

1 **New speakers: challenges and opportunities for variationist sociolinguistics**

2

3 Jonathan Kasstan (Queen Mary University of London)

4 j.kasstan@qmul.ac.uk

5 ORCID: 0000-0003-4134-5876

6

7 *Abstract:*

8 While the field of variationist sociolinguistics has advanced rapidly since Labov
9 (1966), it remains the case that a socially informed theory of language change
10 continues to be influenced by only very few languages, typically English and a
11 handful other dominant European languages. This article considers recent work on the
12 emergence of *new speakers* in (severely) endangered or minority language
13 communities, and what they might have to offer variationist theory. Although
14 definitions can vary, it has become convention to describe new speakers as
15 individuals ‘with little or no home or community exposure to a minority language but
16 who instead acquire it through immersion or bilingual education programs,
17 revitalization projects or as adult language learners’ (O’Rourke *et al.* 2015: 1). There
18 is now a wealth of literature available on new speakers in typologically dissimilar
19 language contexts, though, so far, very little work has adopted the variationist
20 paradigm. This article will argue that new speakers can figure prominently in
21 variationist models of diffusion and change, taking the classic sociolinguistic factor of
22 social networks as an example. The article ends by proposing a manifesto of potential
23 research trajectories, based on current gaps in the literature.

24

25

26 *1. Introduction*

27 Since Labov (1966)'s seminal work in New York City, variationist sociolinguistics
28 has sought to develop a socially accountable theory of linguistic diffusion and change.
29 However, as Nagy and Meyerhoff (2008), Smakman (2015) and Stanford (2016)
30 have all highlighted, non-English languages continue to play only a very marginal
31 influential role in the process. Their surveying of the variationist-sociolinguistic
32 literature reveals a surprising dearth of geolinguistic diversity in leading variationist
33 venues; language variation and change, then, continues to be the preserve of English
34 and a handful of other dominant European languages. Although the picture is slowly
35 changing, such observations have important implications for the development of a
36 generalisable, cross-linguistic sociolinguistic theory. Moreover, as Stanford points
37 out, non-English language communities can offer 'fresh viewpoints' on established
38 theoretical and methodological frameworks (2016: 526). To evidence this, the present
39 article will consider one classic sociolinguistic factor: social networks. Variationist
40 studies that employ a social network methodology have demonstrated that close-knit
41 ties support highly localised linguistic norms and intercommunity distinctiveness in a
42 unilingual context, whereas weak ties promote susceptibility to processes of levelling
43 and innovation diffusion (*e.g.* Milroy and Milroy 1985). These findings are now well-
44 documented in monolingual English-speaking communities (*e.g.* Milroy 1980 in
45 Belfast, Kerswill and Williams 2000 in Milton Keynes). In bi/multilingual
46 communities, social network theory has also been deployed to try to account for
47 processes contributing towards language obsolescence, where loose-knit ties have
48 been argued to bring about language shift (*e.g.* Li and Milroy 1995 on Chinese
49 communities in Tyneside). However, Milroy maintains that, while of considerable
50 theoretical interest, in such under-studied contexts, it is much less clear how the

51 parameters of social networks can be adequately operationalised to account for
52 socially and geographically mobile speakers, whose ties are considered ‘weak’ in the
53 traditional sense (2004: 562). Further, while only a very small number of studies have
54 attempted to apply this model to account for variation and change in minority variety
55 speech communities in contact with English (*e.g.* Matsumoto 2010), much less
56 attention still has been paid to non-English contexts altogether.¹

57 In response to Stanford (2016)’s ‘call for more diverse sources of data [...] in
58 non-English contexts’, this article considers recent work on the emergence of *new*
59 *speakers* in (severely) endangered or minority language communities, and what this
60 work might have to offer variationist theory. Although definitions can vary, it has
61 become convention to describe new speakers as individuals ‘with little or no home or
62 community exposure to a minority language but who instead acquire it through
63 immersion or bilingual education programs, revitalization projects or as adult
64 language learners’ (O’Rourke *et al.* 2015: 1). There is now a wealth of literature
65 available on new speakers of typologically dissimilar languages, though, so far, few
66 of these studies have adopted the variationist paradigm. Instead, the bulk of the work
67 on new speakers has tended to be qualitative in nature, focusing on interaction-level
68 analysis, with ideological themes oscillating around sociolinguistic authenticity in
69 endangered-language communities (*e.g.* native speakers as gate keepers and
70 authenticators of language), legitimacy of new speakers (*e.g.* as community members)
71 and power relations with other speaker types (*e.g.* their role in language revitalisation
72 efforts). That said, some new-speaker studies have also recognised that the speech of
73 new speakers can be far removed from community norms (or at least perceived as
74 such). Although few of these studies are devoted to quantitative methods, they can

¹ Gal (1978; 1979), Bortoni-Ricardo (1985) and Lippi-Green (1989) are perhaps the best-known of these network-based studies.

75 (and, it will be argued, should) appeal to the variationist paradigm, which – for fifty
76 years now – has sought to understand the social significance of language variation,
77 and the mechanisms that drive linguistic change. These fundamental tenets of the field
78 (as proposed by Weinreich *et al.* 1969) will carry important implications for contexts
79 of (extreme) language shift, such as those offered by many of the new-speaker studies
80 surveyed below. Therefore, this article attempts to bridge these two areas of inquiry.
81 To do so, it will first be necessary to present an overview of the recent literature on
82 new speakers in sociolinguistics. In Section 2, a number of studies are reviewed to
83 illustrate how new speakers have been characterised as social actors; how they can
84 differ from typical second-language learners; and what observations have been made
85 where new speakers emerge in communities with fluctuating sociolinguistic
86 practices.² In Section 3, focus is given to the very few existing quantitative production
87 studies that include samples of new speakers, where the evidence presented illustrates
88 how new speakers can be conceived of as agents of sociolinguistic change in
89 variationist terms. Then, using the classic micro-level factor of social networks as a
90 case study, Section 4 exemplifies how new speakers can figure prominently in
91 variationist models of diffusion and change. Owing to the largely qualitative nature of
92 new-speaker studies to date, Section 5 concludes with some suggestions for future
93 research trajectories, based on current gaps in the literature.

94

95 2. On ‘new speakers’

96 The *new speaker* label is one of recent prominence in the language endangerment
97 literature. While regional or minority language communities in many parts of the

² While this article provides a comprehensive overview of sites where new speakers have been the object of study, it should be noted that the vast majority of these studies converge on minority European varieties. This article is therefore inherently Eurocentric, though, where available, research on new speakers of non-European varieties is also discussed.

