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This COST Action focused on the dynamics involved in becoming a ‘new speaker’ of a language in a multilingual Europe. The Action ran for four years between 2013-2017. We are delighted to present this report, which highlights some of the major accomplishments of our COST Action on New Speakers in a Multilingual Europe: Opportunities and Challenges, since its initiation in 2013.

The work of this network was supported by the European COST Association (Co-operation in Science and Technology) and funded within the European Commission’s research programme Horizon 2020. COST Actions are designed to build new knowledge by bringing together researchers to cooperate and coordinate nationally-funded research activities, and to build up new transnational and international research cooperation. The funding provides an opportunity for researchers to develop their competences, share experience and expertise with colleagues in other countries, and improve their research career through workshops, training and exchange programmes.

From the outset in the Action, we have strived to position ourselves at the international forefront of language research, generating research on multilingual competence, linguistic practices across the lifespan, and language policies, that has been published in key international outlets in the field. Some of our results are summarised in this report. Our research over the life of the Action has demonstrated that multilingualism is a resource that can be utilized much more by individuals and institutions than is the case today. However, as a resource it also needs to be sustainable and equitable. In our Action we have reflected critically on what multilingualism means to different people. Access to different languages and ways of speaking are not always equally distributed or equally accessible to everyone in the same way. In the four-year period of our Action we have brought together researchers from a range of disciplines to collaborate on issues around new speakerness and what it means to people to become speakers of new languages in the context of a multilingual Europe.

Language as we know is a key component in accessing education, employment, social services and for community participation. In Europe, languages have also been seen historically as defining individual and collective identities. The processes whereby people learn new languages and become legitimate speakers of these languages are complex. Through the Action our aim has been to better understand the potential social tensions that emerge from unequal access to participation of new speakers in Europe’s multilingual project. These inequalities pose a potential challenge to both European integration, social cohesion and economic collaboration, as well as to the full participation of territorial and immigrant minorities. A shared understanding of these complexities across the different multilingual scenarios (including education, healthcare, youth culture, the workplace and NGOs) in which the participants of the network have been working, has helped sharpen our
knowledge of how to tackle the challenges that new speakers of different linguistic varieties face in the context of a multilingual Europe.

This is particularly important in a world in which diversity and inclusion is being challenged. It is important so as to better contribute to how society can deal with the challenges of multilingualism through increased knowledge, promoting agency for individuals in society, and a better quality of life, no matter what their linguistic and social background is.

It became clear to us over the course of the Action that while much research in the field is devoted to language teaching, new speakers encounter many social and political barriers to language learning. However, these barriers are rarely tackled. Through the work of our Action we have identified the need for specific social spaces to be created so as to provide access to different types of speakers. In the Action we have also uncovered the important emotional investment involved in learning and using new languages. Research emerging from the Action has amply documented how new speakers can experience anxieties around questions of language ownership and authenticity. Through the work of the Action, we have attempted to increase awareness of these issues amongst policy makers and government. In minoritised language communities, for example, we have increased awareness amongst language activists and administrators about the opportunities and the challenges which new speakers face in their respective communities. Overall, we would contend that the processes that characterise language learning and the use of a particular language or variety in social life have important implications for social and political participation which, if not addressed, may lead to inequalities in the context of increasing mobility.

Over the life of our Action we hope to have created a platform for further research ventures on what is a highly relevant topic and one which is critical to our understanding of the contemporary globalised society in which we live.

BERNADETTE O’ROURKE AND JOAN PUJOLAR
ACTION CHAIRS
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Introduction

Who or what is a “new speaker”?

In our Memorandum of Understanding for COST Action on New Speakers in a Multilingual Europe, we set out a broad definition of the new speaker concept applying the term to all multilingual citizens who engage in languages other than their ‘native’ or ‘national’ language(s). By doing so, new speakers find themselves crossing existing social boundaries, re-evaluating their own levels of linguistic competence and having to creatively (re)structure their social practices to adapt to new and overlapping linguistic spaces. Put more simply, a new speaker refers to anyone who embarks on the journey of acquiring and becoming a speaker of a new language. This journey can be very rewarding but it can also involve challenges. In this context, questions such as the following can often emerge:

• How "good" am I with the language?
• How happy are other speakers about the way I speak it?
• How happy are they about the very fact that I speak it at all?

When speaking a new language people cross an invisible line into new social relations, a new territory where social rules, social norms, assumptions and values may be different.

• Where does this leave someone as a speaker?
• What are the consequences?

The new speaker project was conceived as a way of understanding how globalisation, increased mobility and transnational networking is transforming the linguistic ecologies of contemporary societies. By focusing on speakers, the idea was to engage centrally on how these processes affect people’s lives. As such this Action brought multilinguals into the focus by investigating the opportunities and challenges involved in acquiring, using and being understood as a ‘new speaker’ of a language in a multilingual Europe.

Language is a key component in accessing education, employment, and social services and in participating in one’s community from grassroots level to national or European politics. Language has also been seen historically in Europe as defining individual and collective (national) identities; but access to languages has not been evenly distributed, and not all language communities have been able to enjoy the same opportunities through their own languages. The processes whereby people learn new languages and become legitimate speakers of these languages are complex and have remained virtually unexplored, and different kinds of speakers do not have equal opportunities to contribute to Europe’s multilingual project. These inequalities pose a challenge to European integration, social cohesion and economic collaboration, as well as to the full participation of territorial and immigrant minorities. Through this network, we sought to build a shared understanding of these complexities across different multilingual scenarios that would help policymakers, service providers and educators tackle the challenges that (communities of) new speakers of different linguistic varieties face in the context of a multilingual Europe.
Key Phases of the Action

The Action was divided into two key phases.

Phase I

Phase I was organised via working groups researching the new speaker in three contexts:

- **Indigenous language minorities**  
  (Working Group 1)
- **Migrant communities**  
  (Working Group 2)
- **New speakers as workers**  
  (Working Group 3)

There are important differences in how the different working groups understood the new speaker concept and the agendas of the different groups were noticeably distinct. Concretely, Working Group 1 operated with an eye toward policies of minority language revitalisation. Most regional minority languages have seen their numbers of speakers reduced or barely stable in the last decades. This situation prompts questions about what makes it desirable and possible for a person to become a speaker of a given minority language. Working Group 2 and Working Group 3, on the other hand, had little investment in the trajectory of particular languages or language varieties; instead, they were more interested in identifying patterns in the experiences of speakers and the consequences of their linguistic choices. In all three working groups, the legitimacy of varieties and speakers emerged as a key theme, and this theme continued to be central in Phase II of the Action.

In Phase II

In Phase II researchers moved on from the initial working groups organised by socio-linguistic settings and multilingual strands (language minorities, migrants, and transnational workplaces) to a new set of working groups arranged according to theoretical focus:

- **Linguistic competence**  
  (Working Group 7)
- **Subjectivities, trajectories and socialisation**  
  (Working Group 8)
- **Language policy**  
  (Working Group 9)
- **Legitimacy and power**  
  (Working Group 10)

In Phase II, researchers who worked on the three multilingual strands explored in Phase I were now mixed and each took up one theme that would be explored across the three strands. This reshuffle of working groups brought together people with different agendas and perspectives on multilingualism.
Key areas of exploration

Our report is divided into four chapters and synthesises some of the key research on new speakers. A full list of publications can be found in the appendix to this report. The following broad areas are explored:

Chapter 1 focuses on how researchers in the Action examined the situation of new speakers in different contexts, an exercise that was accompanied by a debate on how to define the New Speaker concept.

Chapter 2 looks at how research in the Action illuminated key aspects of the condition of being and becoming a New Speaker connected to legitimacy, belonging and access to capital (social and economic).

Chapter 3 explores how the comparison across settings ultimately led researchers to question the usefulness of ‘new speaker’ as a concept, i.e. as an analytical tool, which led many participants to settle with the category of ‘speaker’. This analytic move from New Speaker to just Speaker as is more amply explained below, is not a simplification or a backtrack; but represents the gradual emergence of “speakerhood” as an angle that contains a critical engagement with key assumptions of linguistics as a discipline.

Chapter 4 looks at how the new speaker concept has and can be been taken up by the policy community and what recommendations can be made on New Speakers.
Chapter 1

Researching New Speakers and debating the concept

Bernadette O’Rourke, Joan Pujolar and Susan Frekko

New Speakers of minority languages

Research on new speakers of indigenous minority languages (initially in Working Group 1) developed typologies that would make it possible to identify the object of study, the ‘new speaker’, with precision. If one goal of revitalisation research is to uncover patterns when people adopt a language, in methodological terms one must have a clear sense of what kinds of speakers are being studied and how these can be distinguished from one another.

Researchers worked toward defining a better set of analytical tools while remaining cognizant of the limits and positionality of all such tools. In doing so, they identified a new speaker of a regional minority language as one who generally learns the language in institutional contexts outside the home. S/he often acquires the language to a high degree of competence and uses it actively outside of classroom contexts. New speakers were seen to include individuals with little or no home or community exposure to a minority language but who instead acquire it through immersion or bilingual educational programmes, revitalisation projects or as adult language learners.

Researchers in the Action focused on a range of minority language contexts including Basque, Breton, Catalan, Corsican, Faroese, Francoprovençal, Galician, Guernésiais, Irish Gaelic, Kven, Luxembourgish, Manx, Monégasque, Occitan, Scottish Gaelic, Sami, Shetlandic, Welsh and Yiddish as well as signed languages.

Researchers in Working Group 1 argued that studies and policy initiatives connected to projects of minority language revitalisation needed to take account of new speakers, since minority languages now tend to have more new speakers than traditional “native” speakers. They advocated for more research on this category of speaker given that the future of many minority languages will in part depend on the continued production of such speakers.

The advantage of working with a (relatively) precise definition of the new speaker was that it allowed Action researchers to identify patterns in circumstances under which speakers acquire and adopt a new language, a question of burning interest in language revitalisation. With this definition in hand, researchers of indigenous minority languages were able go about the task of identifying patterns in when, how and why people become new speakers (as opposed to learners or knowers) and what happens when they do so.
The concept of *muda* (meaning change) was particularly useful in helping researchers identify when and why some people ‘take on’ a minority language they have acquired outside the context of intergenerational transmission. This concept is applied to contexts where knowers of a language become users at transition points in their life course, marked by entry into new speech networks giving both opportunities for use and freedom from old social labels. It is an approach that emphasises speaker agency: speakers already have the knowledge; a *muda* occurs when they decide to put the language to practice in daily life and they find the conditions that make it possible. The term emerged from research on Catalan, but has also been applied to other minority languages, such as Basque and Irish. The patterns of *mudes* vary slightly in each situation. Importantly, the *mudes* are not necessarily linked to ethnonational ideology. In fact, in the Catalan and Basque cases new speakers’ ethnonational identification is absent in people’s accounts of their *mudes*. In other words, the *mudes* framework allows researchers to see that minority language resurgence is not necessarily connected to nationalism. If learners of minority languages are not engaging with the language for nationalistic motivations, this suggests that the Romantic equation between language and nation is not as mandatory as it is often assumed.

Research on *mudes* showed that a *muda* rarely happens for solely economic reasons or because people support a given language variety for political reasons. The *muda* framework also has useful implications for language revitalisation and language policy. For example, it shows that important changes can happen in speakers after the so-called ‘critical period’ of language development that has been traditionally located at the end of adolescence. Research shows that many *mudes* happen during adult life. Research on *mudes* have prompted a rethinking of the assumed purposes of minority language sociolinguistics and to formulate more general questions of what it means to be a legitimate speaker of any language. Speakers cannot perform a *muda* on their own; they need the cooperation of other speakers to ratify them as legitimate speakers. As such, new speakers often express frustration when native speakers or other new speakers are perceived not to engage with them, thus delegitimating their way of speaking and thwarting any attempt at a *muda*.

**Moving beyond the original meaning of New Speaker**

Moving beyond new speakers themselves, researchers in the Acion showed how thinking about new speakers—a category of speakers that denies the presumed link between language, territory and identity—can help us understand the new communicative order of the modern era which is characterised by new types of speakers, new forms of language and new modes of communication.

While the focus on regional minority languages has remained central throughout the Action with a focus on how local speakers became new speakers of regional minority languages, in the later years of the Action, this began to be expanded to take account of transnational migrants who became new speakers of a regional minority language for example Polish speakers who become speakers of Welsh along with English. In this respect we see overlaps between the different working groups bringing together indigenous minority languages, migration and transnational working.
New speakers in the context of migration and transnational working

For researchers on migration, the term new speaker has also been used in order to critique the popular beliefs and institutional practices that tend to blame language (either speaking a different language, or not speaking the national language properly) for the "ills" caused by or suffered by immigrant communities without attention to how racism or processes of exclusion actually operate against them. To write in terms of new speakers put the native speaker paradigm into question, as well as the meanings and values presupposed to go with it, both within the language sciences, in politics, and on the ground among speakers.

Applying the new speaker category in the areas of migration and transnational work allowed for useful comparisons and revealed that new speakers of minority languages had much in common with new speakers of codes that were not ‘minority’ varieties and/or were not considered distinct ‘languages’. For example, the work on transnational workers in Estonia and Norway breaks down the distinction between ‘majority’ and ‘minority’ languages. Researchers described the attitudes and practices of the transnational academic community in Estonia towards learning Estonian. Likewise, research has also identified incentives and hurdles to learning Norwegian in the context of transnational workers in Norway. Interestingly, while both Estonian and Norwegian are national minority languages (although both languages are minoritised globally and Estonian is minoritised in some areas of Estonia), these two cases have much in common with the strand on indigenous minority languages. This research focused on the conditions, policies and ideologies that made it possible (or impossible) for people to take on a variety acquired formally, in this case in work settings. Here again the category new speaker can give us analytic purchase, much as it can for minority language revitalisation.

Similarly, comparative work on Moroccan women who attend Catalan classes in Barcelona and Spanish classes in Madrid implicitly questions the distinction between ‘majority’ and ‘minority’ linguistic status. While Catalan is a minoritised language and Spanish is not, the two languages can be equally inaccessible and alienating for the female students described in the study. In such cases, it is irrelevant whether a language is minoritised or not, because the would-be speakers are minoritised and delegitimated.

While these comparisons allow us to let go of the modifier ‘minority’ when studying new speakers, other comparisons encourage us to let go of the category ‘language’. Researchers in the migration strand applied the new speaker category to speakers who were making a muda into a different regional variety of their habitual language. For example, research has shown that Spanish speakers migrating to Spain from Latin America are treated like new speakers of Spanish. To gain legitimacy, these speakers must make mudes into “peninsular” Castilian Spanish. In a similar vein, other work has shown that making use of a geographically marked variety of Dutch is key to claiming legitimacy as a speaker, a finding we also see widely in the minority language research. In these cases, legitimacy lies not with use of a named language, but with a particular version of it (be it a national standard or a local dialect).

Work on translanguaging similarly reveals that speakers negotiate legitimacy and belonging through the permeable and flexible use of language varieties, including standard named languages, geographical varieties and social registers. In short, comparisons across the different multilingual strands allow researchers to see the value of considering new speakers beyond the case of minoritised, named languages.
Usefulness of New Speaker as an analytical category

As we have seen, the analytical category of new speaker, when applied broadly as an umbrella concept, allowed researchers to identify the object of study (who exactly they were studying), which in turn allowed them to identify patterns in language use, ideologies and life trajectories. However, some researchers in the Action worried that this typological approach was overly positivistic, ‘clinical’, and potentially exclusionary. The use of speaker typologies can always potentially be used to stereotype people or justify forms of segregation.

