Gaels, the subset of Scottish people most associated with the Gaelic language, did not feel speaking Gaelic was a “Gael” thing to do and ignored the language. One participant further noted that while the language was considered a special thing for Scotland and held up as a part of the culture, it was largely ignored by society. It was thought of as special, but irrelevant to people’s lives. They recalled portrayals of Gaelic culture as being outdated. Portrayals of the people of the Highlands and Islands were largely stereotyped and differentiated from other Scottish people, portrayed more as rural hicks.

Participant Observation

Research Setting

Participant observation took place primarily at three universities and two businesses, as well as in the surrounding communities. The first university was located in East Ireland with an enrollment of approximately 30,000 students. The second university was located in West Ireland with an enrollment of approximately 17,000 students. The third university was located in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland with an enrollment of a few hundred students. The two businesses were in West Ireland and the Scottish Lowlands, and both were in the tourism industry as this industry was more accessible and accepting of my presence in the operation of the business. Some participant observation also took place in a community organization in Northern Ireland. Conversations with participants took place both during participant observation

in these institutions and with members in the community whom I was able to brief on the research project.

Findings

Previous exposure to the language before the institution varied greatly depending upon the geographic origination of the participant. Western Ireland had many more native and frequent speakers than Eastern Ireland (where it is taught in school, but spoken little after) or Northern Ireland (where previous conflicts affect opportunities to speak Irish). One participant mentioned parents from “The Pale” (Ireland outside Western Ireland) sending their children to the West to be exposed to traditional Irish culture and language. The Scottish Highlands, the Isles in particular, contain most of the speakers of Scottish Gaelic, while the Scottish Lowlands contain relatively few.

In Western Ireland, most people I encountered indicated the Irish language is still used and prized in the local communities. A faculty member at a university related that Galway is in the process of becoming a bilingual city. Galway was in the middle of a bid for the European Capital of Culture, and the thriving Irish language in the city was a major part of the bid. Irish was used in many of the local businesses with some indicating on their windows that they were Irish-speaking. A local employee stated, “If you go to a pub and get quiet, the people there will start speaking Irish to each other.” I was approached by someone addressing me in Irish while in this part of the country, and he told me he addressed me this way because I “looked Irish.” The people in the community were very optimistic about the future of the language. An older business employee told me, “When I was young, Irish was the language of the poor, but now all

the young people want to speak it.” Another employee related that the Irish language is very much a part of local culture and identity. He stated, “Nowadays, 1 in 10 Irish kids wants to speak only Irish.”

In Eastern and Southern Ireland, the people in the community had a positive view of the language and usually related that they had learned it in school. Almost every person I asked about the language said they do not speak it anymore, but “it’s a shame.” Several people told me that they had grandparents that spoke it fluently, sometimes parents who spoke some Irish, but they themselves knew little of the language apart from their early studies. They often still love the language in theory, but did not use it in practice.

In Northern Ireland, the situation is very different. There has been a Gaeltacht in Belfast for the past 25 years, but few people in the city were aware of it despite the city listing a Gaeltacht quarter on tourist maps. There are some fluent speakers in the Gaeltacht quarter that identify themselves as such by wearing a badge. When I asked about the Irish language in most of the city, some people responded with, “I’m not Catholic.” The Irish language in Northern Ireland is still tied to the history of conflict between Irish-speaking Catholics and the English-speaking Protestants. Tensions between Catholic and Protestant populations in Northern Ireland have existed for centuries. Belfast has a history of segregation, rioting, and instances of ethnic cleansing along these lines since the 1830s. The conflict intensified in 1919 with a violent campaign by the Irish Republican Army against the British state and security forces, which continued through 1921. In 1966, Irish Republican insurgents began another campaign, leading into “the Troubles” in Northern Ireland, in which thousands of fighters and civilians on both sides were killed. The conflict continued until 2007 (Smyth 2017:14-19, 77). A local business

employee related that it used to be dangerous to speak Irish in Belfast because someone might assault you for it. He said, although it is no longer dangerous, “it still marks who you are.” Several community members told me there is still some tension between those sectors of the community, but the end of conflict has been good for tourism and thus the city. One local man told me, “We love you, but hate each other.” The “Peace Walls” are still in place within Belfast, marking a separation between Catholics and Protestants. The Gaeltacht quarter displays markers of the rebellion and conflict in many places. While all of the Republic of Ireland displays bilingual signage in Irish in the public areas, Northern Ireland does not. I only observed bilingual signage on private spaces in the Gaeltacht quarter.