98 world continue to undergo an extreme kind of attrition, particularly in the face of
99 increased urbanisation and globalisation (see *e.g.* Amano *et al.* 2014), new speakers
100 are nonetheless emerging as a result of revitalisation efforts and increasingly
101 favourable language policies. These new speakers have often had little or no
102 community/home exposure to the target variety, which they typically acquire in a
103 purely educational context. In the simplest terms, then, they are qualitatively different
104 from native speakers, who acquire the language via intergenerational transmission,
105 and other types of learners who may be exposed to the target in day-to-day life.
106 However, as O'Rourke and Ramallo (2013: 288) note, a variety of different labels
107 exist in the literature that can also refer to the new speaker phenomenon: 'L2
108 speaker', 'learner', 'heritage speaker' etc. are common in Applied Linguistics,
109 TESOL, and Multilingualism studies. That said, there are important levels of
110 distinction that can be delineated between new speakers and other types of second-
111 language learners in socio-political terms. For instance, given that the target being
112 acquired can be characterised in most cases as minorised, and obsolescent or
113 moribund, new speakers tend to play a significant influential role by comparison with
114 most other L2 contexts. In cases where severe endangerment is coupled with
115 embryonic revitalisation efforts, new speakers not only represent an important
116 proportion of the total speakers of the language, but they are also influential arbiters
117 in emergent normative practices. They can therefore 'occupy greater positions of
118 authority in the language's social hierarchy than many second language users would
119 do' (Nance *et al.* 2016: 168). Moreover, labels such as 'L2 speaker' or 'learner' are
120 increasingly contested, mostly because they imply some deviation from an implicit
121 native-speaker norm, as has been detailed extensively in the Applied Linguistics
122 literature (see *e.g.* Firth and Wagner 1997). Owing to these observations, and under

123 the guise of the EU COST Action research network ‘New speakers in Multilingual
124 Europe: Opportunities and Challenges’, O’Rourke and Ramallo (2013) and Walsh and
125 Lane (2014) have proposed the notion of *new speakerness*. New speakerness implies a
126 dynamic rather than fixed state: it ‘can include a continuum of speaker types, ranging
127 from second language learners with limited competence [...] right up to expert L2
128 users’ (O’Rourke and Ramallo 2013: 288). It can also refer to ‘a stance or subject
129 position that becomes available to social actors’ (Jaffe 2015: 43) throughout the life-
130 span, particularly in endangered-language contexts, where there is often no implicit,
131 hierarchical, or standard norm.

132 It should be stressed, however, that, while *new speakerness* is a novel
133 sociolinguistic notion, speakers that today might be labelled *new* have been the focus
134 of scholarly attention since at least the 1980s. Trosset for instance highlighted that, at
135 the time, ‘no systematic study [had] been undertaken of people attempting to learn a
136 dying language’ (1986: 167) – a void that she was attempting to fill. Trosset
137 foregrounds in particular the challenges faced by new speakers of Welsh entering an
138 increasingly dwindling community of native speakers. In the late 1980s, Woolard
139 made use of the label ‘new Catalans’ (1989: 44) to describe L2 Catalan speakers who
140 come to adopt bilingual practices, seeing themselves as both Catalan and Spanish – a
141 designation that, Woolard reports, very few native Catalonians would accept. More
142 recently, Trenchs-Parera and Newman (2015: 494) identify such attitudes to be
143 associated with a broader cosmopolitanism, where younger middle-class new
144 speakers learn Catalan either for professional reasons, or as an academic exercise (see
145 also Frekko 2013). Similarly, Urla distinguishes between *euskaldun zaharrak* (‘old
146 Basques’), who she describes as ‘native Basque speakers who tend to be primarily
147 from farming and fishing communities’, and *euskaldun berriak* (‘new Basques’),

148 comprised of ‘urban professionals, civil servants, and teachers who have mastered
149 Standardised Basque’ (1993: 830).³ In these studies, then, early conceptualisations of
150 new speakers are sketched out: in the context of Basque, for instance, they are
151 described by Urla (1993) as middle-class urban dwellers, characteristics not typically
152 associated with native speakers of minority varieties such as Basque or Occitan,
153 traditionally viewed as overwhelmingly rural and working class (see *e.g.* Blanchet and
154 Armstrong 2006). Moreover, the new Catalonians make use of different constructions
155 of self that do not necessarily align clearly with community norms. Such descriptions
156 are also very typical of Breton new speakers (Jones 1995; 1998a; 1998b).⁴ Unlike
157 Catalan or Basque, Breton serves as a typical example of a language undergoing
158 ‘gradual death’ (Campbell and Muntzel 1989: 182): native-speaker numbers have
159 been dwindling for some time, and the conventional domains of usage have been
160 eroded. However, attempts to revitalise Breton have led to the development of a
161 learner variety (*néo-Breton*) which is reified predominantly by new speakers (or *néo-*
162 *Bretonnants*). Jones describes these speakers as an urban *intelligentsia*, in that they
163 are predominantly middle-class, urban-dwelling, well educated and highly politicised
164 (1998a: 129). Moreover, in sharp contrast to native speakers, these new speakers
165 typically acquire Breton as an academic exercise. As a result, they speak a
166 standardised, pan-Brittany variety of Breton, which she reports to be unintelligible to
167 native speakers. For example, to render Breton functional in additional domains, the
168 *néo-Bretonnants* have innovated neologisms as opposed to borrowing from Standard
169 French, as is the norm for the vast majority of native speakers; *néo-Bretonnant*
170 lexicon is also typically purged of existing borrowings (see Table 1 for some

³ See more recently Ortega *et al.* on *euskaldunberria*, or more specifically ‘new speaker’ (2015: 93).

⁴ See most recently a special issue by Hornsby and Vigers (2013).

171 examples). In spite of these common ‘distanciation strategies’ (Thiers 1985), which
 172 are said to be ideologically motivated (see Hornsby 2013), Jones reports that their
 173 grammar shows considerable influence from Standard French.⁵ In many cases, new
 174 speakers of Breton are not community-insiders in the traditional sense. For instance,
 175 Hornsby (2015: 54-59) outlines how some speakers in his sample moved from areas
 176 far outside of Brittany into Breton-speaking heartlands, thereafter choosing to identify
 177 as a *brezhoneger* (‘Breton speaker’). Although these speakers self-identify as
 178 *bretonnant*, other members of the community, who are typically more deeply rooted,
 179 can and do contest their status. As a result, Jones (1998b), Adkins (2013) and
 180 Hornsby (2013) also discuss the level of linguistic insecurity that is felt by both native
 181 speakers and new speakers where contact between the two occurs, and where issues
 182 pertaining to *sociolinguistic authenticity*⁶ (e.g. Coupland 2003) are foregrounded.
 183 Therefore, while Breton new speakers are seen as peripheral community members by
 184 those older and more established central members, it is clear that there is at least some
 185 overlap in terms of their respective networks.⁷ Moreover, their language use has been
 186 equated in the literature in some cases as approximating that of a ‘xenolect’,

⁵ It is noteworthy that recent production studies among young children in *Diwan* (*néo-Breton*) schools do not necessarily support this observation (cf. Kennard and Lahiri 2017).

⁶ See *contra* Bucholtz (2003) for a critique of this notion.