Parallel to the sharing of research results there was an ongoing debate on the concept of new speaker. This has facilitated a range of theoretical reflections on research goals and objects of study. The term new speaker—and the Action itself—originate in research on the revitalisation of indigenous minority languages in Europe. Speakers of Basque, Breton and Galician have folk concepts analogous to new speaker, usually describing a person who acquired these languages as an adult. As explained above, researchers in the Action subsequently applied the concept in research on migration and transnational work. In the process of conducting data analysis and sharing results, participants found that the concept opened up new avenues of critique; but they also met difficulties and anticipated possible political risks.

The folk concept of new speaker raised interesting possibilities for a new analytical category that could solve some of the terminological problems in the field of language revitalisation (and, for that matter, the broader fields of sociolinguistics and linguistics themselves). Researchers in the Action point out that the revitalisation of minority languages has tended to depend on the native speaker model, but that doing so is rife with contradictions. In a sense, language revitalisation has ‘needed’ the notion of the native speaker as someone who produces ideal, legitimate, authentic, traditional speech. Without these strategically essentialist notions, it becomes hard to justify language revitalisation at all: if all forms of speech are equally valid, then why bother to revitalise?

The new speaker concept prompts us to query how linguistics as a discipline has participated in the reproduction of linguistic ideologies, essentially through abstract notions of nativeness. Such notions have in fact been shown to have little or no empirical basis. Instead, the ‘ideal native speaker’, who rests at the centre of language theory from generative grammar through to language revitalisation, is in fact a product of dominant linguistic ideology at the end of the 19th century, when the language sciences began to emerge. This native speaker, rather than an analytic category emerging from empirical evidence, is in fact merely an artefact of the Romantic ideology linking language, nation, and territory. In this sense, to adopt the concept new speaker is to reject the paired and hierarchically ordered concepts native speaker and non-native speaker.

Additionally, the new speaker label moves away from a deficit model (‘non-native, ‘second’ language, etc.) and from a commitment to ‘salvaging’ the language and ‘rescuing’ native speaker communities toward understanding the systems of meaning surrounding language varieties in different sociolinguistic settings. As such, the Action’s researchers have used the new speaker concept to question the privileging of the native speaker, which has tended to be taken as the ultimate ‘owner’ of minority languages and the object of revitalisation movements where the focus was on ‘salvaging’ the native speaker.

As highlighted above, the new speaker concept also allowed us to identify phenomena that cut across minority language and majority language contexts. However, this also meant that the
Researching New Speakers and debating the concept

potential types of new speakers (as identified by Working Group 2 and Working Group 3) became very numerous, so that the specific profiles identified by Working Group 1 became just a few amongst many. The criteria by which new speakers were identified and characterised were also much more varied in Working Group 2 and Working Group 3 than in Working Group 1. In this context, the notion of new speaker appeared to some researchers as disperse and as not associated with any specific type of experience.

An article by the late Alexandra Jaffe (2015)1 reviewed systematically all the possible criteria that were mobilised or could potentially be mobilised, as well as combined, to define new speakers. Thus, it was clear from the outset of the Action that the term could not be used in a strict denotative fashion. In the Action many researchers argued that the new speaker concept should be a lens rather than a category. Through this lens researchers were encouraged to analyse the contemporary dynamics of multilingual communities and their speakers, rather than a precise concept which can be used to typologise highly complex social groups. In this vein, the typologising approach came to be seen as problematic by many scholars, as it was seen to position researchers in the Action as linguistic arbiters, a role which Action members had explicitly set out to question in the first place.

By the same token, privileging native speech threatens to undermine revitalisation efforts, considering that so many speakers (and in many cases the majority) of Europe’s minority languages cannot be considered ‘native’. Given these difficulties, the work on typologies in Phase II had to be treated as exploratory and heuristic. Participants in the Action preferred to investigate the emic typologies existing on the ground in sociolinguistic settings that feature speakers learning and/or using varieties acquired outside intergenerational transmission. Researchers advocated for the use of the concept as a social category which would be subject to social negotiation and variation, and delineated largely by new speakers themselves. In other words, new speakers should be taken seriously as a folk category in speakers’ negotiations of language, identity, capital and belonging, but not used as an analytical category for delineating the object of study or its features (since to do so could potentially lead to the misuse of academic research in the deligitimation and/or exclusion of speakers).

A number of participants have decided to maintain new speaker as an analytic category, while acknowledging explicitly that the researcher’s classifications might not always correspond to those of speakers themselves. Because of the purchase it has provided on understanding these issues (and despite the misgivings of some of the Action’s researchers), the new speaker concept has continued to be used as an analytical category throughout the Action, including work which has continued beyond the life of the Action. The new speaker category has enabled clear contributions to the study (and potentially the implementation) of language revitalisation and planning. For example, the ethnography of language policy which emerged as a later theme in the Action shows us how policies play out on the ground and how they can backfire. In this later research, new speaker appears as an analytical category (and, where relevant, as a folk category as well).

---

The dual etic-emic approach to the concept has been especially fruitful when researchers have been interested in revitalisation and language planning (which applies to Action research not only on minority language speakers but also on transnational workers). When a goal of the research is to understand what encourages speakers to use one variety or another, typologising speakers helps researchers uncover relationships between speaker profiles and patterns of language use. In these contexts, it is useful to have an analytical category (among other categories) to describe speakers who are coming to the language via a path other than intergenerational transmission. Researchers in this line of inquiry need a way of describing the speakers they are studying, and the new speaker label has the advantage of not privileging the native speaker ideal or operating from a deficit perspective or from a commitment to named languages.

These contributions respond to an interest in understanding the state and fate of linguistic varieties. This interest appeared particularly in the minority language and transnational work strands of the Action, and less so in the migration strand. A second area of contribution cross-cut the three strands of the Action; this area concerned understanding not the planning and prognosis of linguistic varieties, but the experiences of speakers and the consequences of their linguistic choices. Researchers working from this viewpoint illuminated the dynamics related to speaker’s legitimacy, belonging and access to capital, as described in the next section.
Chapter 2
Legitimacy, belonging, and capital

Bernadette O’Rourke, Joan Pujolar and Susan Frekko

When Action researchers asked when, how and why knowers become users of languages and what happens socially and economically when they do so, they invariably came up against issues of legitimacy, belonging and capital. In fact, these categories are perhaps the most crosscutting in the Action, appearing in nearly all of the research emerging from it. Researchers have asked:

- How do new speakers deal with linguistic legitimacy and authority as members of the community they live in, both from their point of view and the point of view of the community receiving them?
- Do new speakers consider themselves authentic?
- Do others consider them authentic speakers of the new language they have acquired?
- What implications does this have on access to symbolic and economic capital linked to the new language or variety?

In the case of minoritised European languages, on which much of the research focuses, legitimacy seems to be determined by the authenticity/anonymity divide proposed by Woolard (2008). Speakers of minoritised languages tend to incur legitimacy via authenticity, which is linked to intergenerational transmission (or at least contact with those who acquired the language this way), speaking an identifiable and consistent dialect ‘from somewhere’, historic territories, and ‘the local’. In some of the minority languages, the equivalent of the English ‘new speaker’ is itself an emic category used by speakers, in addition to being an analytical category used by the authors. In these cases, new speaker clearly does fit into a typology, one that always seems to be hierarchical. The emic new speaker stands in contrast to the ‘traditional’, ‘native’, ‘local’. And here we see the influence of the value systems imposed by the field of linguistics (which, as mentioned above, has tended to reify ‘native speech’ and used it as an implicit or explicit model).

For example, we see a hierarchy in the case of Basque, where we find a continuum of emic categories of Basque speakers, going from least authentic to most authentic, equivalent to ‘new Basque speaker’, ‘Basque speaker’ and ‘native Basque speaker’. Key to this on-the-ground classification are modes of acquisition, degree of use and variety of use. As for acquisition, only those who acquire Basque through intergenerational transmission can ever count as fully authentic and therefore fully legitimate Basque speakers. ‘New Basque speaker’ and ‘Basque speaker’ are both categories of people who learned the language outside of this mode of acquisition. What distinguishes them is the degree of use (‘Basque speakers’ use the language in more settings) and variety of use (‘New Basque speakers’ speak standard Basque, while ‘Basque speakers’ speak a geographically marked dialect). New speakers tended to want ‘to speak a Basque that is from somewhere’. This language-from-somewhere appears in sharp contrast to the standard, seen as a language-from-nowhere.

---

Legitimacy, belonging, and capital

We see the importance of speaking a geographically marked ‘language-from-somewhere’ in other contexts studied by Action researchers as well, including Galician, Francoprovençal, Irish, and Welsh. The dynamics of legitimacy often play out recursively: an opposition between non-new and new speakers repeats itself among new speakers, where speakers whose language practices and pedigrees are closer to those of non-new speakers are more legitimate (as an expression of authenticity).

However, the Action revealed that authenticity is not the only way through which speakers can pursue legitimacy. As shown by Woolard (2008), the other axis by which languages and speakers acquire legitimacy is through anonymity. Speakers of majority languages tend to derive legitimacy from speaking a ‘language from nowhere’, one that is standardised and neutral. For minority languages that have undergone successful revitalisation and (re-)entered the public sphere, we often see a competing set of values of legitimacy: one can assign value to the local varieties that have been indigenously reproduced across generations, or one can assign value to the new codified language linked to education, standardisation and economically instrumental use. For example, researchers have found that ‘authentic’ Galician continues to be the locus of legitimacy in Galicia, but in Scotland some new speakers point to the value of the new Gaelic forms introduced into professional Gaelic, and some of them deny that one needs a local accent. Similarly researchers have found that new speakers of Manx (which now only has new speakers, but is preserved in its locally linked forms via sound recordings) and of Irish Gaelic question the idea that locally marked ‘authentic’ language is the truly legitimate language. They instead point to the need for functionality and adaptation to the current needs of speakers. They often questioned the goal of speaking a geographically marked dialect.

As seen here, hierarchies of speakers can shift with the context. When authenticity is the source of legitimacy, the ‘native speaker’ is most legitimate (for example, because she speaks a local dialect). When new speakers are able to claim a different route to legitimacy (through flexibility, modern-ness, education, upward mobility, usefulness, etc.) they can occupy the top of the sociolinguistic hierarchy. The two different poles of legitimacy can result in tensions between traditional and new speakers in revitalisation movements, where some speakers value the factors linked to authenticity (leading them in some cases to refuse to speak with new speakers) and other speakers value those linked to anonymity.

These tensions can be extreme, as in the cases of the revitalisation movements surrounding languages such as Yiddish and Breton, where there is little contact between traditional and new speakers, and speakers use these categories to construct social boundaries. In fact, new speakers, who hold stock in standardisation and institutionalisation, may even view traditional speakers as obstacles to revitalisation. In the case of Breton, for example, researchers have found that language revitalisers can actively seek to exclude native speakers from revitalisation efforts, seeing them as a cumbersome burden. When researchers investigate these emic typologies, we can see that the study of new speakers fits squarely within the study of language ideologies.

Despite cases of contestation of the legitimacy of authenticity, the ‘native speaker’ continues to hold sway in many contexts, and being able to ‘pass’ for ‘native’ is often the ultimate sign of legitimacy for a new speaker. For example, researchers have found that younger new speakers of Occitan often claim legitimacy for themselves (while delegitimating a third new speaker) until they hear a recording of a ‘native speaker’, to whom they immediately defer. In fact, a common feature of minority language contexts is that new speakers presume an impermeable boundary between themselves and native speakers as
researchers in the Basque context found. That is, regardless of other dynamics surrounding the languages, people on the ground tend to differentiate between those who acquired the language through intergenerational transmission and those who ‘learned’ it formally.

To understand the issues of legitimacy at play, many researchers in the Action explored the concept of language as social and economic capital. What kind of language use helps speakers position themselves favourably in their social and economic lives, as legitimate persons and workers? In this sense, issues of legitimacy were key not only in the minority language strand of the Action, but also in the strands related to migration and transnational work. In the context of migration, a study of refugees and asylum seekers in England were found to create belonging through an English conversation club. Other research has shown that the pedagogical approach in classes for Moroccan women studying Spanish and Catalan, for example, shows the ways that the classes can in fact de-skill them rather than prepare them as legitimate speakers who can compete in the Spanish labour market. Within this strand, researchers also showed how speakers mobilise a range of linguistic codes, including dialects and accents, to seek legitimacy and/or to deny the legitimacy of others.

Here, researchers applied the concept of *muda* beyond minority language contexts. The *muda* can refer to taking on a majority language or a different geographical dialect of one’s ‘native language’ and a *muda* can be shifting and/or incomplete. People choose to make a *muda* not just to defend a particular language or to advance themselves economically. They usually also make the *muda* as an act of belonging to a given group or network for examine in the case of migrants who adopt bilingual Catalan practices to become full members of their Erasmus community. A *muda* is only seen to be successful when other speakers ratify it (that is, display that they regard it as legitimate by using the new language with the speaker who has made the *muda*).

We see these issues of contested legitimacy and belonging in the case of Latin American students in Madrid, who are subject to ‘linguistic surveillance’ as they attempt to gain legitimacy by adopting the phonology of Iberian standard Spanish. We also see it in the ‘unvoicing’ of a Moroccan girl in a Spanish classroom, whose classmates implicitly question her legitimacy as a speaker of Spanish and Galician.

Importantly, speakers are often legitimated or delegitimated on the basis of language ideologies originating in the language sciences. This ideological baggage can have profound consequences for the social inclusion or exclusion of speakers. For example, researchers in the Action have shown that linguistic knowledge—for example, of phonological differences between normative peninsular Spanish and other varieties of Spanish— is used to delegitimate the speech of Latin American university students in Madrid. This research found that that this delegimation process rests on ‘linguistic knowledge related to the neutrality of a single linguistic norm, standardised through the hierarchisation of languages and dialects, with models of speakerhood remaining linked to a particular territory’. That is, the ideal of the ‘native speaker’, still taken for granted in linguistics, filters into the education system and beyond, creating real-life obstacles for speakers and serving gate-keeping projects. To the extent that the language sciences have taken the legitimacy of the ‘native speaker’ for granted, they have encouraged the exclusion of other kinds of speakers, a problem which tends to become more acute in an age of increased mobility.

In focusing on speakers’ experiences and the social and economic consequences of their linguistic choices, Action researchers noted patterns related to legitimacy, belonging and capital. In doing so, some Action researchers shifted from ‘new speaker’ to ‘speaker’ as an analytical category, as described in the next section. Ironically, the very comparisons enabled by the new speaker category pushed inquiry to the point that some researchers questioned or even replaced the category altogether.
Chapter 3

New Speakers – Umbrella term, analytical concept or lens?

Bernadette O’Rourke, Joan Pujolar and Susan Frekko

As highlighted above, the Action grew out of an interest in new speakers of minority languages, but the proposers of the Action pointed out early on that the concept need not apply to minority language contexts in particular, and from the beginning of the Action, researchers also applied this concept in work in the strands of migration and transnational work. The term was defined as an ‘umbrella concept’ that could be applied to a range of speakers across settings or as a way of describing claims made by speakers themselves over their ownership of a language.

Because of their interest in revitalisation and their commitment to avoiding ideological baggage, the Action’s researchers of indigenous minority languages were invested in developing a definition of new speaker as a specific analytical concept with identifiable features. Scholars identified the concepts of new speaker and new speakerness as tools for talking about the ways of speaking and the social and linguistic practices of speakers which exist outside of the traditional native-speaker communities. This deliberate shift in terminology has sought to draw attention to the ways in which minority language research, and indeed linguistics in general, has participated in the reproduction of linguistic ideologies, essentially through abstract notions of ‘nativeness’. In moving away from deficit-based typologies (‘non-native’, ‘L2’) and toward the new speaker concept, the Action took a stance in favour of linguistic diversity: the underlying assumption was that linguistic diversity should be preserved, but it did not privilege ‘pure’, ‘local’, or ‘native’ forms of linguistic diversity.