I found few references to Scottish Gaelic in the Scottish Lowlands, and few people seem to have any involvement with or exposure to the language, but people in the Highlands and Islands spoke of people in the Lowlands they knew who were native speakers. The absence of exposure seems to partly be due to lack of access to Gaelic education at lower levels, a policy that is more available in Ireland. Lowland populations are more likely to speak the Scots dialect than Scottish Gaelic. However, immediately upon entering the Highlands, bilingual signage in Gaelic appeared. Both people in the Highlands and people in the Islands told me the language was strongest in the Islands. One man in the Highlands spoke about his wife who could still speak Gaelic. She was originally from the Islands, and her mother had spoken only Gaelic until she went to school and was forced to speak English. Her mother’s mother spoke only Gaelic her whole life. On the Islands, I observed several people speaking in Gaelic to each other. Even when they were speaking with me, they would use Gaelic to address another speaker in an aside or question to them.

Exposure to an institution with an official language policy is generally different from previous exposure, where the language policy is unwritten and based on social expectations of which language will be spoken within which groups (i.e. English with young age-mates, Scottish Gaelic or Irish with older members of the community). This policy can encourage students, faculty, and employees to think about which language they are speaking more than they might in daily community life.

Universities and businesses successfully supporting endangered languages build or attempt to build support systems that encompass academic, social, and economic needs. Institutions that do not meet all of these supports often noted that they were in the process of addressing this gap. At an Irish university, they were currently in the process of hiring someone to hold more Irish-speaking social events. A staff member at one university pointed out that their writing center provided help on Gaelic academic writing, a special support for the language academically. In some businesses, merely the use of the language within the office fostered a feeling that the language was more useful and more of an asset, as it helped the employees view the language as a social and economic asset.

The participation of staff at universities varied among institutions. An Irish university required their reception staff to be bilingual. This university also keeps a directory of Irish speakers on the faculty and staff so students and coworkers can find out beforehand if they can begin contact in Irish Gaelic. A faculty member related that if there were two or three Irish speakers in the same office at the university, they might begin to speak Irish Gaelic with each other. At a university in the Scottish Highlands, the staff is encouraged to speak Scottish Gaelic at every possible opportunity. It is an explicit language policy at the university. This university

also tries to hire staff with positive attitudes toward the language, and some staff come to work for the university specifically for the free Gaelic language lessons provided to staff. However, at a Scottish Lowlands university, an interviewee stated the Gaelic language department was small and little-known, and the staff of the university at large are unlikely to speak Gaelic.

Language Ideologies

Participants at all levels of this study indicated that institutional support did change their perceptions of the language in many cases. In analyzing the numerical survey responses measuring negativity or positivity toward the language when entering the institution compared to the present, there was a positive change in the mean response from 7.88 when entering the institution to 7.96 currently. In addition, the median response positively changed from 8 when entering the institution to 9 currently.




Figure 10

Participants discussed the importance of having both social interaction in the language and a use for the language in their career path. In both interviews and participant observation, participants indicated people in these institutions were more likely to speak with non-native speakers or speak in the language in general than people in the society at large. The higher level of interaction with others through the medium of Gaelic supported the creation of positive language ideologies and the view of the language as a social asset. In addition, several participants expressed changes in language ideologies when they found a use for the language in their career, as the language was viewed as an economic asset. Participants expressed support within a business was influential to them, as language skills being an economic asset was an important factor.

In certain cases, the institutional exposure negatively affected language ideologies. Participants expressed two reasons for this change. First, native speakers accustomed to speaking the language informally within a community can become frustrated with using it within the more rigid structure of academia. Second, some students do not find a use for the language moving forward in their careers and lives and still do not view the language as an asset after being exposed to it institutionally, as they see the institution (usually a university in this case) as a special situation that will not be continued elsewhere once they leave. Despite these situations, the institutions still seemed to support a positive change in language ideologies overall.