⁷ A conceptual question might be raised here as to whether or not new and native speakers can be considered part of the same *speech community* (Labov 1972). While acknowledging the considerable attention that has been paid to problematising this notion in (variationist) sociolinguistics (e.g. Romain 1982), the present article follows Milroy (1980: 14), (Dorian 1982: 29), and Bortoni-Ricardo (1985: 80), in adopting instead Hymes (1974: 51)’s definition in terms of ‘common locality’ and ‘primary interaction’. Dorian (1982) in particular has shown why it is important that peripheral members with – what Hymes called – communicative competence (see Section 3) should not be excluded from any definition of speech community. Moreover, as Bortoni-Ricardo (1985) has shown, a network analysis can provide the appropriate means for assessing both common locality and primary interaction. It is also worth recalling Sankoff and Labov’s perspective, who argued that ‘every speaker is a member of many nested and intersecting speech communities’ (1979: 202). This has also been interpreted to mean ‘many different integrated networks’ (Bortoni-Ricardo 1985: 80).

187 representing ‘the pre-terminal stage of some dying languages’ (Jones 1998b: 323),
188 rather than toeing communal norms.

189 Such observations are not unique to Europe. Alaskan Athabascan is an
190 analogous North American example. All eleven recognised varieties of Athabascan
191 are considered to be moribund, as English has largely supplanted each of them in all
192 but the most intimate functional domains, and children are no longer raised with
193 Athabascan as a mother-tongue. Much like the Breton example, language
194 revitalisation strategies undertaken mostly by new speakers have led to linguistic
195 variants that differ from native-speaker norms. As a result, these new-speaker forms
196 are generally not accepted as authentic Athabascan variants by older speakers, who
197 are documented as ‘laughing mercilessly’ (Holton 2009: 248) at their grandchildren’s
198 efforts to learn, which in turn brings about a deep sense of social and linguistic
199 insecurity.⁸ Further, given the vast geographical space that is considered Athabascan-
200 speaking, opportunities for learners and native speakers to come together and interact
201 are rare, and so the learners have taken to the Internet, which serves as a forum to
202 exchange and interact in the minority variety. Since these Athabascan internauts are
203 almost exclusively new speakers, Holton (2009) remarks that the web provides them
204 with a virtual space in which to use their new-speaker varieties, free from native-
205 speaker authentication. This hostility towards new speakerness provides a further
206 important level of distinction between new speakers and other types of second-
207 language learner contexts, and similar criticism of new-speaker practices are now also
208 documented elsewhere (*e.g.* O’Rourke and Ramallo [2011] on Irish and Galician,
209 Kasstan [2018] on Francoprovençal). The above – largely qualitative – research on

⁸ It should be noted that attitudes can sometimes change at the ‘tip’ (Dorian 1981:51), as noted in the context of Tlingit (southeastern Alaska), with fewer than 200 speakers left. Here, elders are said to embrace language emersion retreats, designed to create new spaces for the use of Tlingit among both native speakers and new speakers (see Mitchell 2005).

210 new speakers of endangered languages reveals then a native/non-native divide, where
211 speakers on both sides are reported to be ‘socially and linguistically incompatible’
212 (O’Rourke and Ramallo 2011: 139): new speakers are seen as peripheral members of
213 the community, and new-speaker practices are described deviant from communal
214 norms. These findings are not limited to the cases explored above. Indeed, in recent
215 years, an increasing number of papers in typologically dissimilar contexts have
216 revealed many common themes and findings. New-speaker studies are now available
217 on Baseldytsh (Del Percio 2016), Belarusian (Woolhiser 2013), Catalan (Frekko
218 2013, Pujolar and Puigdevall 2015), Cornish (Sayers 2012, Sayers and Renkó-
219 Michelsén 2015), Corsican (Jaffe 2015), Francoprovençal (Kasstan 2015, Bichurina
220 2018, Kasstan and Müller 2018), Galician (O’Rourke and Ramallo 2013, Tomé
221 Lourido and Evans 2015; 2016), Giernesiei and Jèrriais (Wilson *et al.* 2015, Sallabank
222 and Marquis 2018), Irish (Walsh 2013, O’Rourke and Walsh 2015), Lemko (Hornsby
223 2015), Louisiana Creole (Mayeux 2015), Manx (Ó hIfearnáin 2015), Occitan (Costa
224 2013), Scottish Gaelic (McLeod and O’Rourke 2015, Nance 2015, Nance *et al.* 2016),
225 Welsh (Robert 2009, Morris 2014), Western Armenian (Manoukian 2017), and
226 Yiddish (Hornsby 2015). Owing to the observations set out above that new speakers
227 are frequently characterised as employing linguistic variants that differ from
228 traditional norms, it is surprising that so few studies have made use of quantitative
229 variationist methods to better understand the social significance of this variation, or to
230 connect variation in production with broader questions of linguistic diffusion and
231 change. However, some recent studies have begun to focus on these areas of inquiry,
232 appealing in particular to variationist sociolinguistics.

233

234 *3. New speakers and linguistic variation*

235 In reference to the Corsican context for instance, Jaffe suggests that new speakers
236 '[...] acquire a socially and communicatively consequential level of competence and
237 practice in the minority language' (2015: 25). Jaffe refers here not only to the level of
238 linguistic competency that can be acquired by new speakers, but also to
239 communicative competency (*i.e.* acquisition of sociolinguistic variation). While
240 acquisition of variation (so-called 'Type 2 variation', following 'Type 1' or linguistic
241 competence, Mougeon *et al.* 2004) among learners is not novel in the literature (see
242 *e.g.* Drummond 2011 on Polish speakers and (t)-glottaling), recent studies reveal
243 Type 2 variation to convey important social work among minority-variety new
244 speakers, too, in spite of a cline of linguistic competency.

245 Using sociophonetic methods, Tomé Lourido and Evans (2015; 2016) explore
246 speaker variation among *neofalantes* ('new speakers') of Galician in Spain. The new
247 speakers in these studies were raised as Spanish monolinguals who acquire Galician
248 in adulthood, later becoming bilingual, but Galician dominant. Both studies focus on
249 the production of mid-vowels, where mid-high and mid-low contrasts are not present
250 in Spanish, but are in Galician. The results reveal that *neofalantes* vowel production
251 differed from that of Spanish dominants in the study in that at least some of the new
252 speakers had acquired the Galician front and back mid-vowel contrasts. However, the
253 *neofalantes* data suggested that the contrast made in mid vowels was not as great as
254 that of the Galician dominants, who had acquired Galician before critical age. Based
255 on this evidence, the authors identify an emergent hybrid category of vowels that they
256 postulate to be deployed *indexically* (Silverstein 2003) by new speakers to convey
257 speaker identity.⁹

⁹ However, this hybrid category, they argue, is not accompanied by a change in perception. In other words, the new speakers sampled could not distinguish *neofalantes* from Spanish-dominant bilinguals and Galician-dominant bilinguals to a statistically significant extent.