As we have seen, the new speaker as an analytical category is useful when the focus is on revitalisation and planning; that is, when researchers are studying (or designing) efforts to get people to speak a certain way. However, revitalisation and planning were only one focal point of the Action. Many Action researchers were more interested in understanding speakers’ experiences, with a particular interest in how speakers (fail to) gain legitimacy and with what social consequences in today’s mobile, multilingual Europe. In most research settings examined by Action researchers, new speaker is not a folk category. In this sense, to use it at all is to use it as an analytical category. A fascinating (and ironic) outcome of the Action is that when researchers examined new speakers in the three multilingual contexts (indigenous minority languages, migration and transnational work), the very useful comparisons that emerged began to chafe against the category of new speaker that was initially proposed to allow these crosscutting comparisons.

An analytical category is of course useful if it helps researchers isolate factors that illuminate their research questions across a range settings. It clearly does so in the revitalisation and language policy research. However, turning to the research focused more on social outcomes, the new speaker category is less effective in picking out these factors. We can see this problem clearly if we return to Working Group 1’s definition of new speaker, described above. For Working Group 1, a new speaker is someone who learns a language in institutional contexts outside the home, often acquiring a high degree of competence and using it actively outside the classroom. Moving step-wise through this definition, we can see that these factors may not give researchers much purchase on speakers’ experiences and the
social consequences of their linguistic choices in general, nor on legitimacy, belonging and capital in particular. The elements of the definition fail to pick out meaningful differences among participants that hold across settings:

**Acquired formally in institutionally contexts outside the home**

This element does not effectively reveal patterns around social meanings and outcomes for speakers. For example, while Action researchers have shown that ‘native speakers’ continue to be considered the most legitimate in many minority language situations, they have also shown contexts in which people acquiring such languages in institutional settings outside the home can have more legitimacy. Further, a wide range of degrees of competence can be encompassed within the descriptor ‘acquired in institutional contexts outside the home’. For example, researchers in the Action have applied the term New Speaker both to Basque speakers who began immersion schooling at age two and whose speech is linguistically indistinguishable from that of the (emic) ‘native Basque speaker’ and immigrants learning rudimentary Dutch using an online tool. While the crosscutting comparisons are in themselves illuminating, they tend to empty the New Speaker category of meaning. Also, comparing research across the strands reveals that speakers’ experiences of legitimation and delegitimation can be similar irrespective of mode of acquisition; some varieties are rarely transmitted formally in institutions (e.g. youth registers or local accents) yet may be as important for speaker legitimacy in some contexts as acquisition of a standard variety might be in others. Finally, it is worth noting that standard varieties are only rarely acquired intergenerationally, and are almost always acquired formally in institutions. In this sense, mode of acquisition gives us little purchase on understanding the use of and meanings surrounding standard varieties. These reflections allow us to see that mode and locus of acquisition do not isolate the issues of legitimacy, belonging and capital that interest many Action researchers. Therefore, when these issues are on the table, rather than staking an analytical claim on acquisition, it seems more fruitful to examine what role (if any) that mode and locus of acquisition play for speakers in a given setting.

**High linguistic competence**

This factor also turned out to be of little use in defining an object of study or picking out broad patterns related to speakers’ experiences and the social and economic consequences of their linguistic choices. Action researchers studied speakers of a range of different competences—from ones with little or none to those who ‘passed’ as ‘native speakers’ locally and/or even engaged in ‘majority language displacement’, giving up a majority language altogether, in favour of a minority one. The moniker New Speaker began to lose purchase when defined in part by competence, because researchers applied it to speakers of varying degrees of competence in order to examine similar questions of legitimacy, belonging and capital. Additionally, degree of competence did not necessarily correlate with degree of legitimacy (for example, in the cases of Yiddish and Breton). These cases suggest that the factor of competence cannot help researchers detect patterns in social outcomes.

**Active language use outside of classroom contexts**

This delimiter also provided little purchase on speakers’ experiences and the social consequences that follow from their linguistic choices. For one thing, differing access to social and economic capital determines who has the chance to acquire a language well enough to use it outside the classroom. In other words, if researchers begin by defining the object of study as highly competent speakers, they are setting aside the
The key question of why only some speakers have the opportunity to become highly competent in the first place. Furthermore, questions of legitimacy condition whether a speaker is accepted as an interlocutor outside the classroom, even if she has enough competence to become one. Finally, sometimes the classroom is itself the site of a linguistic community of practice. We see that this factor also dissolves when researchers make comparisons across sociolinguistic settings.

**Why New Speaker when Speaker will do?**

After seeing that the elements used to define the new speaker offer little theoretical purchase on understanding many of the phenomena that interest Action researchers, it could be said that the analytical category New Speaker may no longer seems necessary. We see that speakers can face similar challenges or opportunities regardless of mode or locus of acquisition, degree of competence, locus of use, whether the variety in question is minoritised or whether it is a named language, a geographic dialect or a socially marked register. This reflection resonates with warnings from some scholars about academic slogans and the creation of new terms. Why New Speaker when Speaker will do?

In an article predating the Action, O'Rourke and Pujolar\(^3\) proposed a shift from the theoretical lens of the ‘native speaker’ to that of the ‘new speaker’ (2013) in the context of language revitalisation. As described above, Action researchers have continued to successfully apply the New Speaker category when Speaker won’t; that is, when the goal is to uncover sociolinguistic patterns relevant to language revitalisation and language policy. However, much of the Action's research has inspired questions related to social—as opposed to linguistic—outcomes. In this vein, dissolving the analytic category New Speaker and replacing it with Speaker has allowed researchers to generate crosscutting comparisons focused on how people perform social actions through the language varieties in their lives—how they negotiate legitimacy and belonging and acquire social capital. This research was not about producing a new taxonomy of speakers, but about understanding the political economy of speaker categorisation in specific contexts, and hence shedding light on how language participates in struggles over access to resources. This Speaker perspective and more specifically a sociolinguistics of the speaker can perhaps allow researchers to illuminate who has access to which codes, how and where they are able to deploy them, and with what social and economic consequences, across a wide range of settings in today’s multilingual, globalised Europe.

---

The Policy Community

The salience and relevance of the cogent and well-researched evidence undertaken both by the COST New Speaker network and others will be enhanced if members of the policy community are made aware of the needs of new speakers and can be influenced by the force of key recommendations. It is contended that without knowing the predisposition of significant decision makers to act so as to strengthen the needs of and likely requirements of new speakers in context, the well formulated recommendations will not gain much purchase and would be seen as being one step removed from the policy landscape they seek to influence.

1. The policy community itself is a diverse array of interests, resource allocation imperatives and competing political ideologies. For agencies and departments concerned with language revitalisation there is a clear understanding that the contribution of 'native or indigenous speakers' is vital as a source of legitimacy, authenticity and creativity in reproducing both language and its associated culture(s).

2. However, they are less certain as to how to categorise or operationalise programmes which also seek to acknowledge the salience and contribution of New Speakers as opposed to L2 learners. Given this there is no priori expectation that there will be a comprehensive interpretation of the requirements and roles of new speakers in language policy development expressed by those official representatives interviewed in this pilot project. Rather some critical detective work and creative trajectories were needed to tease out the salient features of any official response to the questions posed.

Key Questions

- How can the "new speaker" concept inform language policy scholarship and practice?
- How do different jurisdictions interpret the role and potential contribution of new speakers to the vitality of the target language population(s)?
- What policy outcomes can be identified in terms of inequalities and social stratification affecting "new speakers" more directly?
- What are the ideas and beliefs of different sorts of actors about "new speakers" in a given setting?
- What particular aspects does it illuminate more clearly than other related concepts?
- How is the governance of any programme targeted at new speaker promotion and satisfaction to be managed?

Approaches and Methodologies

The salient feature of new speakers is their dynamism for as was set out in the introductory chapter to the report, "new speakers are multilingual citizens who, by engaging with languages other than their 'native' or 'national'..."
language(s), cross existing social boundaries, re-evaluate their own levels of linguistic competence and creatively (re)structure their social practices to adapt to new and overlapping linguistic spaces” (p.10)

The New Speaker network to date has produced a great deal of fascinating data on a number of related issues such as the adjustment process undertaken by speakers of additional, non-mother tongue languages; the role of immigration and mobility in inducing and reinforcing some to become a new speaker; the underlying and trigger factors which conduce to the transition towards being competent and confident in an additional language; the emotional and psychological factors involved with the transition;1 the melding of several disciplines so as to produce a syncretic overview of the new speaker process; the reinforcement of linguistic anthropological methodology as a suitable means of garnering data and evidence; the introduction of the new speaker concept into the public discourse on language, education, the health services, mobility and immigration. In welcoming each and every one of these initiatives there is a need also to translate the very many fine descriptive and ethnographic results into realisable policy recommendations so that the needs and interests of the new speakers may be incorporated into mainstream public policy.

This is easier said than done in a crowded policy environment. One of the key determining factors in navigating into this busy scene is the attitude, predisposition and value judgement of senior policy advisers and decision makers regarding the necessity and pragmatism of foregrounding new speakers as a policy item. To that end this part of the COST Action investigation on New Speakers sought to interrogate the opinions of senior public servants in several jurisdictions and to report on their views prior to presenting a series of domain-specific policy recommendations which may be of value in the formulation of future policy objectives and best practice actions.

These findings were calibrated by discussions with a range of leading actors in the field from academia, politics and civil society so as to contextualise the interpretation.

The investigation sought to undertake a preliminary analysis in respect of three mutually-reinforcing areas of work specifically:

1. to conduct face-to-face interviews and email follow up requests for additional material and opinion from within a select group of senior public servants and policy advisers. The interviews were conducted from within the following jurisdictions, viz., the Basque Country, Catalonia, Ireland, Finland, Scotland and Wales, with supplementary material gathered through interviews in Canada.2

2. to explore the potential policy implications of the data and evidence generated from within the New Speaker Network’s Working Group 8 and Working Group 9 during their lifespan (2015-17); participation within the Working Group 9 and early sight of the final reports of selected Working Groups has allowed me to harvest good ideas and experiences at a variety of levels of interaction.

3. to extend a long-running interpretation of Official Language Strategies and undertake further work to harness the latest material and insights from within the New Speaker Network so as to ascertain how integral (or not) are any reference to New Speakers within several of the revised Language Strategy and Policy reforms currently being undertaken.
The Policy Community and Recommendations on New Speakers

While recognising that this analysis is concentrating on a small sample of minority language jurisdictions, it is contended that in principle several of the recommendations and examples of best practice should be transferable to other contexts, either in terms of raising awareness or in relation to broad policy developments in education, local administration, community engagement and civil-government interactions. Of course, the long-term aim is to influence outcome-related behaviour through such policy interventions.

One of the features of the New Speaker Network interaction was the production of a wide array of publications describing the situation in many jurisdictions and the related aspects of the transformative processes by which new speakers were produced. A second was the attempt to engage and empower local communities in discussing a range of issues and aspects of how new speakers were welcomed and treated. A third was the production of a set of guidelines to Stakeholders; however, to date there is little evidence on whether the guidelines have been adopted or have had a positive effect. It could be argued that this is too early, but even so the interviews that were conducted sought to find material related to changed attitudes, more inclusive behaviour and plans for the future as will be reported on below.

An abiding concern of those who work on the issue of new speakers is to construct a satisfactory working definition of the concept and the phenomena it seeks to describe. The most comprehensive definition adopted refers to individuals who make regular use of a language that is not their first language. This is meant to relate to a language they acquired outside of the home, often through the education system or as adult learners. This interpretation may not satisfy all, but it is a good approximation to cover the range of scenarios and situations within which the concepts and paradigms which undergird new speaker discussions may lie. Rather than be preoccupied with precise definitions some of the leading scholars in the field aver that despite the lack of definitional precision the concept itself has captured a momentum and a trajectory which is significant both in terms of the specific cases analysed and as an added value approach to language policy analysis.

Recently two of the principal leaders of the New Speaker Network have traced how their theoretical lens has moved from a native speaker/new speaker perspective to one which incorporates all speakers and thus lays a focus on research which is not about producing a new taxonomy of speakers, but about understanding the political economy of speaker categorisation in specific contexts, and hence (throwing) light on how language participates in struggles over access to resources: (Pujolar & O’Rourke K&P draft 1bis, p. 1). The concern with resources gets to the heart of the relevance of the new speaker paradigm for the political economy of most states. Indeed, it could be argued that the new speaker lens opens up new possibilities for interpreting long established discussions on language pedagogy, in group and outgroup membership, migration and adjustment, open and closed boundaries and the like. Ultimately how new speaker policies are framed are a reflection of underlying political cultures covering the entire spectrum of European (and other) jurisdictions from Conservative through Liberal and Social Democratic to Socialist/Communist precepts. Ministerial decisions are crucial, but so is the context of the respective public administrative and governmental departments acting as a key influence on the predisposition of public servants to consider integrating New Speaker requirements into their programmes.
The Policy Community and Recommendations on New Speakers

The Response of the Policy Community

Interviews and document analysis were undertaken in the following jurisdictions: The Basque Country, Canada, Catalonia, Finland, Ireland, Scotland and Wales. In this briefing report a very general summary only will be provided. Perhaps the most important finding was there was little intuitive agreement as to the salience of embedding new speaker concerns within language and education policies throughout all jurisdictions. There was no consensus, some confusion and only an occasional professional commitment to the concept and its implementation. In all the interviews with policy formulators, when the issue of policy reform in favour of considering the needs of new speakers was introduced, two dominant reactions were registered. Either the policy formulator insisted that such needs were already catered for in well-established programmes, or that they believed there was no great urgency to adapt existing priorities to take account of such needs, if indeed there was a recognised lacuna in current provision. Few senior policy advisors enthusiastically endorsed a fresh approach to new speakers as if it were a novel, urgent and sustainable policy item. Some did argue that in time consideration might be given to enlarging the scope of current programmes, in relation to education and community integration, so as to account for the growing presence of new speakers, but this was generally couched in terms of a larger integration approach to migrants, whether or not they had identified as new speakers per se.

By contrast most specialists, academics and commentators, were strongly of the opinion that specific, tailor-made policy initiatives were needed to better reflect the contribution of new speakers whether competent learners or migrants. It was also evident that there was some frustration with the paradigm for it failed to adequately differentiate between different trajectories followed by new speakers, whether as students from non-native language homes who learned the target language within statutory education, or as adult learners or as migrants/refugees predisposed to learning the target language so as to cope and absorb into parts of the host community.

Others argued that the new speaker concept was a sop, a form of deceit to cover over several long-standing and well-established weaknesses in the education system which had failed to produce competent L2 speakers and users in sufficient quantities to justify the time, resources and efforts in promoting the target language within certain jurisdictions. They further argued that the concept and its accompanying rationale, literature and advocacy was an as yet unproven case. In consequence they were not minded to embrace this new dimension of policy and curriculum reform until such time as realistic, measurable and significant advantages could be demonstrated. This is an important line of reasoning and as it is held by selected decision makers within the policy community across several jurisdictions is worth giving serious consideration to by those who advocate a more holistic approach to the incorporation of new speaker needs into the system.

In terms of existing practices, awareness and recognition of the need to adopt practical policy measures a short interpretation summarising each jurisdiction in turn will suffice in this context.
The Basque Country displays an impressive and urgent understanding of the need to incorporate new speakers into mainstream linguistic, educational and community affairs. A number of relatively well-established programmes exist by which governments (at all levels) seek to incorporate new speakers. The demographic weight of new speakers, both as competent learners and relatively recent migrants, makes it imperative that such programmes work, for there is a fear that if they do not then the vitality of the indigenous Basque speaking population will be reduced.