Institutional Support

Institutions played a varied role in changing language ideologies depending on the supports provided. The graph shows the average rating of university policy options from 1 to 6, with a lower numerical score indicating a higher rating on importance of the policy




Figure 11

In the university context, the survey indicated that the most effective policy in changing language ideologies is making classes available in the medium of the language. This result was corroborated by many of the interview and observation results, as students and faculty found the complete immersion to be helpful in increasing their use of the language and confidence in using the language. A few participants thought highly of the explicit language policy to use the language as much as possible, as the policy encouraged them to see the language as a daily means of communication. All other policies highly rated toward this end, such as recruitment of bilingual staff or improving staff and student language skills, had the essential element of showing students that the university was serious about the students and faculty being able to use the language in their daily lives. A survey respondent expressed frustration when this expectation was not met and a supposedly bilingual university did not acknowledge the Gaelic speakers and communicated mostly in English.




Figure 12

In business contexts, bilingual business communication was highly rated, along with one response highly rating improving staff language skills. Bilingual business communication was rated slightly higher than other information delivered bilingually. Bilingual business communication, Gaelic used for the purposes of actually doing business rather than more informal communication within the business, may contribute more to viewing the language as an economic asset.

Chapter 5: Discussion

Institutional support does have some positive effects on language ideologies by increasing feelings of usefulness and legitimacy. The hegemonic influence from these institutions does influence perceptions of the language through the dissemination of ideas about the language. Both languages historically declined due to drastic hegemonic changes that broke up Gaelic-supporting power structures, made English the language of circles of power and influence, and actively suppressed the use of Gaelic languages. The results of hegemonic suppression on these languages are apparent in the history of decline. The government passed legislation against the language. The education system forced the use of English. Business favored English speakers as the economy of the times made Irish useless in economic spheres. With these hegemonic influences, it is not surprising that many Gaelic speakers believed English was the common-sense language choice. However, this research shows support from the hegemonic structure can provide the opposite effect. The same structures of government, education, and economy that sent these languages into endangerment can aid in revitalization when substantial support is provided. In many cases reviewed here, the hegemonic structures of government, universities, and business are directly influencing the language ideologies by providing funding and resources relating to the language, incentivizing use of the language within the society. These institutions also more subtly change the views about the language and the people that speak it by creating ideologies of language accessibility, socioeconomic advantage, and cultural access about the language. Learning or otherwise supporting the language becomes more of a common-sense choice for many of these speakers in the context of the institution.

However, this potential for effect has several factors. One factor is the commitment of the institution to supporting the use of the language in day-to-day interaction. The university or business needs to provide some structural support, using Gaelic in official channels such as classes or business communication, as well as encourage people through language policy or opportunity to use the language instead of English.

Secondly, the effect is best when the language is supported at several levels of institution, government, university, and business. The Irish language is better supported by the government of Ireland than Scottish Gaelic is supported by the government of Scotland. The Irish made more efforts over the whole of the Republic of Ireland for the Irish language to be visible and accessible in some way through lower levels of education, accounting for the increased familiarity and positivity over the whole of Ireland, contrasting with the whole of Scotland where Gaelic is only visible in the Highlands and Islands. Speakers of Scottish Gaelic expressed more of a frustration over having to fight to use and teach Gaelic. While lower-level education in Scottish Gaelic is available in Scotland, it is not as widespread as similar educational efforts in Ireland. Although universities and businesses have an effect in Scotland without this support, the support of the government does make a difference. Universities supporting the language have an effect on their own, especially when heavily supporting the language with multiple opportunities for support, immersion, and interaction. The effect of universities and the positive effect on language ideologies in general is best when the language is supported by businesses. At a university level, students have multiple languages to choose from that may help their career, such as German or French, so it is influential for Gaelic to also have an economic benefit to speakers. Speakers interact with all of these sections of the hegemonic structure throughout their daily

lives. Without this support at several levels, speakers are more subject to conflicting language ideologies of usefulness or advantage within a certain institution, but not in another institution or in the society at large.