258 Similarly, Nance *et al.* (2016) explore linguistic variation among new speakers
259 of Scottish Gaelic in Glasgow and Edinburgh, where revitalisation initiatives have
260 driven a rise in employment opportunities requiring the language. The study focuses
261 on word-final realisation of rhoticity, where palatalised or alveolar rhotic consonants
262 are constrained by the quality of final vowel. While the native speakers in the sample
263 broadly approximated to palatalised rhotics, the new speakers evidenced substantial
264 variation in their production, with several new speakers preferring weakly rhotic or
265 non-rhotic variants, in spite of high levels of proficiency. The authors present data to
266 suggest that some proficient Gaelic new speakers ‘preferred an ideal self that was
267 more oriented towards a new-speaker model and considered a native-speaker target as
268 inauthentic’ (2016: 185), and that this was reflected in their production data. In other
269 words, new speakers produce divergent linguistic variants from native speakers and
270 other types of learners, based on alternative constructions of self, that do not
271 necessarily align with community norms. So, while observations made in the context
272 of Gaelic and Galician are similar to those outlined in the case of Breton above, the
273 advantage of the variationist methods adopted in both cases here illustrates the social
274 significance of the variable linguistic behaviour among new speakers.

275 Analogous observations have been made most recently by Kasstan and Müller
276 (2018), who examine production data among new speakers of Francoprovençal – a
277 severely endangered language spoke in parts of France, Switzerland, and Italy. While
278 native speakers broadly evidenced phonological levelling of palatalised lateral
279 approximants in obstruent + lateral onset clusters (a feature of Francoprovençal, but
280 not of Standard French), the data revealed that new speakers can style-shift between
281 highly localised dialectal variants and pan-regional variants in sociolinguistic
282 interviews, with very limited linguistic competency. The authors argue that these pan-

283 regional forms are also deployed indexically to convey membership to a wider
284 language revitalisation movement. This suggests, as has been argued elsewhere, that
285 ‘being a new speaker of a minority language does not necessarily require full mastery
286 of that language, and that knowing certain registers or mastering certain genres might
287 be enough for what social actors seek to achieve with the minority language’ (Costa
288 2018). In this case, new speakerness is invoked to signal a very different kind of
289 Francoprovençal identity when compared with native speakers, who can openly reject
290 new-speaker practices (see Kasstan 2018). Kasstan and Müller further postulate that
291 these new forms might come to be community norms in the future, following Jaffe:
292 “new” [...] “learner” linguistic forms may stand out as “new speaker” indices at one
293 point in a community’s sociolinguistic trajectory, but may become the norm at some
294 later date’ (2015: 26).¹⁰ Studies such as these clearly illustrate the potential of
295 bridging research on new speakers with variationist sociolinguistic theory, in order to
296 illustrate the social significance of linguistic variation in (severely) endangered-
297 language communities, and the parallels that can be drawn with the broader
298 variationist work on English and other dominant languages. New speaker studies also
299 have much to offer the variationist literature on stylisation of speech, and, on the basis
300 of the observations made by Tomé Lourido and Evans (2015; 2016), Nance *et al.*
301 (2016), and Kasstan and Müller (2018), it seems possible to conceive of new speakers
302 as agents of sociolinguistic change in variationist terms. It will next be argued that a
303 social network analysis can offer a fruitful case study for understanding the social
304 mechanisms that underpin this variation.

305

306 *4. A social network approach to analysing new-speaker variation*

¹⁰ The end-result of which is probably best exemplified by the case of reconstructed Cornish (*e.g.* Sayers and Renkó-Michelsén 2015).

307 In Milroy (1980)'s classic Belfast study, she argued that that close-knit, dense and
308 multiplex network ties foster intra-community cohesion and norm enforcement,
309 whereas sparse and uniplex network ties are hospitable conduits for variability and
310 innovation diffusion. Her analysis was based on a network-strength scale, which
311 examined the relationship between the variable strength of network ties to an *ego* (the
312 central member), and variation in language behaviour. This approach was designed
313 principally to test the effect of strong ties among monolingual speakers within a
314 tightly defined geographical area. Milroy's general observations on network structure
315 and language variation have since been replicated too in big urban centres with
316 rapidly changing social landscapes, as evidenced in Milton Keynes (Kerswill and
317 Williams 2000) and London (Cheshire *et al.* 2008). Further, a small number of
318 important studies have attested to these outcomes in non-English contexts, too. For
319 instance, Bortoni-Ricardo recognised the social network paradigm 'as an effective
320 analytical tool to tackle the issue of variation, especially in fluid settings undergoing
321 rapid change' (1985: 69) in her study on language variation and change among rural
322 Caipira speakers moving into urban Brazilian centres. Broadly, she observed that, in
323 the rural-to-urban transition, typical low-status Caipira features decreased and that
324 categorical non-standard rules of Caipira speakers' repertoires became variable where
325 strong networks were weakened, exposing these speakers to prestige norms (Bortoni-
326 Ricardo 1985: 239-241).

327 It is proposed here that a social network approach can also be adopted to
328 elucidate the social mechanisms underpinning new-speaker behaviour described in
329 Section 3. As Bortoni-Ricardo (1985) and others have argued, the social network
330 paradigm is perhaps best suited to analysing variation in communities undergoing
331 rapid change, with fluctuating sociolinguistic norms. These descriptors also are also

332 clearly characteristic of the (severely) endangered-language communities that have
333 been illustrated above, where dwindling native-speaker bases have galvanised
334 revitalisation efforts, which in turn have led to emergent new-speaker practices in
335 communities often lacking hierarchical or standard norms. New speakers have in
336 particular been described above as peripheral members in their communities: owing to
337 their linguistic practices that do not toe community norms, their status is contested by
338 native speakers, and they are in some cases chastised for their practices. These
339 attributes are not dissimilar from those used to describe sociolinguistic ‘Lames’ (e.g.
340 Labov 1973, Edwards 1992), *i.e.* peripheral group members who are less familiar with
341 the norms of more central members in the vernacular peer-group. However, unlike
342 ‘Lames’, new speakers make up a significant proportion of the total speaker numbers
343 in their communities, and, as has been argued, this grants them power and prestige as
344 arbiters in fluctuating normative practices. It is therefore unclear what the
345 determinants of *strong* and *weak* ties might mean in such contexts. That said, a social
346 network analysis can still be operationalised to fit the relevant research questions for
347 new-speaker studies. In particular, the absence of an overtly prestigious norm presents
348 at least one important research question: if – as has been proposed above – new
349 speakers are agents of change, then are they responsible for the diffusion of new
350 vernacular forms in their communities, as suggested by Jaffe (2015) and Kasstan &
351 Müller (2018)? Do these new forms then penetrate native-speaker networks? While
352 further research is needed to systematically test this hypothesis, some evidence from
353 the new-speaker literature suggests that such diffusion is possible. For instance,
354 Hornsby (2013) identifies in his sample a small number of native Breton speakers
355 who do not necessarily harbour negative attitudes towards new-speaker variants.
356 Similarly, on the basis of a subset of Francoprovençal lexical variables, Kasstan

357 (2013) has shown that, in some cases, native speakers can produce neologised new-
358 speaker variants in a wordlist translation tasks (see Table 2). However, only 5%
359 (N=39) of native speakers sampled were able to produce them, all of whom had at
360 least some contact with new-speaker participants. A social network analysis therefore
361 lends itself nicely to testing these sorts of hypotheses, though the framework would
362 need to be altered to account for the new-speaker context.