The growth of the Basque Education System demonstrates how the society has embraced the integral use of Basque from kindergarten to Higher Education. A generation ago some 20% of children and students were enrolled in Ikastolas, now there are some 80% plus with only some 5% enrolled in conventional Spanish-medium schools. This a result of a massive swing in parental choice requiring huge investment by successive governments and educational authorities in teacher training, educational resources, assessment bodies. In consequence it is the education system which is the principal means by which new speakers are produced and sustained. Understandably a great deal of attention is paid in the formulation of curriculum development, educational pedagogy, adult education classes and university education, as to how to best encourage new speakers to accelerate their learning and contribute to the socio-economic success of the Basque Country. By definition, given their preponderance, it is new speakers who constitute the vast majority of Basque students, and as a result all mainstream policies necessarily incorporate their interests as a matter of routine deliberation and implementation.

Interviews were conducted with senior public servants and representatives of the principal agency for government language policy, the Kultura eta Hizkuntza Politika Saila, together with a selection of interviewees from local government, councillors, the Euskaraldia initiative, together with language policy and planning specialists and academic researchers involved in the COST Action on New Speakers.

Their view was that whilst in the main the growth in numbers reflects a remarkable success story the radical nature of the revitalisation reforms also reveals a number of underlying concerns. The most profound is that the formal assessment of various Basque language skills and competencies do not match the expectations of professionals and parents. There are early-warning signals that the spectacular growth to date may be questioned by both supporters and opponents alike. Some teacher trainers argue for better training methods, others for differentiated class-room practices to account for diversity of home language and argue that it is unfair to expect L2 to match L1 competences in a short space of time. The policy imperative for both decision-makers and senior public servants is how to manage the anticipated backlash?

In addition, there is a related concern that despite the enormous investment in educational provision and the corresponding increase in the requirement to demonstrate Basque language skills in sectors of the economy, the actual usage of Basque in so many socio-economic contexts remains disappointing. It was assumed that increasing the total number of speakers through the education system, the Basque for Adults programme, numerous well evidenced government initiatives and the social mobilisation of actors, would automatically transfer into increased social usage outside education, given the sheer weight of numbers and socio-economic transformation of the workforce, requiring increased skills in Basque.
That this has not happened to the expected degree has prompted a fresh round of initiatives by both government and civil society so as to reinforce patterns of language choice in favour of Basque. The most notable of such recent actions is the Udaltop resolution of May 2018 in Lasarte which sought to embed the social use of Basque through a programme known as Euskaraldia run by 316 local committees and implemented in November and December 2018. It was assumed that by seeking to actively intervene in the social and economic conversations and interactions so as to favour Basque, determined adherence to the principle of open all interactions with Basque might prompt a shift in favour of the language in future subsequent patterns of relations. Government investigations of the outcomes and other social investigation research by specialist organisations such as Soziolinguistika Klusterra now offer a diagnosis, a methodology for evaluation and ideas for improvement e.g. Arrue (analysis), Berbekin (spoken competence), Aldahitz (promote language switching) which feature new speakers as an essential element in the interpretations and remedial actions.

National and local government officials who were interviewed were fully supportive of such actions and indeed in the case of the national government they had initiated and funded many of them directly so as to influence the desired outcomes. They were well informed about the contribution new speakers could make to Basque sociolinguistic vitality in each distinct region and were enthusiastic about developing additional programmes to enhance their role in revitalisation efforts in education, the workplace, leisure and social interaction. In summary it may be said that the Basque jurisdiction is fully aware of the significance of encouraging new speakers, devising programmes to meet their needs and keen to adopt other best practice features from cognate contexts in Europe, for they recognise that increasing Basque language numbers and use is a major challenge and the active participation of new speakers is key to success.

**Catalonia** represents a jurisdiction with a very mature and well-established approach to incorporating the needs of new speakers whether as competent second language learners or migrants.

The basis of Catalan language policy has been well established and is enshrined in Act No. 1, of 7th January 1998, on linguistic policy together with the Organic Act 6/2006, dated 19 June, reforming the Statute of Autonomy of Catalonia. However, this Statute was modified by the ruling of the Constitutional Court on the 28 June 2010 which investigated a challenge of unconstitutionality no. 8045-2006 which was brought against several provisions of the Organic Act 6/2006.

The political system’s language strategy seeks to ensure that all citizens have access to knowledge of Catalan and the possibility of full language integration. Consequently, the language is used in compulsory education and is the official language at university and post-secondary education. The education system is designed to reinforce the primacy of Catalan as the language of normal social interaction. The school system adopts a programme to maintain the family language aimed at the Catalan-speaking students, and a programme of starting linguistic immersion aimed at Spanish-speaking children. Time-series evaluations of the programmes demonstrate that students develop a robust competence in both official languages and clearly for many from a Spanish speaking background they may be identified as new speakers of Catalan in adulthood for they use their Catalan proficiency in work, leisure and social interaction.

At the beginning of the century the population of Catalonia was 6,261,999 which rose to 7,539,618 by 2011. This included some 1,185,852 (15.7%) recorded as immigrants, a trend which has accelerated remarkably since 2000 when only some 181,590 people were so recorded.
Given this growth in immigration to Catalonia from many parts of the world a new imperative is how to deal with the children of migrants in the schools system and the migrants themselves as they seek to navigate into the mainstream of Catalanian Society. The ‘new linguistic immersion’ programme aims to reduce the difficulties which students face in meeting Catalan and Spanish medium instruction and it is evident that among the teaching profession there is a strong support for the integrative measures and consideration of the needs of learners and new speakers alike as they progress through the educational system. Pedagogic practices have been modified and new methodologies and social awareness programmes have been implemented. That is not to say that there are not educational and social tensions surrounding this adjustment process and just as with the Basque educators interviewed there are serious discussions regarding the threshold of Catalan and Spanish language learning, the forms of assessment used, the training of teachers to cope with an increased multilingual intake of students and the sufficiency of out-of-school integration practices that have been developed. As a consequence there is a considerable policy-oriented discussion on the role of new speakers whether as learners of Catalan from non-Catalanian speaking homes or more recent migrants, and this bodes well for the planned response to this growing sector of the population.

However, there is a down side also or at the very least a series of challenges with which the Catalan authorities and socio-economic agencies are struggling. Clearly the significant change in the composition of the population has thrown up a number of challenges and socio-economic tensions and has placed a great strain on the public services beyond education, especially public health, employment and housing. Thus, for Catalan language strategists the manner in which such immigrants are integrated into mainstream society is an urgent and politically sensitive matter, the more so given the numbers involved and the fact that both Castilian and Catalan are potential recruiting grounds for new speakers. This is quite different in scale from that which is happening in, for example, Ireland, Scotland, Wales and Finland.

Regular sociolinguistic evaluations confirm the strength of Catalan as a socially inclusive language and the 2010 Language Policy Report together with subsequent investigations concerning the Catalan language demonstrates the salience of Catalan in reinforcing the intergenerational language transmission processes. Social and economic integration are fostered through the numerous Catalan for Adults courses and training for specific groups is provided by a large variety of agencies in most domains. Corpus planning initiatives have included the full range of standard resources required when normalising a language while the government has been developing tools such as Parla.cat, Optimlot, Termcat. A distinctive and innovative feature of the Catalan approach to the integration of migrants and new speakers is the partnership between the national, regional and local governments and agencies within civil society. The best practice example is the ‘Voluntaris per la Llengua’ (the Language Volunteers programme) which not only provides language use practice and linguistic pattern reinforcement, but also new opportunities for engagement, for friendship, access to local social networks and most critically, supportive advice on how to navigate one’s way through the bureaucratic and institutional support agencies when searching for accommodation, employment, educational options and basic social rights. Additional supportive mechanisms are the local language plans, the work of the Consorci per a la Normalització Lingüística, especially its Cursos de català, the latecomer reception classrooms for adults and children and the wealth of online and IT resources such as Intercat.
Interviews were conducted with senior public servants and representatives of the principal agency for government language policy, the Direcció General de Política Lingüística de la Generalitat de Catalunya, together with a selection of interviewees from the Consorci per a la Normalització Lingüística, language policy and planning specialists and academic researchers involved in the COST Action on New Speakers.

In general representatives of the government were satisfied that the needs of new speakers were already incorporated within their comprehensive linguistic, educational and employment programmes. They identified long-standing innovations which had derived from many social campaigns aimed to both promote Catalan and to secure the role of various types of new speakers within various social and economic sectors. They granted that more could be done, but in the unusual fiscal circumstances in which they have found themselves as a result of the escalating tension between the Catalan authorities and the Madrid Government, there was little prospect of new speakers becoming a priority. They were also concerned that the introduction of a new concept, such as new speaker, would cloud the discussions without adding anything new.

In contrast the representatives of the Consorci were enthusiastic advocates of much more work being done at the regional and local level in advancing the socially integrative work that they undertook. It is anticipated that as concern regarding the integration of migrants, let alone new speakers of Spanish origin will grow, then the various programmes devised by the Consorci will be replicated in more and more locations throughout the jurisdiction. The addition of new speakers to the Catalan population was not only welcomed as a sign of increased vitality and numbers, but also as a token of cultural diversity which fitted well with the ideology propogated by the Catalan authorities that the country was an open, welcoming and cosmopolitan society. They recognised the degree of difficulty in integrating people from so many different backgrounds and argued that until relatively recently the trajectory they had followed in celebrating the contribution of new speakers was both honourable and socially binding. However, they also expressed frustration and doubts that this trajectory was being stymied for the great stumbling block at present, of course, is the lack of resource expenditure and programme development occasioned by the political and constitutional stand off between the Catalan authorities and the Spanish state.

The Catalan academics interviewed were also strong advocates of further applied work being undertaken so as to make policy initiatives more integral to Catalan Society. A particular perspective advocated by Pujolar and Puigdevall draws on earlier work (Pujolar and Puigdevall, 2015) whereby there is a need to revisit traditional sociolinguistic dichotomies such as power and solidarity, us and them, integrative versus instrumental motivations. It was argued that the new speakers as social subjects invest in specific linguistic capitals that are marked by the struggles over access to symbolic and material resources. As a consequence their positions are charged with emotional investments that also draw upon the discourses and ideologies that partake in these struggles. Thus there is an a priori need to understand these discourses and ideologies if sound policy outcomes are to be achieved. It was recognised that new paradigms and approaches were needed for changed circumstances and it seems reasonable to conclude that given the dynamism expressed by both civil society and research networks that a form of new speaker emphasis will characterise policy changes in the medium-term.
Finland

In Finland, approximately 4.9 million people speak Finnish as their first language, and more than 0.5 million people speak it as a second language. While globally, approximately 9 million people speak Swedish as their first language, Finland has approximately 296,000 Swedish-speakers. The two official languages in Finland are Finnish and Swedish. 90% of the population are Finnish-speaking and 5.4% are Swedish-speaking. Finland is divided into 313 municipalities, of which 33 are bilingual and the rest unilingual with either Finnish or Swedish as the primary language (situation in 2017). Most of the bilingual municipalities are located on the west coast.

The basis for the linguistic rights is section 17 of the Constitution. The 2003 Language Act further elaborates on the linguistic rights of the two national languages and in addition, there are laws containing provisions on language matters in other legislation as well. It is the Ministry of Justice which is responsible for the implementation of the Language Act and the current Minister is Antti Häkkänen from the National Coalition Party.

The first Government Strategy for the National Languages of Finland was adopted in December 2012. It is a strategy aimed at supporting the co-existence and sustainability of two national languages and seeks to provide a roadmap for the medium-term future viability of both. Its purpose is to help the authorities to implement basic linguistic rights and to better observe the language legislation. It includes both short-term and long-term measures.

At its plenary session on 30 December 2015 (VNK/480/49/2015), the Government decided to develop strategies and programmes adopted by the previous Governments which are still valid in respect of their policy lines during the present government term 2015–2019. The Strategy for the National Languages of Finland contains an Action Plan built around concrete instruments for implementing long-term measures covering several administrative branches.

A second element of policy formulation is a reliance on time-series data collection. Every four years such data is interpreted and summarised in a Report of the Government on the Application of Language Legislation, the latest of which was for 2017. In neither official document was there any explicit reference to new speakers nor even to the future challenges posed by the phenomenon which underpins the concept.

Interviews were conducted with senior civil servants in the Ministry of Justice, local government councillors in the Swedish-speaking west, party activists from the Svenska folkpartiet and academics specialising in language policy, education and multilingualism from Åbo Akademi and Vaasa University. The civil servants in the Ministry of Justice are responsible for developing language strategies and guaranteeing the linguistic rights of Swedish speakers and Saami speakers in Finland. The twin pillars of such guarantees are the recently revised 2003 Language Act together with the evidence derived from the regular reports on the implementation of Language Legislation.
The civil service representatives of the Ministry of Justice argued that new speakers per se was not an operational concept in their political administrative culture. A barometer of linguistic choice and profiling undertaken every four years suggested that far from there being an increased abundance of new speakers of Swedish, either from native Finns or from migrants, there was in fact sufficient evidence to be concerned about the vitality of Swedish in Finland. Despite engaging in Swedish lessons as part of the national curriculum most mother tongue Finns found it difficult to communicate, read and write in Swedish and recent concerns to try to improve this situation have faced the almost inexorable backlash that many parents and students would prefer to improve their proficiency in English rather than Swedish. Part of the national debate surrounding language teaching and the provision of Swedish medium health and public services has been mired in the long-running regional and local government administrative reforms which have called for the reorganisation of public administration into less, but larger geographical, units which has implications for the long-standing convention of enabling Swedish Finns to access services if they constitute a minimum of 8% or at least 3,000 speakers within an officially bilingual municipality. Within this territorial language planning system there are a variety of contexts thus:

- 44% live in officially bilingual towns and municipalities where Finnish dominates
- 41% live in officially bilingual towns and municipalities where Swedish dominates
- 9% live in Åland, of whose population about 90% was Swedish-speaking in 2010
- 6% live in officially monolingual Finnish-speaking towns and municipalities

These voluntary mergers were justified on the grounds of equity of treatment, a fairly standardised demographic base and economies of scale. Following initial mergers at the turn of the century there were four mergers in 2010, six in 2011, ten in 2013, three in 2015, four in 2016 and two in 2017. In the period 2005-2017, the number of municipalities was voluntarily reduced from 444 to 311. In 2012, Katainen’s government published an extensive plan aiming at merging municipalities to reach a target of population 20,000 per municipality. However, these and other initiatives were modified by the pragmatism of coalition politics a fact reinforced in the 2015 elections when on the 29th May 2015, the President of the Republic appointed Finland’s 74th Government, that of Prime Minister Juha Sipilä whose government is formed by the Centre Party, the Blue Reform Party and the National Coalition Party.

Senior civil servants who were interviewed argued that under recent governments the position of Swedish speakers, and by extension activities to promote new speakers of Swedish, have stalled. Because of the ‘pacificity of politicians’ on this issue there is little real vision or leadership which derives from a lack of political will to define the future role of Swedish in the nation’s future. Indeed, alongside Swedish several other major European languages are also suffering from ‘benign neglect’ and it is only really English which shows any sign of growth and significance.

Local government representatives and party-political councillors and activists from the Svenska folkpartiet i Finland (SFP); Suomen ruotsalainen kansanpuolue (RKP) argue that what is needed is a sustained campaign to raise awareness not only of the plight of Swedish, but also of the possibility of becoming new speakers of the language. They further suggest that migrants who gravitate toward Swedish are far more likely to be welcomed as co-equal members of the community than were they to become members of the host Finnish community, but that the
likelihood of the former happening is becoming less because of educational changes and infra-structural reforms within local government and public administration. Language specialists and experts in multilingualism suggest that the national debate surrounding the needs of new speakers is very recent and there are few detailed proposals as to how to encourage the development of programmes which imitate those which have been established in, for example, the Basque Country and Catalonia.