Thirdly, both languages also need to be supported as community languages. While new speakers' language ideologies are affected by the institutional structural support, it was also clear that exposure to native speakers and the Irish Gaeltacht or Scottish Gaidhealtachd areas allowed newer speakers to see the language as more attainable and useful. Two survey respondents made additional comments to stress the importance of supporting the language as a community language. The support of the surrounding community can be an influential factor toward the visibility of Gaelic languages within the institution. While the Republic of Ireland, particularly Western Ireland, offers community support that allows institutions to promote the Irish language with more institutional support, this community support was lacking in both Northern Ireland and the Scottish Lowlands, often segregating Gaelic-speaking institutions into little-known sectors of the community or the institution itself. However, even when supported as a community language, institutions will still have an important role to play in legitimizing and giving authority to the language.

Several respondents expressed that the people involved in Irish and Scottish Gaelic at institutions often already have positive language ideologies about these languages. Since Gaelic at a university or business level is not required of any Irish or Scottish person, these institutions tend to draw people who already have an interest in the subject. Thus, it is difficult to extrapolate what these institutions might do for the language ideologies of those who feel more neutral or even negatively about the languages. This project could be continued with more involvement

from non-speakers who are not directly involved in studying Gaelic. However, the project does reveal important data about the role institutions can play in changing language ideologies, as even those with positive views of the language generally became more positive about the language over time.

Conclusions

Universities and businesses can positively influence language ideologies by increasing the visibility, legitimacy, and opportunity related to the language. The hegemonic structure of the government, universities, and businesses often promotes a more attractive and accessible picture of the language through the use of the language within these realms of authority. The support of this structure of authority is an important bolster to otherwise low-profile languages. These institutions can build a Gaelic speaker community of their own, allowing speakers the opportunity to use Gaelic where they would otherwise naturally use English.

The most influential language policies institutions can put forward are those that show the institution is committed to people using language for the main work of the institution. Commitment to the use of the language within the institution can encourage these speakers to use the language and become more confident using the language. Explicit language policies and clear opportunities to use Gaelic over English can support the use of these languages within institutions.

The findings of this study support the conclusion that institutions do positively influence language ideologies when supporting an endangered language. Even when the institution cannot influence the language ideologies coming from all aspects of life, it is usually successful in changing language ideologies within the institution itself. Outside of the institution, speakers may express frustration at Gaelic being a choice in sacrifice of more useful and supported language options. If endangered languages are supported in this way by multiple sectors of the hegemonic structure, it could change the ideologies positively within the society by making speaking the languages a choice of common sense.

Appendix A: IRB Outcome Letter



University of Central Florida Institutional Review Board
Office of Research & Commercialization
12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501
Orlando, Florida 32826-3246
Telephone: 407-823-2901 or 407-882-2276
www.research.ucf.edu/compliance/irb.html

Approval of Exempt Human Research

From: UCF Institutional Review Board #1
FWA00000351, IRB00001138

To: Beatriz Mireya Reyes-Foster and Co-PI: Christy Caitlin Box

Date: May 26, 2016

Dear Researcher:

On 05/26/2016, the IRB approved the following activity as human participant research that is exempt from regulation:

Type of Review: Exempt Determination
Project Title: The Effects of Hegemonic Support of Endangered Languages on Language Ideologies
Investigator: Beatriz Mireya Reyes-Foster
IRB Number: SBE-16-12232
Funding Agency:
Grant Title:
Research ID: N/A

This determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made and there are questions about whether these changes affect the exempt status of the human research, please contact the IRB. When you have completed your research, please submit a Study Closure request in iRIS so that IRB records will be accurate.

In the conduct of this research, you are responsible to follow the requirements of the [Investigator Manual](#).

On behalf of Sophia Dziegielewski, Ph.D., L.C.S.W., UCF IRB Chair, this letter is signed by:

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kanille Choy" followed by a horizontal line.

IRB Coordinator

Appendix B: Survey Data

Responses to question: I think about this language more positively than I did before entering this institution.

Answer	Responses
Strongly Agree	10 (45.5%)
Agree	3 (13.6%)
Neither agree nor disagree	7 (31.8%)
Disagree	1 (4.5%)
Strong Disagree	1 (4.5%)
Total	22 (100%)

Responses to question: On a scale of 0 to 10, with 0 being the most negative and 10 being the most positive, how would you rate your overall perception of the language when you entered this institution?

Answer	Responses
10	9 (36%)
9	0 (0%)
8	6 (24%)
7	3 (12%)
6	5 (20%)
5	1 (4%)
4	0 (0%)
3	1 (4%)
2	0 (0%)
1	0 (0%)
0	0 (0%)
Total	25 (100%)

Responses to question: On a scale of 0 to 10, with 0 being the most negative and 10 being the most positive, how would you rate your overall perception of the language currently?