363 Following Matsumoto (2010)'s study on the island of Palau, a social network
364 analysis based on *active* and *passive* ties may be best suited to such a context. Under
365 this framework, first proposed by Milardo (1988), and adapted by Li and Milroy
366 (1995) and Matsumoto (2010), *active* ties consist of *exchange* and *interactive*
367 networks: *exchange* networks constitute members such as friends, with whom the ego
368 not only interacts routinely, but also exchanges symbolic resources, such as direct
369 advice, criticism, support and interference (Milardo 1988: 23); Matsumoto (2010:
370 140), following Li and Milroy (1995), identifies such networks as constituting *strong*
371 ties in the traditional sense. Conversely, *interactive* networks constitute members with
372 whom the ego interacts with frequently, but on whom the ego does not rely for the
373 sorts of symbolic resources that define the *exchange* network. Such ties, which are
374 characteristically *weak*, might consist of work colleagues or neighbours, for instance.
375 In addition, *passive* ties are identified as entailing an absence of regular contact, but
376 are nonetheless valued by the ego as a source of influence and moral support.
377 Matsumoto (2010) suggests that close friends, spread over a large geographical space,
378 best describes the nature of *passive* ties. While the quality of *passive* ties is
379 ambiguous in these studies, they can be conceived of for our purposes as *strong*,
380 given the quality of the relationships. In applying this network analysis, Matsumoto
381 finds that social networks can best account for both code and choice of linguistic

382 variants in her multilingual community (2010: 160). *Exchange* and *interactive*
383 networks function in an analogous way to *strong* and *weak* ties in Belfast: *exchange*
384 networks (both active and passive) promote the maintenance of the vernacular (a local
385 variety of Japanese) at the expense of the incoming dominant language (English),
386 whereas *interactive* networks act as conduits for modern Japanese, and the diffusion
387 of English.

388 Distinguishing between these different network orders is useful for analysing
389 new-speaker variation, as the framework can account for the behaviour of individuals
390 whose language patterns may not be like those of their peers, or other members of the
391 network; ‘they can be shown to have contracted different types of personal network
392 structures’ (Li and Milroy 1995: 155). To apply this framework to a new-speaker
393 context, the characteristics of the community under investigation would need to be
394 properly reflected in the methodology-design. For instance, Kasstan (2015) outlines
395 how a social network analysis, based on the number and quality of first-order
396 (exchange) ties is able to account for innovative vernacular forms among a small
397 number of new speakers of Francoprovençal. However, given (a) the extent to which
398 some new speakers were ostracised in the community, and (b) the overall size of the
399 community of new speakers, he found that the distinction between the various
400 network types employed by Matsumoto (2010) to be too nuanced for his endangered-
401 language context. Instead Kasstan (2015) adopted an integration index based on that
402 of Cheshire (1982) and Edwards (1992), where participants are assigned a score
403 which determines how well-integrated they are into their respective networks. The
404 challenge for the study was to establish an integration index for two very different
405 speech communities in France and Switzerland, that was not only sensitive to the
406 socio-economic factors of each fieldwork area, but which could also account for very

407 different types of speakers, as well as the unique sociolinguistic context of
408 Francoprovençal (see Kasstan 2015 for details). As Milroy points out, though, each
409 community will vary, and it is up to the investigator to pursue ‘the most relevant and
410 easily measurable cultural categories’ (1987: 216).

411 However, it remains to be seen how successfully new speakers might ‘figure
412 prominently in a socially accountable theory of linguistic diffusion and change’
413 (Milroy 2004: 563), which has yet to be fully explored. Few new-speaker studies have
414 attempted to bridge speech production data with these broader concerns. If, as
415 Kasstan (2015) argues, new speakers maintain characteristically *weak* network ties
416 with native speakers, then it should be possible to model new speakers into social
417 network theory as mobile speakers who harbour numerous loose and uniplex
418 networks.¹³ However, little work on new speakers has yet systematically tested this
419 possibility, even though some studies provide data ripe for a network analysis. Nance
420 *et al.* (2016), for instance, do not conceive of their sample as a social network, but,
421 loosely, as a *Community of Practice*, which, in Wenger’s terms, consists of a body of
422 individuals with a shared repertoire, who come together around mutual engagement in
423 a jointly negotiated enterprise (1998: 76). This is clearly reflected in Nance *et al.*’s
424 study, ‘where many speakers use Gaelic in their work and attend a range of social and
425 cultural events in the expectation that Gaelic will be used and other Gaelic speakers
426 will be present’ (2016: 168). While the *Community of Practice* model is useful for the
427 purpose of their analysis, it would not illuminate on the potential spread of new-
428 speaker variants into the wider Gaelic-speaking networks (as proposed above), and

¹³ The observation that new speakers maintain inherently loose and uniplex ties is based on a long-held tenet of social network theory: ‘on the whole, networks in rural areas tend towards density and multiplexity and in urban areas to uniplexity and sparseness’ (Milroy and Margrain 1980: 48). As reviewers to this paper have suggested, though, it is worth acknowledging that not all new-speaker networks will be equally loose and uniplex, which may have implications for this revised framework. Further research on new speakers of severely endangered or minority languages is needed to confirm this.

429 the associated social significance that any such variants might carry for different
430 communities of practice; this is where social networks are most useful.

431

432 *5. Trajectories for future research*

433 Research on new speakers, then, has much to offer the variationist paradigm, which
434 has renewed calls for ‘more diverse sources of data’ (Stanford 2016), and this article
435 has suggested that social network theory, a still very productive avenue of inquiry in
436 variationist research, provides a useful bridge for applying variationist theory to an
437 expanding body of data on new speakers of (severely) endangered or minority
438 languages. New speakers have been shown to play complex roles in these
439 communities: they can be ostracised by native speakers for their new-speaker
440 practices, and, yet, paradoxically, in those contexts where the target variety is
441 severely endangered, new speakers represent an important proportion of total speaker
442 numbers. In variationist terms, new speakers maintain peripheral community status,
443 akin to ‘the working margins’ in Dorian (1982: 29)’s terms, and this article has argued
444 that they overlap with native-speaker networks. More research is therefore needed in
445 order to establish the sociolinguistic correlates of these factors.