Ireland

2011 Census figures suggest that there was a 7.1 per cent increase in the number of self-declared Irish speakers. Some 1.77 million people said they could speak Irish – 41.4 per cent of respondents. Of the 77,185 people who spoke Irish daily, outside the classroom, one in three lived in Gaeltacht areas. The census also recorded a 5.2 per cent increase in the Gaeltacht population. Some 96,628 people were living in Gaeltacht areas of whom 68.5 per cent said they could speak Irish and 24 per cent said they spoke it daily, outside the education system. This was an increase of 2.9 per cent on the number of daily Irish speakers in 2006. However, the number of Gaeltacht dwellers who said they spoke Irish less than weekly increased by 6.6 per cent.22

Interviews were conducted with senior civil servants from Government Departments with various responsibilities for Irish and the Gaeltacht, the media and legal affairs. Public servants from Foras na Gaeilge,23 Gaelscoileanna24 and other agencies were also interviewed as were educationalists, academics and commentators.

While civil and public servants in government and official agencies were fully aware of the new speaker concept and the discussion surrounding the contribution of new speakers to the vitality of Irish there was a muted reception to the idea of using the concept as an operational measure or as a significant addendum to current policies.

Policy recommendations on new speakers made by Walsh, O’Rourke and Rowland (2015) are in the public realm, although when asked the senior civil servants did not have comprehensive plans to action them, but were seeking to integrate some elements within their current programmes. They include the creation of more ‘safe spaces’ where Irish can be spoken socially, thereby strengthening the existing network of ‘ciorcail chomhrá’ [conversation circles] and creating a variety of new social spaces for Irish in cities and towns as proposed and detailed within the Fiontar draft 20 Year Irish Language Strategy (Fiontar, 2009).

A second recommendation which has been discussed, but not actioned, is to focus on how people who are in a transitional phase from being learners to new speakers cope with the challenges and difficulties they face. These would include social psychological elements, identity issues, acceptance by the host ‘native’ community, opportunities to use their target language in real-life as opposed to classroom situations and increased support from official agencies. Thus Walsh, O’Rourke and Rowland (2015) recommend that policy measures be developed to support people who wish to move beyond being learners of Irish to becoming active new speakers.
This is a laudable aim, but when discussed in detail with senior civil and public servants the response to my questions was while nominally sound the real difficulty with such recommendations was in their implementation, the allocation of support measures to different agencies and the evaluation of outcomes as a result of such interventions. These are all credible reactions by public servants who have to make difficult policy and resource decisions and one of the challenges for new speaker advocates is to provide robust arguments and to detail short and long term actions by which such measures are to be put in place.

A third recommendation is that potential new speakers need to be informed about how to integrate themselves into existing Irish speaking networks. This was seen as largely the responsibility of civil society and the many Irish support agencies, which although often funded by central government are not a direct reflection of official language policy.

A fourth recommendation was that as new speakers suffer some social anxiety about speaking Irish and have low levels of confidence in their ability to communicate effectively with Gaeltacht speakers then policy initiatives should emphasise the fact that becoming an Irish speaker does not necessarily mean adopting a traditional variety and that other competent speakers could act as role models for potential new speakers.

A means of reducing such anxieties would be a high-profile campaign to reflect and represent the diversity of people who are Irish speakers so that conventional stereotypes may be ameliorated somewhat. If this could be linked to the renewed promotion of the Gaeltacht and its language plans for revitalisation then Irish language networks would be doubly strengthened for interaction with the Gaeltacht was a two-way process.

Educationalists and academics argued that the current teaching of Irish, especially at post-secondary level was witnessing a substantial growth in numbers and that recruitment for teacher training was strong. As a consequence, they saw great potential in the harnessing of educational programmes to strengthen the transitional phase for advanced learners becoming active new speakers. They did not shy away from the fact that many of the new speakers were limited in their capacities, registers and competence compared with native speakers. They also expressed some concern that so many of these new speakers undergoing teacher training, at for example, Dublin City University, would represent their form of Irish when engaged in the classroom and as a consequence children would pattern themselves on these new speakers rather than on the conventional teacher profile many of whom were native speakers. This fear was countered by others who argued that Ireland had long experienced a mixture of teacher repertoires, styles and competences and the current situation was not a cause for alarm or disquiet. Quite the opposite in fact for they recognised that if Irish was to flourish it was only from the pool of advanced learners and new speakers that new growth, dynamism and innovation would come.
Scotland

Given the relatively precarious position of Gaelic in modern times it has been argued that the phenomenon of new speakers has not only been an ever present within the community, but that its growth is a sign of vitality as Gaelic can attract more fluent speakers through formal education, marriage patterns or immersion within predominantly Gaelic speaking communities. In consequence the reality of the new speaker construct has loomed larger here than in many of the other jurisdictions surveyed because the total number of residents with some Gaelic skills, at c.87,000 (1.7% of the population at 2011 census) is relatively small and so new speakers have a disproportionate significance for language transmission, attraction and planning.

The substantial growth of enrolments in Gaelic medium primary and to a lesser extent secondary schools has contributed greatly to the potential of new speakers becoming a major element of language revitalisation. However, a concern among several of those interviewed was the quality of spoken Gaelic as a result of this increase in learners and new speakers. Some argued that even the ‘native’ speakers were so influenced by the hegemony of English that the residual difference between native and new speakers was now diminishing.

Given the salience of new speakers it is not surprising that of those interviewed within the Scottish civil service, the staff of Bòrd na Gàidhlig, academics and commentators, the overwhelming majority viewed the encouragement and provision for the needs of new speakers to be a priority in policy terms. They suggested that as so little was known about the process by which people became new speakers it was difficult to base policies on concrete data and good evidence. This view was echoed by academic specialist who suggested that as there was no sociolinguistic profiling of new speakers, no mechanisms as to how they became new speakers, no independent measure of proficiency levels, that any policy which addressed their needs was operating in a vacuum.

Senior civil servants argued that many of the structures already in place facilitate the emergence of new speakers and encourage their participation within the various social, educational and media networks. Indeed, it is very evident that both in the world of Gaelic-oriented public affairs and scholarship that a significant proportion of participants would describe themselves and be identified by others as new speakers, and for the most part, such individuals are heralded as doing sterling work in advancing the cause of the language in so many different domains. When asked about the relative absence of direct reference to new speakers in the National Gaelic Language Plan, 2018-2023, both senior civil servants and staff of Bòrd na Gàidhlig were of the opinion that as the contribution was so obvious one did not need an additional descriptor to draw attention to their role and significance. Rather what was emphasised was the inclusive nature of a relatively fragile set of communities. It was conceded that there were many gaps in the support and provision for Gaelic Adult Learning, but that improvements in the opportunities to use Gaelic in the education, the economy, the media and the creative arts would reinforce the commitment made by new speakers that their skill acquisition would be valued and rewarded. It was readily accepted that the lack of opportunities to use the language and the progress made by some to integrate within communities was highly variable and dependent on well established social networks, but that changes in social behaviour and advances in IT and communication patterns were creating opportunities which government could and should harness in partnership with civil society.
The head and staff of Bòrd na Gàidhlig suggested that as so many of their own people and those that they were involved with were new speakers, it made little sense to add an additional category for policy development even though they were very interested in the phenomenon. In truth they argued that the whole concept of new speaker was so integral to the Gaelic promotion that it had already been mainstreamed and normalised. The National Plan sought to promote simple messages for all, namely that a more positive attitude shift should be constructed, that greater opportunities to learn Gaelic should be created and that those who already knew Gaelic should use it more. In part this was to be achieved through the implementation of Gaelic Language Plans, even though it was recognised that they were only partially effective. The most important element in the creation of new speakers was family and friends, for the community and network ties were more intimate than public service delivery systems. Where the action points of the Language Plans came into their own was in reinforcing the need for opportunities to use the language and thereby strengthen the social interaction between Gaelic speakers. The National Plan, it was argued, referred implicitly to the contribution of new speakers in each of the following seven sectors, namely Initiatives targeting the use of Gaelic by young people; increasing the contribution Gaelic makes to the Scottish economy across different sectors; increasing the demand and provision for Gaelic education; developing Gaelic medium workforce recruitment, retention, training and supply; Gaelic in the family; Gaelic Language Plans developed and implemented by public bodies; and promotion of the social, economic and cultural value of Gaelic (Bòrd na Gàidhlig, 2018).

Academics and commentators interviewed argued that the role of new speakers, while crucial to the revitalisation efforts, were largely under-researched and taken for granted. Little in detail was known of the precise stages through which advanced learners progressed to become new speakers. Thus, it is essential that together with changes which various transitional stages occasioned that the identity, frustrations, ideological positions and linguistic practices of new speakers be understood. Typically, judgements were made on the slow rate of learner progression, the limitations of formal programmes for learning Gaelic, few opportunities for conversational practice in real-life situations and the tendency by some native speakers not to fully recognise the capacity of active learners who wished to participate fully within Gaelic networks. When asked about the role of government intervention a common response was that so many of the adult new speakers were individual isolates - for their partners and children rarely spoke Gaelic, so that indeed it was hard to plan for behavioural change given the low demographic weighting of Gaelic speakers in the nation. One way of overcoming this isolation, especially in the larger metropolitan cores would be to establish Gaelic language social centres, but it is acknowledged that with low numbers in most urban areas the best option might be to initiate one or two such centres as a trial in the first instance.
Other issues raised during interviews were the lack of real integration of Gaelic educational and language policy issues within public policy considerations and debates. It was almost as if Gaelic affairs were treated as an addendum rather than integral and this limited the majoritarian support for Gaelic learning and language transmission. Criticisms were also made of the adequacy and quality of formal language plans and their inconsistent application throughout the nation. A more clear statement on Gaelic language rights would also assist as would more detailed long term planning documents and resource commitments by government.

A particular sub-set of Gaelic new speakers were those who were from outside the UK. Previous work by McLeod and O’Rourke (2017) had identified a number of structural characteristics of this population sub-set. The key findings were that unlike Scottish-born speakers none of the sub-set had any familial or emotive nationalist ties to the land, language and culture. As a consequence, none of the interviewees had learned Gaelic out of a desire to integrate into the local community, which according the authors demonstrates the limited role of Gaelic even in the strongest Gaelic areas. Having learned Gaelic in a formal classroom situation they complained that there were so few opportunities available to develop their language and socio-linguistic skills, even if they had very positive interactions with Gaelic-speaking contacts. When interviewed separately for this current pilot project both authors emphasised the critical nature of understanding this sub-set, especially in relation to their decision to send their children to Gaelic-medium education where available or to work in a predominantly Gaelic environment. The insights gained into their motivations and language transmission practices were invaluable and both authors advocated that more intensive ethnographic work be undertaken on this small but significant sub-set of new speakers. However, it is quite difficult to suggest specific recommendations which focus exclusively on the contribution of this group, but may yet bear fruit as the paradigm and the practice both develop and embed themselves within the policy community.

The sum total of these critical observations varied from those expressed by government civil servants and Bòrd na Gàidhlig staff who argued that within current constraints a gradualist approach would bear fruit while civil society agencies and academics argued that far from being mainstreamed as integral to language revitalisation efforts, much more could be done to promote and integrate advanced learners and new speakers. The limited research evidence to date suggested that a significant proportion of the potential mass of new speakers was being lost due to the inability of the system to cater for their needs.
Wales

Interviews were conducted with policy formulators in the Government of Wales Civil Service, with civil society language agencies, commentators and academics.

The dominant perspective of senior civil servants was that the new speaker concept was not well understood and certainly did not feature as an element in official language strategies to date. Key individual civil servants were very active within European minority language and educational networks and had come across the new speaker paradigm and indeed had contributed to the debate. However, while there was a recognition of the contribution of learners whether through statutory education or Welsh for Adults to the vitality and diversity of a Welsh speaking population, there was little active consideration of any specific targeted programme which had new speakers at its core. Rather the argument was put that current agencies such as Mudiad Ysgolion Meithrin (Welsh nursery schools’ movement), Yr Urdd (Welsh League of Youth), Mentrau Iaith (Language Enterprise agencies), the Eisteddfod and media catered well for a variety of speakers with different needs, skills and levels of fluency. Given the longevity and success of this approach it was not considered either feasible or necessary to supplement this approach with fresh perspectives which may flatter only to deceive. It was recognised that some limited valuable work had been done in the field, as with the programmes developed by Cardiff and Swansea Universities to teach Welsh to recent migrants and refugees. However, on a broader canvas concerns were raised at to how one would identify the new speakers, how would programmes which sought to satisfy their needs be evaluated, measured and funded and most critically whether identifying new speakers as a priority may run counter to current reforms which sought to avoid distinctions within and between Welsh speakers.

The one area where consideration of new speakers could have purchase was in education, not because of the attraction of the concept and its implied value system, but because of the radical nature of the current reform model as applied to Welsh statutory education. The Government of Wales had recast its curriculum design following the recommendations of the Donaldson Report (Government of Wales, 2015) which argued that all children and young people will be:

- “ambitious, capable learners, ready to learn throughout their lives
- enterprising, creative contributors, ready to play a full part in life and work
- ethical, informed citizens of Wales and the world
- healthy, confident individuals, ready to lead fulfilling lives as valued members of society.” (Donaldson, Government of Wales, 2015).
Two other specific reports focussed on the review of teacher education (Government of Wales, 2014a) and on the teaching of Welsh (Government of Wales, 2014b). The latter drew attention to the weaknesses in the manner which Welsh was taught and advocated the abolition of the curriculum and qualification divide between first and second language learners. Drawing on these three reports the Government of Wales announced far reaching changes to the manner in which Welsh and other languages were to be taught within the statutory education sector. Education Minister Kirsty Williams declared “We want all our learners to be citizens of both Wales and the world and that means ensuring that all young people from all backgrounds have an opportunity to develop their language skills – whether that’s in Welsh, English or international languages.”

The proposed new national curriculum starting in 2022 will thus see Welsh remain compulsory for all learners aged three to 16 – alongside English - but no longer separated into first and second language programmes of study. All learners will follow the same curriculum and there will be more of an emphasis on improving their skills and use of the language.

“While it would be up to schools to decide how they approach this, they would need to think about opportunities for learners to listen, read, speak and write in Welsh – this might be through use in different parts of the curriculum or outside the classroom.”

The four regional school improvement consortia across Wales are now planning ways to ensure teachers can deliver the changes through professional learning including the augmentation of a sabbatical scheme of intensive Welsh language training to teachers and teaching assistants. So a continuum, a sliding scale of performance and assessment and a recasting of the primacy of teaching Welsh as a first language are the elements of the new approach to promoting Welsh within the statutory education system. This reform will spark controversy by both supporters and detractors of Welsh.

The implication of abolishing the formal distinction between first and second language learners is likely to create a space (read vacuum) for a new descriptor of non-native speakers and it is thus likely that a set of descriptors analogous to the new speaker’s paradigm will be coined for this phenomenon. But in truth how sustainable is the idea of a continuum and with what effect for the teaching of Welsh as a first language? The reforms leave much to be desired and critics such as Brooks (2019) have pointed to the fact that:

A ‘language continuum’ will destroy the principle of Welsh-medium education, replacing it with an emphasis on ‘bilingual’ schools. English of course will remain a proper language, taught not on a continuum but as a first language. Welsh instead becomes a second language for all. It is a nonsense that children who cannot hold a conversation in a language be on a continuum with those who speak Welsh as a first language all day, every day. This is a damaging idea which will harm the education of children all over Wales (Brooks, 2019).

Thus, some questioned in this project argued that:

“One of the problems from our perspective is to create new opportunities for our new speakers (whether adults or young people) to use the language. Another problem is recognising that the pupils in a great many of our Welsh-medium schools are ‘new speakers’ as they come from English-speaking homes. But if they are ‘new speakers’; what would we call those who are currently learning Welsh in the English sector? Would they remain as L2 speakers (if they are ‘speakers’ at all of course), and where on the “continuum” do they change from being L2 speakers to being new speakers?”
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On conclusion, there is no certainty among policy makers how this concept will be operationalised at present. There also remains the question as to what descriptor will be used for those significant many who do not become new speakers of Welsh despite an increased exposure to formal instruction in and through the language. These are important questions, not only for teachers and school managers, but also for curriculum designers, assessors, the students and their families.