Answer	Responses
10	12 (48%)
9	2 (8%)
8	4 (16%)
7	1 (4%)
6	2 (8%)
5	0 (0%)
4	0 (0%)

3	2 (8%)
2	2 (8%)
1	0 (0%)
0	0 (0%)
Total	25 (100%)

Responses to question: Please indicate which of these policies or services you are aware are available at this university. Check all that apply.

Answer	Responses
Information delivered bilingually (i.e. websites, signage, etc.)	16
Bilingual university communication (i.e. emails, phone calls, etc.)	15
Bilingual staff	17
Improving staff and student language skills	14
Classes available in the medium of this language	18
Other (Text Responses: 1. Events outside of class taught through Gàidhlig, 2. Social activities using Gaelic; language buddies system)	2
Total	18

Responses to question: Please indicate which of these policies or services you are aware are available in this business or organization. Check all that apply.

Answer	Responses
Information delivered bilingually (i.e. websites, signage, etc.)	3
Bilingual business communication (i.e. emails, phone calls, etc.)	3
Bilingual staff	3
Improving staff language skills	1
Bilingual public and media relations	3
Other	1

(Text response: Bi-lingual policies + articles of assoc. Gaelic book collection aimed at all ages & interests.	
None of the above	1
Total	4

The following questions were asked of participants who were exposed to Scottish Gaelic

Responses to question: I think about this language more positively than I did before entering this institution.

Answer	Responses
Strongly Agree	8 (44%)
Agree	2 (11%)
Neither agree nor disagree	6 (33%)
Disagree	1 (6%)
Strongly Disagree	1 (6%)
Total	18 (100%)

The following five questions asked participants to agree or disagree with a statement about Scottish Gaelic based on their perceptions *when they entered the institution*.

Responses to statement: This language is an asset when interacting with people socially.

Answer	Responses
Strongly Agree	7 (39%)
Agree	10 (55%)
Neither agree nor disagree	1 (6%)
Disagree	0 (0%)
Strongly Disagree	0 (0%)
Total	18 (100%)

Responses to question: This language is an asset for employment.

Answer	Responses
Strongly Agree	11 (61%)
Agree	3 (17%)
Neither agree nor disagree	4 (22%)
Disagree	0 (0%)
Strongly Disagree	0 (0%)
Total	18 (100%)

Responses to question: This language is as useful as English is.

Answer	Responses
Strongly Agree	4 (22%)
Agree	6 (33%)
Neither agree nor disagree	5 (28%)
Disagree	2 (11%)
Strongly Disagree	1 (6%)
Total	18 (100%)

Responses to question: I enjoy hearing this language spoken in my daily life.

Answer	Responses
Strongly Agree	14 (78%)
Agree	2 (11%)
Neither agree nor disagree	2 (11%)
Disagree	0 (0%)
Strongly Disagree	0 (0%)
Total	18 (100%)

Responses to question: I would like to improve my skills in this language.

Answer	Responses
Strongly Agree	13 (72%)
Agree	3 (17%)
Neither agree nor disagree	2 (11%)
Disagree	0 (0%)
Strongly Disagree	0 (0%)

Total	18 (100%)
-------	-----------

The following five questions asked participants who were exposed to Scottish Gaelic to agree or disagree with a statement about Scottish Gaelic based on their perceptions *currently*.

Responses to question: This language is an asset when interacting with people socially.

Answer	Responses
Strongly Agree	8 (44%)
Agree	8 (44%)
Neither agree nor disagree	1 (6%)
Disagree	1 (6%)
Strongly Disagree	0 (0%)
Total	18 (100%)

Responses to question: This language is an asset for employment.

Answer	Responses
Strongly Agree	9 (50%)
Agree	6 (33%)
Neither agree nor disagree	2 (11%)
Disagree	1 (6%)
Strongly Disagree	0 (0%)
Total	18 (100%)

Responses to question: This language is as useful as English is.

Answer	Responses
Strongly Agree	5 (28%)
Agree	6 (33%)
Neither agree nor disagree	6 (33%)
Disagree	1 (6%)
Strongly Disagree	0 (0%)
Total	18 (100%)

Responses to question: I enjoy hearing this language spoken in my daily life.