446 A synthesis of the literature on new speakers reveals a number of other
447 avenues of inquiry, too. First, as has been discussed, new-speaker studies have
448 evidenced many common cross-linguistic findings. However, most of these studies
449 have been undertaken independently: there is now a need for greater comparative-
450 sociolinguistic work on new speakers. Some comparative work does already exist. For
451 instance, O’Rourke *et al.* (2015) comprises a special issue dedicated to new speakers
452 of minority varieties, though the contributions address various different themes across
453 disparate methodological frameworks (none of which adopt variationist

454 sociolinguistic methods). Hornsby (2015) is a comparative linguistic ethnographic
455 study of Breton, Lemko, and Yiddish. Although rich in qualitative detail, the study
456 offers little in terms of speech production data, which is outside the scope of the
457 volume. Adopting the comparative-sociolinguistic methods that have evolved from
458 the variationist paradigm into new-speaker research would elucidate our
459 understanding of language variation across contexts, as such methods cross-compare
460 conditioning effects on sociolinguistic variation.¹⁴ Comparative-sociolinguistic
461 endeavours could consider emerging minority-language new speakers in heritage-
462 language contexts, such as those brought to light most recently by McEwan (2015) in
463 the context of Gaelic spoken in Nova Scotia. No quantitative work has yet compared
464 new speakers of homeland and heritage Gaelic. Potential research questions here
465 might include, for example, asking whether or not different patterns of language use
466 emerge among new speakers in homeland and heritage Gaelic (*cf.* Nagy *et al.* 2018
467 for an analogous context of homeland and heritage Francoprovençal varieties).

468 Secondly, there is little work that implicates new speakers in well-known
469 instances of language change. In general, we maintain a very poor formal
470 understanding of how linguistic innovations have been introduced by multilingual
471 speakers as contact-induced language change. This begs a number of potentially
472 interesting theoretical questions: what is the role that non-dominant bi-/multilingual
473 speakers play in language change? What types of innovations do they tend to
474 introduce into the language(s) in which they are not dominant? Are specific aspects of
475 linguistic structure particularly vulnerable to such innovations? New speakers as a
476 novel category therefore offers new ground for historical linguistics.

¹⁴ Tagliamonte (2012) for instance highlights the contribution made by comparative sociolinguistics to research on African American Vernacular English

477 Thirdly, there is equally little evidence of any work currently being
478 undertaken on new speakers of endangered languages in cognitive linguistics, despite
479 the fact that there are some potentially very important implications for our
480 understanding of language acquisition. For instance, acquisition research has
481 evidenced the significant role played by speakers' L1 on L2 phonological
482 categorisation in minority-variety contexts where English is the target (*e.g.* McCarthy
483 *et al.* 2014). What then are the implications for new speakers acquiring a minorised
484 variety? There are fruitful avenues of inquiry to be explored, here.

485 Lastly, it is incumbent on future research initiatives that there be meaningful
486 social impact emanating from new-speaker research. The above synthesis outlines
487 significant hurdles faced by new speakers entering (severely) endangered-language
488 communities (*e.g.* sentiments of social and linguistic incompatibility between new
489 speakers and native speakers). Bridging this native/new-speaker divide must be
490 addressed, though no clear avenues reveal themselves. As new-speaker practices, and
491 linguistic innovations in particular, might be posited to contribute towards this divide
492 (see Kasstan 2018), the development of a 'positive framework' (Meyerhoff 2015: 78)
493 for speakers to evaluate language change might be a suitable point of departure.

494

495 *Acknowledgements*

496 The author thanks Phillip Carter, Michael Hornsby, Dave Sayers, and two anonymous
497 reviewers for their helpful comments and suggestions on earlier article drafts. This
498 work has also benefitted from participation in the COST EU network IS1306 New
499 Speakers in a Multilingual Europe: Opportunities and Challenges.

500

501 *Works Cited*

- 502 Adkins, Madeleine. 2013. Will the real Breton please stand up? Language
503 revitalization and the problem of authentic language. *International Journal of the*
504 *Sociology of Language*, 223: 55-70.
- 505 Amano, Tatsuya, Brody, Sandel, Eager, Heidi, Bulteau, Edouard, Svenning, Jens-
506 Christian, Bo Dalsgaard, Carsten Rahbek, Davies, Richard G. and William J.
507 Sutherland. 2014. Global distribution and drivers of language extinction.
508 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 281: 1-11.
- 509 Bichurina, Natalia. 2018. Francoprovençal as social practice: comparative study in
510 Italy, France and Switzerland. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*,
511 249.
- 512 Blanchet, Philippe. and Nigel Armstrong. 2006. The sociolinguistic situation of
513 'contemporary dialects of French' in France today: an overview of recent
514 contributions on the dialectalisation of Standard French. *Journal of French*
515 *Language Studies*, 16(3): 251-275.
- 516 Bortoni-Ricardo, Stella M. 1985. *The Urbanization of Rural Dialect Speakers: A*
517 *Sociolinguistic Study in Brazil*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 518 Bucholtz, Mary. 2003. Sociolinguistic nostalgia and the authentication of identity.
519 *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(3): 398-416.
- 520 Campbell, Lyle and Martha C. Muntzel. 1989. The structural consequences of
521 language death. In *Investigating Obsolescence: Studies in Language Contraction*
522 *and Death*, ed. by Nancy C. Dorian, 181-196. Cambridge: Cambridge University
523 Press.
- 524 Cheshire, Jenny. 1982. *Variation in an English Dialect: A Sociolinguistic Study*.
525 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- 526 ——— Fox, Sue, Kerswill, Paul and Eviind Torgersen. 2008. Ethnicity, friendship
527 network and social practices as the motor of dialect change: linguistic innovation
528 in London. *Sociolinguistica*, 22: 1-23.
- 529 Costa, James. 2015. New speakers, new language: On being a legitimate speaker of a
530 minority language in Provence. *International Journal of the Sociology of*
531 *Language*, 231: 127-145.
- 532 ——— 2018. Book Review. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 249.
- 533 Coupland, Nikolas. 2003. Sociolinguistic authenticities. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7
534 (3): 417-431.
- 535 Del Percio, Alfonso. 2015. New speakers on lost ground in the football stadium.
536 *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(2): 261-280.
- 537 Dorian, Nancy C. 1981. *Language Death: The Life Cycle of a Scottish Gaelic Dialect*.
538 Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- 539 ——— 1982. Defining the speech community to include its working margins. In
540 *Sociolinguistic Variation in Speech Communities*, ed. by Suzanne Romaine, 25-34.
541 London: Edward Arnold.
- 542 Drummond, Rob. 2011. Glottal variation in /t/ in non-native English speech. *English*
543 *World-Wide*, 32(3): 280-308.
- 544 Edwards, William F. 1992. Sociolinguistic behavior in a Detroit inner-city black
545 neighborhood. *Language in Society*, 21(1): 93-115.
- 546 Firth, Alan and Johannes Wagner. 1997. On discourse, communication, and (some)
547 fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal*, 81: 285-300.
- 548 Frekko, Susan E. 2013. Legitimacy and social class in Catalan language education for
549 adults. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16(2): 164-
550 176.