Canada

The New Speakers concept was not generally used or acknowledged by participants in the Canadian interviews conducted. This was in part because it was considered to be confusing and in part because it did not seem to add much to the established work on immigrant additional language acquisition.

However, a great deal of new speaker experience is evident in Canada, particularly in relation to those who learn the other Official Language, whether Francophones or Anglophones. For Francophones, centuries of integration and labour mobility have produced generations of new speakers of English in Quebec and beyond, particularly so for Acadians in the Maritimes and Franco-Ontarians who have gravitated to employment opportunities in the private sector and since the late sixties in the Federal and Provincial bureaucracies.

Conversely a large number of Anglophones in Quebec are becoming new speakers of French. This is the result of three overlapping trends. The first is the attempt by successive Quebecois governments to ensure a majoritarian French speaking population through legislation and immigration policies. The second is the decline of the English school system in Quebec. The third is the decision by many Anglophone parents to place their children in the French Schools system. The net effect is to produce a generation of Anglophones and Allophones who are in effect new speakers of French, especially in the work place and in the social foci of small town and rural Quebec. Academics argue that little is known about the phenomenon of such new speakers and until recently their needs and interest were not incorporated into official government programmes. This has changed as a result of the establishment in 2017 of a Quebec Government Secretariat for English speaking residents under the direction of William Folch to address the needs of the English-speaking population.27

A further consideration is the element of free choice which is exercised by migrants as to which of a state's official languages they would gravitate towards and thus become new speakers in a designated community. In officially unilingual states this is not a major conundrum, but in Canada where despite the existence of two official languages, migration quotas and trajectories are largely provincial affairs, the matter of choice is more complicated. Let us illustrate.
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One difficulty for immigrants is the manner in which they are ‘routed’ into the English language system. We may illustrate this by reference to recent immigrants from Iran who arrive in Canada already speaking French, but who are encouraged to register with the English settlement system because, so few French language services are on offer in the Rest of Canada outside Quebec. Given that there are more services on offer in English, they face less resistance if they are channelled into the majoritarian system and thus over time they become new speakers of English rather than French. In the view of the Assistant Director of the Official Languages and Bilingualism Institute28 one way in which the two solitudes may be overcome is to develop the concept of cultural bilingualism, a form of Canadian identity which incorporates both traditions in one, rather than reproduce the institutionalised categories of Anglophone and Francophone (Jezak, 2018).

Several senior civil servants interviewed within key federal government agencies were not aware of the new speaker concept, nor of its related data sets and case studies, but expressed an interest in learning more and argued that an increased comparative European-Canadian perspective on such issues would doubtless yield fruitful policy developments.

Conclusion

Despite the fact that few current official language strategies were found to have explicit reference or sections devoted to new speakers, the iterative nature of policy based upon changing evidence and paradigms suggests that decision-makers in the medium term will confront several issues as a matter of routine. This is most pertinent in the case of minority language educational reform where an increasing number of students are to be found undertaking courses within the target language as both a subject and as a medium of instruction.

A second conclusion is that it would be expedient to accelerate the coupling and interaction between policy formulators and academic research specialists in the specific aspects of language learning and socio-economic usage discussed above, so that more purposeful programmes of action can be co-constructed.

A third conclusion is the need to refine the predictions currently being made regarding the needs-based requirements of the various types of new speakers identified herein.

A final conclusion is to advocate and interrogate the need to identify and influence the range of stakeholders and agencies that would most likely benefit from learning from and adopting some of the various recommendations which derive from the COST Action on New Speakers. I present below some generic recommendations, but there will be several other recommendations that will emerge in practice and be specific to individual jurisdictions and contexts.
Generic Recommendations

It is imperative that recommendations are framed in such a way that they are both readily understandable and suitable for action by decision-makers at several levels within the policy community.

Describe and evidence best practice principles and processes of new speaker engagement and apply to various jurisdictions when suitable modified.

Develop standardised statements in support of new speaker needs in language, educational and work domains.

Develop specific profiles of the new speaker sub-groups currently amalgamated under the new speaker paradigm: - namely non-native speakers who have learned the target language at school; adult learners who have embraced the target language for whatever reason; and migrants/refugees who have learned the target language as a result of a set of unforeseen circumstances.

Develop accurate assessments of the various stages in the transition process of becoming new speakers so that should the authorities wish to promote this process they would know at which trigger points to offer support.

Despite significant exceptions calling for a more plural and diverse language promotion discourse, the dominance of the nationalistic monoglossic discourses renders it difficult to navigate a path for new speakers in many contexts. As a consequence, robust narratives pertaining to social inclusivity need to be constructed and diffused within policy making circles.

Given that most new speakers operate in a triangular socio-linguistic environment, it would be prudent to construct syncretic interpretations of their experiences as they navigate simultaneously both through majoritarian and lesser used language pathways.

A most effective way to harness the potential for new speakers to engage with the host community would be through the development of multi-agency resources centres with a social outreach remit. Thus consideration needs to be given how such social spaces can be developed.

Inform and empower new speaker representatives about their input in influencing the dialogue and potential policy changes regarding the role of new speakers in public policy determination. Hitherto there has been a tendency to speak on behalf of new speakers as if they were a dependent category and in consequence there are too few robust examples of new speakers becoming active voices in the construction of their own narratives. Additional opportunities and pathways need to be constructed so that new speakers may be the authors and representatives of their own destiny as far as that is possible.

Innovative methods need to be developed whereby value may be added to the commitment and experience of new speakers as they navigate into the mainstream of the target language community so that their initial enthusiasm is not dented by disappointment and frustration and they are thereby lost to the vitality of the target group.
Specific Recommendations

For each jurisdiction only a minimum and context specific type of recommendation is reported here. Naturally many of them may apply elsewhere, but those that are suggested were grounded from the field work and interview data derived in each location.

In the Basque Country there is a need to further strengthen the role of new speakers as a genuine element of language revitalisation and to reduce the ideological gap between native and new speakers. (Care has to be taken in determining when a child/student is considered a native speaker).

There is a need to capitalise on the current potential of new speakers for fear of losing the contribution of many to the overall vitality of the language revitalization efforts.

It is recommended that integrated programmes of increasing the societal use of Basque, such as Euskaraldia, be strengthened so that new and enduring patterns of language interaction be secured.

In Catalonia the work of academics has suggested a rethink of the manner in which new speakers are conceived within official planning circles. An a priori need is to understand the discourses and ideologies which influence new speaker choices and behaviour if sound policy outcomes are to be achieved.

It is recommended that the idea of safe and encouraging linguistic spaces be developed by the authorities and civil society so as to provide a reinforcement for the other programmes designed to integrate immigrant new speakers into society.

In Finland it is recommended that additional research and evidence be provide so as to feed into policy proposals at national and local government level.

To date the concept of transitional new speaker has not been fully realised, thus a more robust debate so as to raise awareness of their needs, particularly those from among the immigrant community would be advantageous to broaden the horizons of decision makers.

It is further recommended that stronger statements and programmes be devised by central authorities regarding the future role of Swedish in the nation’s future, and by extension the role of new speakers within this renewed vision.

A robust and reconfigured vision for the role and significance of Swedish (and its new speakers) would aid the preparation of new programmes for the promotion of the language writ large.

In Ireland where a significant amount of research has been undertaken on the phenomenon of new speakers several recommendations are in the public domain. These would include:

Undertaking research to understand the ideologies and identities of new speakers and their potential role in the future development of Irish.

Develop policy measures to support people who wish to move beyond being learners of Irish to becoming active new speakers.

The creation of designated language centres which could serve as ‘safe spaces’ for the native and new speaker to mingle and thus develop the competence and confidence of the new speakers in as many communities as it is feasible.

Inform new speakers about how to integrate themselves better into existing Irish speaking networks.
Implement the educational proposals in the 20-Year Strategy\textsuperscript{30}, such as part-immersion and significant reform of teacher training, to boost the potential to produce larger numbers of new speakers. (Government of Ireland 2010: 23-36).

Mount a highly visible campaign to increase awareness of the diverse profile of new speakers so that negative stereotypes and ‘traditional’ interpretations are countered.

Improve the opportunities provided by Gaeltacht communities to engage in language planning under the Gaeltacht Act 2012 so as to boost the social opportunities to learn, practice or improve Irish.

In Scotland it is recommended that in order for the potential of new speakers to contribute more effectively to language revitalisation efforts there is a need for the greater specification of the legal rights of speakers, a greater satisfaction of their expectations when faced with the frustration of not receiving the services which are advertised as theirs by statutory obligation and delivered through Language Plans and a deeper sense that Gaelic policy is an integral part of public policy writ large.

It is also recommended that additional opportunities be provided for social interaction through the establishment of trial Gaelic language social centres in promising locations.

In Wales it is recommended that a thorough review be undertaken of the manner in which new speakers will contribute to the strategic aim of producing a target of one million Welsh speakers by 2050.

It is further recommended that current educational reforms which seek to erode the long-established division between first and second language learners, together with any official certification of skills acquisition at whatever level, does not overwhelm or exaggerate the capacity of new speakers to perform a comprehensive set of functions. The management of expectations is a critical part of the evaluation of how successful current educational programmes are in producing advanced learners and new speakers.

It is evident that an increased proportion of the active Welsh speakers in the future will be new speakers. In consequence it may be advisable for the Government of Wales, having chosen not to use second language speakers as an operational description, to adopt a variant of new speaker ideology/descriptor so as to identify a sub-section of the population who will also need targeted programmes beyond the educational sector to reinforce their role within a variety of socio-linguistic and economic networks.

It would also be prudent to secure the rights and stability of educational policies which guarantee the permanence of Welsh as a first language, a lengua propia, so that a co-equality of Welsh and English is maintained rather than fudged in compromise reforms.

In Canada it is recommended that the needs of new speakers be fully integrated into the mission and implementation of programmes which stem from the innovative work of the Secretariat for relations with English-speaking Quebecers.

A further recommendation is that immigrants who are already new speakers of either official language be allowed to register and receive services in their designated language choice at both provincial as well as Federal levels where feasible. Clearly this telling phrase ‘where feasible’ masks a great deal of ambiguity, but in an increasingly multicultural polity the concept of fusing both identities into one of cultural bilingualism is an appealing prospect for some and especially recently arrived migrants.
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Endnotes

1. The *muda* framework ‘invites us to rethink the assumed purposes of minority language sociolinguistics and to formulate more general questions of what it means to be a legitimate speaker’ (Pujolar and Puigdevall (2015) p. 170).

2. Supplementary advice from local members of the COST New Speaker network was sought to identify key interviewees in Catalonia, Finland and Ireland.

3. However, there is one ironic feature of an Action designed to analyse New Speakers in a Multilingual Europe, namely the hegemonic position of written English as nearly all the Network outputs are in English. This may be the nature of the academic publishing industry, but to mitigate this somewhat it would be good to anticipate a range of future publications in Polish, Catalan, Irish, Galician (even if some of these are national reports to ‘local’ readership).

4. It should be acknowledged so many of the meetings held under the auspices of this Action, were in fact at least bilingual if not more generally multilingual, so that the contributors practice what they preach about the value of linguistic diversity.

5. As a general comment many of the Action activities took place in a wide variety of contexts, academic, stakeholder, lobby group meetings resulting in a very good geographical spread, both large and small polities and jurisdictions and with the co-operation of many institutions.

6. At interview in UOC, Barcelona, 20th March 2018, both Joan Pujolar and Maite Puigdevall i Serralvo, emphasised that the current emphasis on new speakers had opened up new avenues of enquiry and enriched the methodological and epistemological approaches used in their field work and analysis.

7. The authors argue that ‘this `speaker` perspective will allow researchers to further illuminate who has access to which codes, how and where they are able to deploy them, and with what social and economic consequences, across a wide range of settings in today’s multilingual, globalised Europe.’


9. http://www20.gencat.cat/portal/site/Llengcat/menuitem.df5fba67cac781e7a129d410b0c0e1a0/?vgnextoid=d287f9465ff61110VgnVCM1000000b0c1e0aRCRD&vgnextchannel=d287f9465ff61110VgnVCM1000000b0c1e0aRCRD&vgnextfmt=default


11. In terms of language, it should be noted that the ruling declares the phrase “and preferred” in section 1 of article 6 of the Act to be unconstitutional. Furthermore, the court ruling submits article 5 (language in relation to historic rights), article 6.2 (official languages), article 33.5 (relations between citizens and national constitutional and legal bodies), article 34 (language rights of consumers and users), article 35.1 and 2 (education) and article 50.5 (language of internal procedures, communications and notifications) all subject to interpretation. On a positive note such pronouncements recognised the citizen’s right to have Catalan available as per the Organic Act, on a negative note the ruling did declare the phrase “and preferred” in section 1 of article 6 of the Act to be unconstitutional. A separate advance was the recognition of Catalan sign language as a legitimate means of communication.

12. http://www20.gencat.cat/portal/site/Llengcat/menuitem.b318de7236aad0e7a129d410b0c0e1a0/?vgnextoid=69f4f945ffc61110VgnVCM1000000b0c1e0aRCRD&vgnextchannel=69f4f945ffc61110VgnVCM1000000b0c1e0aRCRD&vgnextfmt=default&newLang=en_GB


16. I am grateful for the advice and unstinting support I have received for many years from senior civil servants of the Direcció General de Política Lingüística de la Generalitat de Catalunya, Barcelona.

17. https://www.cpnl.cat/

This point is well made by Puigdevall et al (2018, p. 455) when they argue that “Attention to new speakers also provides a necessary balance to dominant ideologies based on nativeness, authenticity and monolingualism that often obscures the social conditions that enable or hamper people’s participation in specific language communities. Thus, it is paramount in order to change the framing of language policies and to move away from traditional nationalist monoglossic discourses towards a less prescriptive promotion of the language that allows new speakers to gain access more easily to boost their integration into their respective communities.”
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Key Publications


(see appendix for full list of publications)

Milestones

**Working Group Meetings**
- Edinburgh, March 2014
- Barcelona, December 2014
- Vigo, March 2015
- Galway, September 2015
- Hamburg, May 2016
- Cyprus, January 2017

**Whole Action Conferences**

1st Whole Action Conference  
**Keynote:** Jacqueline Urla (University of Massachusetts)  
Barcelona, December 2014

2nd Whole Action Conference  
**Keynote:** Aneta Pavlenko (Temple University)  
Hamburg, May 2016

Final Whole Action Conference  
**Keynote:** Colin Williams (University of Cambridge)  
Cécile Vigouroux (Simon Fraser University)  
Coimbra, September 2017

**Training**

Training course for early-career and doctoral researchers  

**Events in 18 countries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Faroe Islands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 working group meetings  
3 whole action conferences  
6 training events  
2 public events  
22 research workshops and seminars
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Steering Committee

James Costa (WG10) Lecturer in Sociolinguistics at the Institut de Linguistique et phonétique générales et appliquées, Université Sorbonne Nouvelle – Paris 3.

Jeroen Darquennes (WG9) Professor in the German Department at Université de Namur, Belgium.


Alexandre Duchène (WG3) Professor of Sociology of Language and Head of Department of Multilingualism Studies at the University of Fribourg.

Michael Hornsby (WG6) Professor at the Centre for Celtic Studies, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, Poland.

Kathryn Jones (WG5) Managing Director at IAITH: The Welsh Centre for Language Planning, Sir Gaerfyrrddin, Wales.

Sviatlana Karpava (WG6) Lecturer in Linguistics at the University of Central Lancashire, Cyprus, Larnaka

Pia Lane (WG1) Professor of Multilingualism at the Center for Multilingualism in Society across the Lifespan, University of Oslo, Norway.

Luisa Martin Rojo (WG2) Full Professor of Linguistics at the Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Spain.

Noel Ó Murchadha (WG7) Assistant Professor of Education at Trinity College Dublin, Ireland.