Answer	Responses
Strongly Agree	15 (83%)
Agree	3 (17%)
Neither agree nor disagree	0 (0%)
Disagree	0 (0%)
Strongly Disagree	0 (0%)
Total	18 (100%)

Responses to question: I would like to improve my skills in this language.

Answer	Responses
Strongly Agree	12 (67%)
Agree	4 (22%)
Neither agree nor disagree	2 (11%)
Disagree	0 (0%)
Strongly Disagree	0 (0%)
Total	18 (100%)

The following questions were asked of participants who were exposed to Irish Gaelic.

Responses to question: I think about this language more positively than I did before entering this institution.

Answer	Responses
Strongly Agree	1 (33.33%)
Agree	1 (33.33%)
Neither agree nor disagree	1 (33.33%)
Disagree	0 (0%)
Strongly Disagree	0 (0%)
Total	3 (100%)

The following five questions asked participants to agree or disagree with a statement about Irish Gaelic based on their perceptions *when they entered the institution*.

Responses to statement: This language is an asset when interacting with people socially.

Answer	Responses
Strongly Agree	0 (0%)
Agree	1 (33%)
Neither agree nor disagree	0 (0%)
Disagree	2 (67%)
Strongly Disagree	0 (0%)
Total	3 (100%)

Responses to question: This language is an asset for employment.

Answer	Responses
Strongly Agree	0 (0%)
Agree	0 (0%)
Neither agree nor disagree	1 (33%)
Disagree	2 (67%)
Strongly Disagree	0 (0%)
Total	3 (100%)

Responses to question: This language is as useful as English is.

Answer	Responses
Strongly Agree	0 (0%)
Agree	0 (0%)
Neither agree nor disagree	1 (33%)
Disagree	2 (67%)
Strongly Disagree	0 (0%)
Total	3 (100%)

Responses to question: I enjoy hearing this language spoken in my daily life.

Answer	Responses
Strongly Agree	2 (67%)
Agree	0 (0%)
Neither agree nor disagree	1 (33%)
Disagree	0 (0%)
Strongly Disagree	0 (0%)
Total	3 (100%)

Responses to question: I would like to improve my skills in this language.

Answer	Responses
Strongly Agree	1 (33.33%)
Agree	0 (0%)
Neither agree nor disagree	1 (33.33%)
Disagree	1 (33.33%)
Strongly Disagree	0 (0%)
Total	3 (100%)

The following five questions asked participants who were exposed to Irish Gaelic to agree or disagree with a statement about Irish Gaelic based on their perceptions *currently*.

Responses to statement: This language is an asset when interacting with people socially.

Answer	Responses
Strongly Agree	1 (33.33%)
Agree	1 (33.33%)
Neither agree nor disagree	0 (0%)
Disagree	1 (33.33%)
Strongly Disagree	0 (0%)
Total	3 (100%)

Responses to question: This language is an asset for employment.

Answer	Responses
Strongly Agree	0 (0%)

Agree	0 (0%)
Neither agree nor disagree	1 (33.33%)
Disagree	1 (33.33%)
Strongly Disagree	1 (33.33%)
Total	3 (100%)

Responses to question: This language is as useful as English is.

Answer	Responses
Strongly Agree	0 (0%)
Agree	0 (0%)
Neither agree nor disagree	0 (0%)
Disagree	2 (67%)
Strongly Disagree	1 (33%)
Total	3 (100%)

Responses to question: I enjoy hearing this language spoken in my daily life.

Answer	Responses
Strongly Agree	2 (67%)
Agree	0 (0%)
Neither agree nor disagree	1 (33%)
Disagree	0 (0%)
Strongly Disagree	0 (0%)
Total	3 (100%)

Responses to question: I would like to improve my skills in this language.

Answer	Responses
Strongly Agree	1 (33.33%)
Agree	1 (33.33%)
Neither agree nor disagree	0 (0%)
Disagree	1 (33.33%)
Strongly Disagree	0 (0%)
Total	3 (100%)

\

References

Ahearn, Laura M.

2012 *Living Language: An Introduction to Linguistic Anthropology*. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.