- 551 Gal, Susan. 1978. Peasant men can't get wives: language change and sex roles in a
552 bilingual community. *Language in Society*, 7(1): 1-16.
- 553 ——— 1979. *Language Shift: Social Determinants of Linguistic Change in Bilingual*
554 *Austria*. New York: Academic Press.
- 555 Holton, Gary. 2009. Relearning Athabascan languages in Alaska: Creating sustainable
556 language communities through creolization. *Speaking of Endangered Languages:*
557 *Issues in Revitalization*, ed. by Anne Goodfellow, 238-265. Cambridge:
558 Cambridge University Press.
- 559 Hornsby, Michael. 2013. Contested varieties and competing authenticities:
560 neologisms in revitalized Breton. *International Journal of the Sociology of*
561 *Language*, 223: 71-86.
- 562 ——— 2015. *Revitalizing Minority Languages: New Speakers of Breton, Yiddish and*
563 *Lemko*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 564 Hornsby, Michael and Dick Vigers (eds.) 2013. Breton: The Postvernacular
565 Challenge. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 223.
- 566 Hymes, Dell. 1972. *Foundations of Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*.
567 Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- 568 Jaffe, Alexandra. 2015. Defining the new speaker: theoretical perspectives and learner
569 trajectories. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 231: 21-44.
- 570 Jones, Mari C. 1995. At what price maintenance? Standardization in Modern Breton.
571 *French Studies*, XLIX(3): 428-439.
- 572 ——— 1998a. Death of a language, birth of an identity: Brittany and the Bretons.
573 *Language Problems & Language Planning*, 22(2): 129-149.
- 574 ——— 1998b. *Language Obsolescence and Revitalization: Linguistic Change in Two*
575 *Sociolinguistically Contrasting Welsh Communities*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- 576 Kasstan, Jonathan R. 2013. Standardisation through the back door? Neo-speakers and
577 'distanciation strategies' in Francoprovençal. Paper presented at Association for
578 French Language Studies 2013. France: Perpignan.
- 579 ——— 2015. Variation and change in Francoprovençal: A study of an emerging
580 linguistic norm. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Canterbury: University of Kent.
- 581 ——— 2018. Exploring contested authenticity among speakers of a contested language.
582 *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*.
- 583 Kasstan, Jonathan R. and Daniela Müller. 2018. (l) as a sociolinguistic variable in
584 Francoprovençal. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 249.
- 585 Kennard, Holly J. and Aditi Lahiri. 2017. Mutation in Breton verbs: Pertinacity across
586 generations. *Journal of Linguistics*, 53(1): 113-145.
- 587 Kerswill, Paul and Ann Williams. 2000. Creating a New Town koine: Children and
588 language change in Milton Keynes. *Language in Society*, 29(1): 65-115.
- 589 Labov, William. 1966. *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*.
590 Washington D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- 591 ——— 1972. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- 592 ——— 1973. The linguistic consequences of being a lame. *Language in Society*, 2(1):
593 81-115.
- 594 Li, Wei and Lesley Milroy 1995. A social network approach to code-switching: The
595 example of a bilingual community in Britain. In *One Speaker, Two Languages:
596 Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Code-Switching*, ed. by Lesley Milroy and
597 Pieter Muysken, 136-157. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 598 Lippi-Green, Rosina. 1989. Social network integration and language change in
599 progress in a rural alpine village. *Language in Society*, 18(2): 213-234.

- 600 Manoukian, Jennifer. 2017. In search of linguistic legitimacy: Western Armenian and
601 the new speaker. In *Language and Globalization: An Autoethnographic Approach*,
602 ed. by Maryam Borjian, 195-204. London: Routledge.
- 603 Matsumoto, Kazuko. 2010. The role of social networks in the post-colonial
604 multilingual island of Palau: Mechanisms of language maintenance and shift.
605 *Multilingua*, 29(2): 133-165.
- 606 Mayeux, Oliver F. 2015. New Speaker Language: The morphosyntax of new speakers
607 of endangered languages. Unpublished MPhil dissertation. Cambridge: University
608 of Cambridge.
- 609 McCarthy, Kathleen, Mahon, Merle, Rosen, Stuart and Bronwen G. Evans. 2014.
610 Speech perception and production by sequential bilingual children: A longitudinal
611 study of Voice Onset Time acquisition. *Child Development*, 85(5): 1965-1980.
- 612 McEwan, Emily. 2015. Top 10 Differences between Gaelic in Nova Scotia and
613 Scotland. Blog Post. Available Online. Accessed 14 October 2016:
614 <http://gaelic.co/top-10-gaelic-diffs-part-2/> [Accessed 21 December 2016].
- 615 McLeod, Wilson and Bernadette O'Rourke. 2015. 'New speakers' of Gaelic:
616 Perceptions of linguistic authenticity and appropriateness. *Applied Linguistics*
617 *Review*, 6(2): 151-172.
- 618 Meyerhoff, Miriam. 2015. Turning variation on its head: Analysing subject prefixes
619 in Nkep (Vanuatu). *Asia-Pacific Language Variation*, 1(2): 78-108.
- 620 Milardo, Robert M. 1988. Families and social networks: an overview of theory and
621 methodology. In *Families and Social Networks*, ed. by Robert Milardo, 13-47.
622 Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- 623 Milroy, Lesley. 1980. *Language and Social Networks*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- 624 ——— and Sue Margrain. 1980. Vernacular language loyalty and social network.
625 *Language in Society*, 9(1): 43-70.
- 626 ——— 2004. Social Networks. In: *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*,
627 ed. by Jack K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill and Natalie Schilling-Estes, 549-572.
628 Oxford: Blackwell.
- 629 Milroy, Lesley and James Milroy. 1985. Linguistic change, social network and
630 speaker innovation. *Journal of Linguistics*, 21(2): 339-384.
- 631 Mitchell, Roy D. 2005. Tlingit language immersion retreats: creating new language
632 habitat for the twenty-first century. *International Journal of the Sociology of*
633 *Language*, 172: 187-195.
- 634 Morris, Jonathan. 2014. The influence of social factors on minority language
635 engagement amongst young people: An investigation of Welsh-English bilinguals
636 in North Wales. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 230: 65-89.
- 637 Mougeon, Raymond, Rehner, Katherine and Terry Nadasdi. 2004. The learning of
638 spoken French variation by immersion students from Toronto, Canada. *Journal of*
639 *Sociolinguistics*, 8(3): 408-432.
- 640 Nagy, Naomi, Iannozzi, Michael and David Heap. 2018. Faetar null subjects: A
641 variationist study of a heritage language in contact. *International Journal of the*
642 *Sociology of Language*, 249.
- 643 ——— and Miriam Meyerhoff. 2008. The social lives of language. In: *Social Lives in*
644 *Language – Sociolinguistics and Multilingual Speech Communities*, ed. by Miriam
645 Meyerhoff and Naomi Nagy, 1-17. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- 646 Nance, Claire. 2015. ‘New’ Scottish Gaelic speakers in Glasgow: A phonetic study of
647 language revitalisation. *Language in Society*, 44(4): 553-579.