Bernadette O’Rourke (Chair) Professor in Sociolinguistics at Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, Scotland. University of Glasgow (from April 2019)

Ane Ortega (WG7) Professor at the Begoña Andra Mari Teacher Education College and the Department of Language and Literature Education, Universidad del País Vasco, Bilbao, Spain.

Agnieszka Otwinowska-Kasztelanic (WG7) Associate Professor at the Department of Applied Linguistics, Institute of English Studies, University of Warsaw, Poland.

Sari Pietikäinen (WG3) is Professor of Discourse Studies at the Department of Languages at the University of Jyväskylä, Finland.

Maite Puigdevall Serralvo (WG8) is Lecturer in Arts and Humanities Department at Universitat Oberta de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain.

Joan Pujolar (Co-Chair and WG4) is Professor of Sociolinguistics at Universitat Oberta de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain.

Rosina Márquez-Reiter (WG2) is Reader in Communication at the University of Surrey, England.

Josep Soler (WG9) is Assistant Professor at the Department of English, Stockholm University, Sweden.

Tom Van Hout (WG4) is Lecturer at the Leiden University Centre for Linguistics, Leiden, Netherlands.

John Walsh (WG1 and WG8) is Senior Lecturer in Irish at the School of Languages, Literatures and Culture, National University of Ireland, Galway.

Anastassia Zabrodskaia (WG6) is Professor of Estonian as a Second Language at Tallinn University.

A full list of management committee of the Action is available here: https://www.cost.eu/actions/IS1306/#tabs|Name:management-committee
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COST Action on New Speakers: Context and objectives

This COST Action focused on the dynamics involved in becoming a ‘new speaker’ of a language in a multilingual Europe.

Our COST Action (2013-2017) was part of an intergovernmental framework for European Cooperation in Science and Technology (COST). This framework makes it possible to coordinate nationally-funded research on a European level.

Globalization, increased mobility and transnational networking transform the linguistic ecologies of contemporary societies.

Our Action brought multilinguals into the focus by investigating the challenges and opportunities involved in acquiring, using and being understood as a ‘new speaker’ of a language in a multilingual Europe. From this perspective, new speakers are multilingual citizens who, by engaging with languages other than their ‘native’ or ‘national’ language(s), cross existing social boundaries, re-evaluate their own levels of linguistic competence and creatively (re)structure their social practices to adapt to new and overlapping linguistic spaces.

The New Speakers Network facilitates structured dialogue and collaboration amongst researchers who focus on three types of new speakers: regional minorities, immigrants, and transnational workers.

Language is a key component in accessing education, employment, social services and in participating in one’s community. It has also been seen historically in Europe as defining individual and collective identities. The processes whereby people learn new languages and become legitimate speakers of these languages are complex, and different kinds of new speakers don’t have equal opportunities to contribute to Europe’s multilingual project. These inequalities pose a challenge to European integration, social cohesion and economic collaboration, as well as to the full participation of territorial and immigrant minorities.

A shared understanding of these complexities across the different multilingual scenarios (including education, healthcare, youth culture, the workplace and NGOs) can help policy makers, service providers and educators tackle the challenges that new speakers of different linguistic varieties face in the context of a multilingual Europe.
Phase 1: Meta cross-case analysis of new speakers in a multilingual Europe

The aim of this phase of the Action was to conduct a cross-case analysis within and across the three strands of new speakers: indigenous minorities, immigrants, and transnational workers. This analysis allowed us to typologise new speaker profiles and, in preparation for Phase Two, to identify recurring themes across the three strands. We looked in particular for patterns that offered explanatory power and policy relevance.

In line with these objectives, the Action’s participants selected the strand (and hence working group) in which they wished to participate, corresponding to their multilingual area of expertise. Working Group 1 (New speakers and indigenous minorities), Working Group 2 (New speakers and migration) and Working Group 3 (New speakers as workers), explored new speaker profiles within their respective strands and identified relevant themes relating to the new speaker concept.

In addition to Working Group 1, 2 and 3, another three working groups were set up. These include Working Group 4 (Methods and Concepts), Working Group 5 (Dissemination and Impact) and Working Group 6 (Training Schools and STSMs). Each of the six groups met twice during Phase 1 to coordinate their efforts. Working groups had the opportunity to initiate Short-Term Scientific Missions (STSMs) to assist in their research objectives in preparation for the Whole Action Conference.
New speakers and indigenous minority languages (WG1)

Coordinators: John Walsh and Pia Lane

John Walsh is currently focusing on the ideologies and motivations of ‘new speakers’ of minority languages, people who were not raised speaking those languages but who speak them fluently and regularly.

Pia Lane has investigated multilingualism from a range of theoretical perspectives, primarily drawing on data from Kven-speaking communities in Northern Norway, but also amongst Finnish-speakers in Canada.

Overview
In contexts where indigenous minority languages are spoken, there are growing numbers of ‘new speakers’—that is, individuals who learn a heritage language through schooling, adult classes or other formal means and adopt it as part of their linguistic repertoire. We extended the number of cases studied and adopted a cross-case approach to identify similarities, differences and generalizable trends. As part of this work, we examined uses of the concept of the ‘new speaker’ in order to settle on a working definition. Our investigations revealed that prototypically the term is used to refer to a speaker who has acquired a minority or indigenous language in an institutional setting rather than in the home or community. However, we use this definition flexibly, so that speakers who were once passive bilinguals can also be included. Name all the context studied: Euskadi, Galicia, Catalonia, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, the Meänkieli, Breton, Occitan, Sámi, Franco-Provençal, Limburguese, Kven, Jersey Island, Isle of Man, Monaco, Shetland Island.

Final report
‘Position paper on research themes and profiles related to new speakers of indigenous minority languages’

In this paper, we outline

1) research themes identified by members of WG1 in the first phase of the Action and

2) labels, categories or profiles of new speakers of minority languages from both community and academic perspectives.

The research themes we identified in the study of the acquisition of indigenous minority languages are: the ideoligisation of target varieties of new speakers; register and linguistic proficiency; linguistic mutes; the home-community-school nexus; the performance of new speakerness; group integration and identity; and new speakers and language policy.
New Speakers and migration (WG2)

Coordinators: Luisa Martín Rojo and Rosina Márquez-Reiter

Luisa Martín Rojo is a specialist in sociolinguistics focusing on multilingualism in education. Also, she has used discourse analysis to study the social representations of immigrants in the press, the parliament and everyday contexts and their social repercussions.

Rosina Márquez-Reiter is currently researching intercultural communication in communicative environments resulting from globalisation, with particular attention to the contact between native speakers of Spanish who come from different backgrounds, have had limited contact with each other’s lingua-culture and speak different standard varieties of the same basic language.

Overview

Large numbers of immigrants in Europe are adopting the language of the community in which they have chosen to live. The acquisition of a new language is often essential to their prospects of integrating into the host society and playing their part in its economic, social, political and artistic life. However, their linguistic abilities in an adoptive language are often challenged by first language speakers and can serve as a source of discrimination and exclusion. We examined what it means for migrants to be ‘new speakers’ of a language, through the lenses of linguistic mudes and legitimacy. We also produced guidelines to assist stakeholders in managing and developing linguistic diversity.

Final report

‘Position paper: New speakers in a multilingual Europe: Opportunities and challenges’

WG2 constitutes a large and a highly diverse group, albeit with a common interest in language and migration across different communicative environments. Most of the members of the group have conducted research on newly arrived or on second-generation migrants, with a bilingual or multilingual profile, using different methods from ethnography to quantitative research focused on grammatical and discursive competence development.

Our aim was to find common issues and grounds to establish and develop cross-linguistic and cross-cultural knowledge as to how newspeakershness should be approached with a view to achieving the larger societal ‘integration’ of migrants. Thus, one of the first issues we addressed was to what extent linguistic trajectories are intertwined with the life course, specifically trajectories of migration. In particular, we used the framework of the linguistic muda (Pujolar and Fonzález, 2013; Pujolar and Puigdevall, 2015), that is, particular shift points in the life course at which migrants become ‘new speakers’ of the language varieties of the of the receiving society. However, even speakers making such a muda are not necessarily seen and accepted as legitimate speakers. We showed that ‘becoming’ a new speaker, not only entails linguistic skills but also recognition as a competent and legitimate speaker, who can even pass as ‘native’ (Piller, 2002) among members of the receiving society.
New speakers as workers (WG3)

Coordinators: Alexandre Duchêne and Sari Pietikäinen

Alexandre Duchêne conducts research on language and social inequality, language politics, linguistic minorities and multilingualism in relation to the school, the workplace, human migration and globalisation.

Sari Pietikäinen focuses on discourse, identity and social inequalities, multilingualism in transforming peripheries, and language in expanding Arctic economies of tourism, nature resource extraction, and sports. She is also interested in developing research methodologies including rhizomatics, critical discourse studies, critical sociolinguistics, and ethnography.

Overview

Globalization and European integration encourage workers to move across borders, thus potentially becoming ‘new speakers’. Europe’s transnational workers invest to varying degrees in multilingualism at work, at home, and in their cultural consumption. We asked how multilingualism features in work processes in different contexts so that new forms of disadvantage are being constituted around language. This includes issues around: a) desirability and expectations in language learning on the part of both (potential) employees and (potential) employers; b) variable ways of becoming a new speaker (i.e. formalized and less formalized); and c) the making of new speakers who align with and satisfy workplace.

Final report

‘Workers as new speakers: Collaborative report’

This working group addressed both the historical, economic and political conditions that bring new speakers to the workplace and the specific terrains in which we have studied this category of new speakers (education, health, extraction and construction, minority entrepreneurship, community service, and the service industry). We also examined the processes that articulate new speakerness with particular moments in the life trajectories of workers: becoming a new speaker for and at work; entering work as a new speaker; being a new speaker at work; and leaving work and new speakerness. Finally, we suggested that the WGs for Phase 2 could examine new speakerness in relation to the following social processes: regimentation and governmentality, axes of differentiation, identification, recognition and ownership; normativity and variability; and evaluation and (de)valueization.
Methods and concepts
(WG4)

Coordinator: Joan Pujolar

Joan Pujolar is Professor of Sociolinguistics. His research focuses on how language use is mobilized in the construction of identities and its implications for access to symbolic and economic resources. He has conducted research on the use of Catalan amongst young people, immigrants and in the economic sector, as well as on multilingualism and gender.

Overview

An umbrella group for the ‘core’ WGs (1, 2 and 3, 7,8,9,10), this working group took stock of the theoretical perspectives and conceptual frameworks that have been used to examine ‘new speakers’ across different multilingual situations. We also explored the range of methodological approaches used by network members and investigated new conceptual frameworks and methodologies relevant to the ‘new speaker’ concept.

Final report

‘Position paper of WG4: Concepts and methods’
We performed a meta-analysis of the approaches of WG1 (New speakers and indigenous minority languages (WG1), WG2 (New Speakers and migration), and WG3 (New speakers as workers). We identified a contrast between the approaches of WG1 on one hand, and WG2 and WG3, on the other. WG1’s orientation to indigenous minority languages led the group to refer frequently to a revitalisation agenda, which in turn seems to have structured the research approach. Results and phenomena were judged as meaningful in terms of their implications in the processes of expansion (or stopping the contraction) of the language community. In this context, the research community has no specific interest in deconstructing language as a bounded category, and on querying the status of language as community marker and community builder, as this assumption is what constitutes the field. In contrast, for WG2 and WG3, changing language epistemologies may help researchers understand how linguistic knowledge and knowledge about language is produced and reproduced within specific power-knowledge regimes. Thus, the critique of language as an object becomes a central concern.

WG1 directed its gaze to an object called language, which may undergo variation and hybridisation; but WG2/3 focused their gaze on the practices that transcend linguistic boundaries. The category of ‘new speaker’ sat well with WG1, however the concept of language as an object now needs to be interrogated, because it may not be realistic to expect both the expansion of an indigenous language and a stability in its form. Additionally, revitalisation ‘participants’ need to clarify what is the status of the speakers that the politics of revitalization produce. In contrast, for WG2 and WG3 the concept of ‘new speaker’ joins a field where speaker categorization was already richly problematized.
Phase 2: Developing a Research and Dissemination Framework

In this phase of the Action we explored the themes identified in Phase 1 as having the strongest explanatory potential across our three research strands: indigenous minorities, immigrants, and transnational workers. In analysing across our cases, we moved away from the specifics of language types and contexts. In line with this objective, we reorganised the working groups according to theme instead of strand. The new working groups became Working Group 7 (Competence and new speaker varieties), Working Group 8 (Speakerness: Subjectivities, trajectories and socialisation), Working Group 9 (Language policy regimes, new speakers and sociolinguistic ethnography) and Working Group 10 (Legitimisation and power).

Whole Action Conference
Hamburg, May 2016

The working groups worked on their assigned theme and explored the theme according to its explanatory power, its relevance to policy makers and practitioners and its fit with the different new speaker profiles. Apart from the structural change in these three working groups, the Action operated in a similar fashion to Phase 1.

Experts in minority languages, immigrant communities and transnational workers were now mixed in the new groups, thus allowing for intergroup dialogue and collaboration. The participation of different stakeholders, including policy makers and practitioners, also facilitated the co-production of theoretically and policy relevant knowledge.
Competence and new speaker varieties (WG7)

Coordinators: Ane Ortega, Agnieszka Otwinowska-Kasztelanic and Noel Ó Murchadha

Ane Ortega’s research has focused on the planning of language integration programmes and on linguistic attitudes and identities of new speakers of Euskera.

Agnieszka Otwinowska-Kasztelanic’s research interests include first/bilingual language acquisition, multilingualism and bilingualism, psycholinguistics, and individual differences in language learning and acquisition.

Noel Ó Murchadha focuses on attitudes and ideologies around linguistic variation, on folk linguistics and on perceptual dialectology. Her research focuses on teenagers’ perceptions of linguistic variation in contemporary spoken Irish and on the standardisation of Modern Irish.

Overview

We brought together WG1 and WG2 from Phase 1 of the Action to examine ‘multilingual competence’ from a range of perspectives: linguistic, psycholinguistic, educational, sociolinguistic, economic and political. To achieve this aim, the workgroup combined quantitative and qualitative methodologies: psycholinguistic experimental studies on L2-Ln languages; classroom-oriented experiments; narrative assessment of speakers’ competence in L2-Ln languages; questionnaire research; focus groups; structured and unstructured interviews; linguistic biographies; and corpus studies. We collected research tools developed and used by network members and shared them available on a shared Internet-based drive. This interdisciplinary research with the use of complementary methods provided us with valuable insights into the concept of multilingual competence at the individual and societal level.

Final report

‘Multilingual competence and new speaker varieties’

Our research goals made it necessary for us to (re) define the notion of ‘competence’ in relation to new speakers, with some points emerging from the work of the researchers. First, we adopted a multilingual perspective on new speakers to highlight the fact that the new language becomes part of the multilingual competence of the new speaker. Second, we noted that languages of the (new) speaker are subject to power relations that have to be taken into account in order to understand the attitudes, language dynamics and language development and use of the new speakers. Third, we defined competence in the new language not only in terms of ‘level’ but also in terms of ‘situation’, that is, competence for the pragmatic needs of speakers in the different situations in which they need to function. In this respect, researchers have often used the term ‘the way I speak’ to describe the type of competence they have and in this description they have highlighted and uncovered the features of their competence that make them adequate or inadequate for their successful functioning as legitimate speakers. Therefore, multilingual competence, situated competence and the-way-I-speak competence emerged as key categories for describing, evaluating and discussing new speaker competence.
**Speakerness: Subjectivities, Trajectories and Socialisation (WG8)**

Coordinators: John Walsh and Maite Puigdevall Serralvo

**John Walsh** is currently researching the ideologies and motivations of ‘new speakers’ of minority languages, people who were not raised speaking those languages but who speak them fluently and regularly.