Armstrong, Timothy Currie

2014 Naturalism and Ideological Work: How is Family Language Policy Renegotiated as Both Parents and Children Learn a Threatened Minority Language? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 17(5):570-585. doi: 10.1080/13670050.2013.860074

Barakos, Elisabeth

2012 Language Policy and Planning in Urban Professional Settings: Bilingualism in Cardiff Businesses. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 13(3):167-186. DOI: 10.1080/14664208.2012.722374

Bechhofer, Frank and David McCrone

2014 What Makes a Gael? Identity, Language, and Ancestry in the Scottish *Gaidhealtachd*. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 21(2):113-133. DOI: 10.1080/1070289X.2014.878249

Briggs, Charles

2002 Linguistic Magic Bullets in the Making of Modernist Anthropology. *American Anthropologist* 104(2):481-498.

Christ, Diarmait Mac Giolla

2012 A Question of National Identity or Minority Rights? The Changing Status of the Irish Language in Ireland since 1922. *Nations and Nationalism* 18(3):398-416. DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-8129.2011.00508.x

Crystal, David

2000 *Language Death*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fishman, Joshua A.

1991 *Reversing Language Shift*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Gramsci, Antonio

1999 *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Quentin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, eds. London: ElecBook.

Grenoble, Lenora A. and Lindsay J. Whaley

2005 *Saving Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI:
<http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.net.ucf.edu/10.1017/CBO9780511615931>

Gu, Mingyue

2014 From Opposition to Transcendence: The Language Practices and Ideologies of Students in a Multilingual University. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 17(3):310-329. DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2013.766148

Harrison, K. David

2007 *When Languages Die: The Extinction of the World's Languages and the Erosion of Human Knowledge*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI:
10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195181920.001.0001

Haviland, John

2003 Ideologies of Language: Some Reflections on Language and US Law. *American Anthropologist* 105(4):764-774.

Irvine, Judith

1989 When Talk Isn't Cheap: Language and Political Economy. *American Ethnologist* 16(1):248-267.

Ives, Peter

2004 *Language and Hegemony in Gramsci*. London: Pluto Press.

Lockwood, Hannah, and Scott Saft

2015 Shifting Language Ideologies and the Perceptions of Hawai'i Creole among Educators at the University Level in Hawai'i. *Linguistics and Education* 33(1):1-13. DOI:
10.1016/j.linged.2015.11.001

McEwan-Fujita, Emily

2010 Ideology, Affect, and Socialization in Language Shift and Revitalization: The Experiences of Adults Learning Gaelic in the Western Isles of Scotland. *Language in Society* 39(1):27-64. DOI: 10.1017/S0047404509990649

McKinnon, Kenneth

2014 *Scottish Gaelic Today*. BBC.
http://www.bbc.co.uk/voices/multilingual/scots_gaelic.shtml

Milligan, Lindsay, Douglas Chalmers, and Hugh O'Donnell

2009 Measuring Up? Non-Profit and Commercial Language Policies in Gaelic-Speaking Scotland. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 19(2):188-203. doi: 10.1111/j.1473-4192.2009.00219.x

National Records of Scotland

2011 Key Results on Population, Ethnicity, Identity, Language, Religion, Health, Housing and Accommodation in Scotland – Release 2A. Scotland's Census 2011 Census Results. National Records of Scotland.
<http://www.scotlandscensus.gov.uk/documents/censusresults/release2a/StatsBulletin2A.pdf>

O'Donnaile, Antaine

2014 Irish Today. BBC. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/voices/multilingual/irish.shtml>

O'Rourke, Bernadette, and John Walsh

2015 New Speakers of Irish: Shifting Boundaries across Time and Space. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 231(1):63-83. DOI: 10.1515/ijsl-2014-0032

Richards, Eric

2007 *Debating the Highlands Clearances*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Schieffelin, Bambi, Kathryn Woolard, and Paul Kroskrity

1998 *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smyth, Jim

2017 *Remembering the Troubles: Contesting the Recent Past in Northern Ireland*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.

Snyder-Frey, Alicia

2013 He Kuleana Ko Kakou: Hawaiian Language Learners and the Construction of (Alter)native Identities. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 14(2):231-243.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2013.818504>

Woolard, Kathryn and Bambi Schieffelin

1994 Language Ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23(1):55-82.