**Maite Puigdevall Serralvo** works in the areas of include sociolinguistics and language planning and policy. More specifically, her research focuses on new speakers of minority languages; language policy in comparative perspective; and language as it relates to identity, tourism and immigration.

**Overview**

In this working group, we defined new speakers as individuals with little or no home or community exposure to a language but who instead acquire it through formal or informal educational settings, as adult language learners, in the workplace, through revitalization projects, or as a consequence of migration. This group, initiated in Phase 2, moved beyond the more demographic approach adopted in Phase 1 and instead identified cross-cutting themes for different profiles of new speakers. Key themes were the journeys undertaken by new speakers, their emerging understanding of themselves, their experiences of key moments of transition and the manner in which they socialise themselves into new networks in the target language(s).

**Final report**

‘Speakerness: Subjectivities, trajectories, spaces’

A key aim of this group was to explore how we are shaped by multilingualism and how people conceptualise themselves as multilinguals. Recently there has been an increased interest in the lived experiences of multilingual individuals as subjective, emotional and embodied dimensions of language learning have been brought to the forefront (Kramsch, 2009 and 2012, Dewaele, 2010, Pavlenko, 2005 and 2014, Busch, 2013 and 2015). While drawing on recent research on subjective aspects of language acquisition, WGB also offered new perspectives by focusing on the experiences, social practices and performance of new speakers. Furthermore, we explored theoretical underpinnings of the new speaker concept and identified suitable methodologies, such as life stories, longitudinal studies, self-ethnography, and *Sprachbiographie* (language biographies). Through our work, we noticed considerable overlap in the concepts subjectivities and trajectories. However, we maintained them as distinct categories because of their distinguishing characteristics: trajectories refer more to the process of language learning and the special junctures where significant changes occur. Subjectivities, on the other hand are ‘our conscious or unconscious sense of self as mediated through symbolic forms’ (Kramsch, 2009: 19). This is mediated through language and therefore they can refer to the emotional response of subjects to their trajectories and *mudes*.
Language policy regimes, new speakers and sociolinguistic ethnography (WG9)

Coordinators: Josep Soler and Jeroen Darquennes

**Josep Soler** pursues research within the broadly-defined areas of sociolinguistics, language ideologies, language policy and language planning, and intercultural communication from a discourse approach.

**Jeroen Darquennes** conducts research in the areas of contact linguistics, the sociology of language, language ecology, social multilingualism, linguistic minorities in Europe, linguistic management, linguistic conflict, multilingual education and historical sociolinguistics.

**Overview**

Work in Phase 1 made it clear that language policy regimes have the potential to influence how different linguistic resources are organised, managed, and distributed across different societies. WG9 brought together a heterogeneous group of scholars working on a range of topics, including historical and immigrant language minorities, migrant groups in diverse societies, language in the workplace, sign language users, and virtual language. This working group, begun in Phase 2, placed itself within recent language policy literature that stresses the multi-sited nature of language policy. We examined existing research on the roles of different sorts of actors in language policy activities that involve new speakers in a range of geographical, social and political spaces.

**Final report**

‘Language policy regimes, new speakers and sociolinguistic ethnography’

We took a Foucauldian angle, with the aim of identifying the ‘challenges and opportunities of newspeakerness for authorities in the management of public policies and any institution operating regimes of power: families, companies, universities’. Some of the main themes were legal and citizenship regimes; policies and services for new speakers; multilingualism as a resource in institutions; governmentality; and policy outcomes, inequalities and stratification. Along those lines, the central question to guide discussions within the group was: ‘How do recognized authorities (from governments to individual parents) provide tools to enable the languages of new speakers to flourish?’ We reflected on methodological and theoretical concepts that may help to illuminate the role and the interaction of actors in the cyclical processes of language policy in specific language policy regimes involving new speakers.
WG10: Legitimisation and Power (WG10)

Coordinators: Alfonso Del Percio and James Costa

Alfonso Del Percio's discourse analytic research deals with the intersection of language and political economy and focuses on language, migration and governmentality; and the links between language, work, and social inequality.

James Costa works within critical sociolinguistics, he researches minority languages in Scotland and France; norms and standardisation; and language and power.

Overview

This group examined the everyday practices and processes through which people become legitimate new speakers, with a particular focus on social inequality and power dynamics. We compared new speakerness across different linguistic varieties, and in particular used the theoretical lenses of 1) governmentality and 2) access to resources and markets. Our work revealed new speakerness as a contingent, historically situated set of processes, rather than as the mere outcome of language learning. Moreover, our comparative approach showed that legitimacy plays out differently in different contexts. These observations suggest that the trope of ‘new speakerness’ should be analysed as a language ideology rather than as a thing in the world.

Final report

‘Legitimisation and power’

We focused specifically on issues of social inequality linked with practices of new speakerness, as well as on the challenges associated with investigating those issues. We were interested, in other words, in how power issues are at play in the legitimization processes that are crucial to social issues of new speakerness. We analysed different linguistic varieties, boundaries and dynamics (e.g. languagisation) across new speaker contexts. We argued that thinking about new speakers through the lenses of governmentality means that to understand how speakers’ linguistic socialisation is not simply a practice of language learning promoted by governments and educational actors, but rather a way to foster a specific type of desirable and compliant citizen. Our research also problematized the articulation between new speakers of autochthonous minority languages and questions of legitimacy and capital, both social and linguistic. In particular, we studied the conditions under which new speakers can become legitimate members of a given minoritised linguistic community and contribute to the reconstruction and revitalization of autochthonous minority languages.
**Dissemination and impact (WG5)**

Coordinator: Kathryn Jones

*Kathryn Jones* has directed and carried out a wide range of academic and government- or agency-funded research projects in the fields of multilingualism, bilingual education and language policy and planning in Wales.

**Overview**

This group provided an overview of the current research activities of the members of the COST Action New Speakers Network through an online survey. Key themes to emerge were the challenges of integration, diversity and complexity, language ideologies and language teaching, and characteristics of new speakers. We issued a series of recommendations for EU policy makers, state-level policy makers, educators, and parents. For example, we recommend the implementation of minority language-based immersion program in schools. We also urge policymakers to adopt a more complex view of plurilingualism that both celebrates linguistic diversity and recognises the potential for exclusion. We also outlined community-based projects carried out by members and areas for future research.

**Final report**

‘Emerging findings and recommendations for non-academic audiences’

This report provides an overview of the current research activities of the members of the COST Action New Speakers in a Multilingual Europe: Opportunities and Challenges and presents the findings and recommendations for non-academic audiences emerging from the research completed to date by network members. The data upon which this report is based was gathered via the distribution of an on-line questionnaire to the COST network database of 213 network members, Barcelona conference participants and interested parties. The main issues provided by the non-academic respondents were:

- the use and ‘usability’ of the new language; numbers of speakers and density of speakers’ networks; the role of new speakers in language transmission; migratory processes (both synchronic and diachronic) viewed from a pan-European perspective; and the language support needs of immigrant children.

**The New Speaker Studio**: This constitutes a series of cultural ‘tools’ conceived and made by Deirdre MacKenna for the COST Action which aims to engage with people to explore the dynamics involved in becoming a new speaker of a language in the context of a multilingual Europe. [http://www.nspk.org.uk/the-new-speaker-studio.html](http://www.nspk.org.uk/the-new-speaker-studio.html)

**New speakers in a multilingual Europe information leaflets**. We produced bilingual leaflets for the public describing our Action.

**Public round table on new speakers of Irish**

National University of Ireland, Galway, September 2015

Three new speakers of Irish from various parts of Ireland and one speaker from the Gaeltacht discussed their language background, their experience of learning Irish or English, their relationship with other Irish speakers and their thoughts on identity and belonging.

**Supporting ‘new speakers’: Building Irish language networks and communities outside the Gaeltacht**

Trinity College, Dublin October 2016

This meeting aimed to provide an opportunity for discussion to groups that are promoting Irish outside the Gaeltacht and that work for the most part with ‘new speakers’ of Irish, people who speak Irish regularly but were not raised with Irish in the Gaeltacht. To that end we invited representatives of Irish Language Networks and groups interested in applying for status as Gaeltacht Service Towns to meet and identify and discuss the challenges and opportunities associated with this initiative.
Researcher training (WG6)

Coordinators: Michael Hornsby, Sviatlana Karpava and Anastasia Zabrodskaja

**Michael Hornsby** studies the reaction of speech communities to the pressures of globalisation and modernisation; preservation, revitalisation and transformation of minority languages; language ‘authenticity’; and the relationship between language and national/regional identity.

**Sviatlana Karpava** performs research in applied and theoretical linguistics; syntax and semantics; first and second language acquisition; bilingualism, multilingualism and dialect acquisition; specific language impairment; teaching, education and literacy.

**Anastasia Zabrodskaja** researches foreign language teaching, intercultural communication, identity, ethnolinguistic vitality, linguistic landscapes, language contact and code-switching.

Overview

We designed Short Term Scientific Missions (STSMs) and training programmes for early-career researchers. STSMs both advanced the research goals of the working groups and provided early-career researchers with vital experience. Through this programme, Action members visited the institutions of other Action participants to access particular case-study data or to acquire new knowledge of theories, concepts and methods.

We also held training activities, including a training course for early-career and doctoral researchers in July 2017, which drew participants from around Europe. In addition to providing these new researchers with theoretical and methodological tools, the school also aimed to foster the development of a Europe-wide group of researchers from different multilingual contexts. The advance of this group will strengthen the European Research Area and provide world leadership in research and policies linked to the management of linguistic diversity.

**Short Term Scientific Missions (STMSs)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Nicola Bermingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Sara Brennan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Michael Hornsby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Joana Kolak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Karolina Mieszkowska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Karolina Rosiak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Anna Styrycharz-Banás</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Mina Sunni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Carla Jonsson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>James Costa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Larissa Semiramis Schedel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Malgorzata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Machowska-Kosciak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Facundo Reyna Muniaín</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Sviatlana Karpava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Dolores Ruiz-Lozano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Elisa A. Hidalgo McCabe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Rosina Marquez Reiter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Montserrat Casacuberta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Silbo Kanobana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Anik Nandi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Sara Nyssen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Training activities**

**Critical sociolinguistic analysis: Research methods and data analysis (workshop)**

Stockholm University April 2016

**Write yourself into science (workshop)**

Tilburg University. April 2016

**New speaker workshop at the Sociolinguistics Summer School**

Université de Lyon. June 2016. Presenters: Bernadette O’Rourke (Heriot-Watt University)
Summer school: Narrative, discourse and interaction
The Center for Multilingualism in Society across the Lifespan (MultiLing)
University of Oslo, September 2016

Training School
Universitat Oberta de Catalunya, July 2017
This four-day training course was hosted in collaboration with the Sociolinguistics Summer School. Language and globalisation, management of multilingualism, newspeakerness, and variation and social identity were the core themes. Presenters included Monica Heller (University of Toronto), Robert Lawson (Birmingham City University), Joan Pujolar (Universitat Oberta de Catalunya), and Francesc Xavier Vila (Universitat de Barcelona).
Organisers: Marina Massaguer, Avel·lí Flors, Andrea Sunyol, Júlia Llompart & Tülay Caglitutuncigil
Global social forces are transforming the linguistic ecologies of contemporary societies. They change our linguistic landscapes, our linguistic repertoires and the ways we use languages in everyday life. In fact, what we used to understand by “languages” is also changing, along with the concepts and theories traditionally employed to analyse language use. Through our three Whole Action Conferences (WACs), we invited linguists, social scientists, language activists and language planners to analyse and debate these sociolinguistic transformations.

The WACs were open to network participants, practitioners (from education, health care, social services, etc.) and policy makers. They offered us a space for meta cross-case analysis and helped us identify overlapping themes across the three multilingual strands and their connection with policy and practice.

1st Whole Action Conference:
Barcelona, December 2014
Organisers: Joan Pujolar & Maite Puigdevall Serralvo

This event had 166 participants, 86 presentations, 2 round tables, 2 plenary conferences and 1 workshop for doctoral students. One of the plenaries featured a panel co-organized with the Catalan Society of Sociolinguistics (SOC5) entitled ‘From conflict sociolinguistics to the sociolinguistics of multilingualism: past, present and future paradigms’ and sessions by the working groups. Keynote speaker: Jacqueline Urla (University of Massachusetts)

2nd Whole Action Conference:
Hamburg, May 2016
Organisers: Jannis Androutsopoulos & Margarita Giannoutsou

The conference featured a training and support forum, a local multilingualism research community panel (‘New Speakers at the Multilingual University’), working group panels and two round tables (‘Migration and Asylum’ and ‘New Speakers at the Multilingual University’). Keynote speaker: Aneta Pavlenko (Temple University)

Final Whole Action Conference: Policies and Practices
Coimbra, September 2017
Organisers: Clara Keating, Vera Ferreira, Olga Solovova & Raquel Matias.

Focusing on Policies and Practices, the New Speakers’ Network Final Whole Action Conference brought together the work that emerged from dialogue and collaboration among researchers, policy makers and stakeholders working together over the past four years. We focused on the dynamics involved in becoming a ‘new speaker’ of a language in the context of a multilingual Europe. We showcased our research findings and policy recommendations, highlighting the relationship between new speakers and competence; subjectivities; language policies; and legitimacy and governmentality.

Along with these working group sessions, the event included plenary conferences, local stakeholder panels on new speakers and linguistic diversity in Portuguese-speaking contexts and public cultural events on territorial and immigrant sociolinguistic minorities.
Workshops, roundtables and other events

"New speakers": Definitions, agendas and consequences. Jyväskylä Discourse Studies Forum. (Re) considering the Concept of New Speakers. Tuesday, 5th November 2013


Spanish in contact: New times, new spaces and new speakers (conference) Heriot-Watt University, May 2015


Globalization, mobility and citizenship: Researching 'new speakers' of Welsh (workshop) Cardiff University, June 2015

New speakerness: epistemics, positioning and struggles for legitimacy in interaction (seminar) University of Surrey. September 2015

Linguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives on new speakers in a multilingual Europe University of Central Lancashire. October 2015

New plurilingual pathways for integration Heriot-Watt University, May 2016

Language & governmentality (workshop) Université Sorbonne Nouvelle-Paris, March 2016


What does it mean to speak a minority language?: Dispelling myths and raising awareness through theatre (workshop in collaboration with actor and theatre maker Brian Thunder) Heriot-Watt University. April 2016

Interaction and Society (with EDiSo) Universitat de València, June 2016

Phonetics and phonology of new speakers (workshop) University College London, July 2016

Español para inmigrantes: Desde la teoría hacia la práctica Asociación de Murialdo (Getafe). June 2016

Second Celtic sociolinguistic symposium Trinity College Dublin. October 2016

Bilingual child migrants in a multilingual Europe University of Warsaw. November 2016

European language diversity forum San Sebastian, December 2016

About 50 million people in the European Union speak regional or minority languages. At present, these people’s language rights are not guaranteed. In the European Language Diversity Forum, we reflected on the central aspects of minority language development in Europe and tackled the most urgent challenges.

New speakers in a multilingual Europe: A transdisciplinary view from Cyprus University of Lancaster, Cyprus. January 2017

Neohablantes en contextos de diáspora Universitat Bremen. January 2017

Refugees, new speakers & global law (workshop) Tilburg University. March 2017

Language policy issues in 'new speakers' contexts: Critical ethnographic perspectives (workshop) Université de Namur. March 2017

New speakers in Latvia: Educational language policy for integration and peace (symposium and round table) University of Latvia. April 2017

(New) speakers in multilingual contexts (roundtable) University College London. April 2017

Writing retreat and workshop Budapest Metropolitan University. April 2017

How do you talk about language? (workshop) Glasgow. June 2017

Language, inclusion and labour markets (seminar) Faroe Islands. August 2017
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