- 648 Nance, Claire, McLeod, Wilson, O'Rourke, Bernadette & Stuart Dunmore. 2016.
649 Identity, accent aim, and motivation in second language users: New Scottish
650 Gaelic speakers' use of phonetic variation. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 20(2): 164-
651 191.
- 652 Ó hIfearnáin, Tadhg. 2015. Sociolinguistic vitality of Manx after extreme language
653 shift: authenticity without native speakers. *International Journal of the Sociology
654 of Language*, 231: 45-62.
- 655 O'Rourke, Bernadette, Pujolar, Joan and Fernando Ramallo. 2015. New speakers of
656 minority languages: the challenging opportunity – Foreword. *International Journal
657 of the Sociology of Language*, 231: 1-20.
- 658 O'Rourke, Bernadette and Fernando Ramallo. 2011. The native-non-native dichotomy
659 in minority language contexts: Comparisons between Irish and Galician. *Language
660 Problems & Language Planning*, 35(2): 139-159.
- 661 ——— 2013. Competing ideologies of linguistic authority amongst new speakers in
662 contemporary Galicia. *Language in Society*, 42(3): 287-305.
- 663 O'Rourke, Bernadette and John Walsh. 2015. New speakers of Irish: Shifting
664 boundaries across time and space. *International Journal of the Sociology of
665 Language*, 231: 63-81.
- 666 Ortega, Ane, Urla, Jacqueline, Amorrortu, Jone Goirigolzarri and Belen Uranga.
667 2015. Linguistic identity among new speakers of Basque. *International Journal of
668 the Sociology of Language*, 231: 85-105.
- 669 Pujolar, Joan and Maite Puigdevall. 2015. Linguistic mudes: how to become a new
670 speaker of Catalonia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 231:
671 167-187.

- 672 Robert, Elen. 2009. Accommodating ‘new’ speakers? An attitudinal investigation of
673 L2 speakers of Welsh in south-east Wales. *International Journal of the Sociology*
674 *of Language*, 195: 93-116.
- 675 Romaine, Suzanne (ed.). 1982. *Sociolinguistic Variation in Speech Communities*.
676 London: Edward Arnold.
- 677 Sallabank, Julia and Yan Marquis. 2018. “We don’t say it like that”: Language
678 ownership and (de)legitimising the new speaker. In: *New Speakers of Minority*
679 *Languages: Linguistic Ideologies and Practices*, ed. by Cassandra Smith-
680 Christmas, Michael Hornsby, Máiréad Moriarty and Noel Ó Murchadha.
681 Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 682 Sankoff, David and William Labov. 1979. On the use of variable rules. *Language in*
683 *Society*, 8(2): 189-223.
- 684 Sayers, Dave. 2012. Standardising Cornish: The politics of a new minority language,
685 *Language Problems & Language Planning*, 36(2): 99-119.
- 686 ——— and Zsuzsanna Renkó-Michelsén. 2015. Phoenix from the Ashes:
687 Reconstructing Cornish in relation to Einar Haugen’s four-step model of language
688 standardization. *Sociolinguistica*, 29(1): 17-38.
- 689 Silverstein, Michael. 2003. Indexical order and the dialectics of social life. *Language*
690 *and Communication*, 23(3-4): 193-229.
- 691 Smackman, Dick. 2015. The Westernising mechanism in sociolinguistics. In:
692 *Globalising Sociolinguistics*, ed. by Dick Smackman and Patrick Heinrich, 16-36.
693 London: Routledge.
- 694 Stanford, James N. 2016. A call for more diverse sources of data: Variationist
695 approaches in non-English contexts. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 20(4): 525-541.

- 696 Tagliamonte, Sali. 2012. *Variationist Sociolinguistics: Change, Observation,*
697 *Interpretation.* Oxford: Blackwell.
- 698 Thiers, Jacques. 1985. Stratégies de la distanciation. *Cahiers de linguistique sociale,*
699 *7: 107-112.*
- 700 Tomé Lourido, Gisela and Bronwen G. Evans. 2015. Switching language dominance
701 for ideological reasons: A study of Galician new speakers' speech production and
702 perception. *Proceedings of the 18th International Congress of Phonetic Sciences,*
703 *ed. by The Scottish Consortium for ICPhS. Glasgow: University of Glasgow.*
- 704 ——— 2016. Can listeners recognize an emergent accent? Accent discrimination in the
705 bilingual community of Galicia. Paper presented at *Sociolinguistic Variation and*
706 *Language Processing Conference (SVALP), March 31st-April 2nd, 2016. Virginia*
707 *Tech, Blacksburg, USA.*
- 708 Trenchs-Parera, Mireia and Michael Newman. 2015. Language policies, ideologies,
709 and attitudes, part 2: International immigration, globalization and the future of
710 Catalan. *Language and Linguistics Compass, 9(12): 491-501.*
- 711 Trosset, Carol S. 1986. The social identity of Welsh learners. *Language in Society,*
712 *15(2): 165-192.*
- 713 Urla, Jacqueline. 1993. Cultural politics in an age of statistics: numbers, nations, and
714 the making of Basque identity. *American Ethnologist, 20(4): 818-843.*
- 715 Walsh, John. 2015. Becoming a new speaker of Irish: linguistic *mudes* throughout the
716 life cycle. *Digithum, 16: 67-74.*
- 717 Walsh, John and Pia Lane. 2014. Report on conceptualisations of new speakerness in
718 the case of indigenous minority languages. Available online at
719 nspk.org.uk/images/downloads/CONCEPTUALISATIONS_OF_NEW_SPEAKER
720 [NESS_final.pdf](http://nspk.org.uk/images/downloads/CONCEPTUALISATIONS_OF_NEW_SPEAKER) [Accessed 18 August 2016].

- 721 Weinreich, Uriel, Labov, William and Marvin Herzog. 1968. Empirical foundations
 722 for a theory of language change. In: *Directions for Historical Linguistics*, ed. by
 723 Winfred P. Lehman and Yakov Malkiel, 95-188. Austin: University of Texas
 724 Press.
- 725 Wenger, Etienne. 1998. *Communities of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University
 726 Press.
- 727 Wilson, Gary N., Henry Johnson and Julia Sallabank. 2015. “I’m not dead yet”: A
 728 comparative study of indigenous language revitalization in the Isle of Man, Jersey
 729 and Guernsey. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 16(3): 259-278.
- 730 Wolfram, Walt. 1998. Black children are verbally deprived. In: *Language Myths*, ed.
 731 by Laurie Bauer and Peter Trudgill, 103-112. London: Penguin.
- 732 Woolard, Kathryn A. 1989. *Doubletalk: Bilingualism and the Politics of Ethnicity in*
 733 *Catalonia*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- 734 Woolhiser, Curt. 2013. New speakers of Belarusian: Metalinguistic discourse, social
 735 identity, and language use. In: David M. Bethea and Christina Y. Bethin (eds.),
 736 *American Contributions to the 15th International Congress of Slavists, Minsk,*
 737 *August 2013*, 62-115. Bloomington: Slavica.
- 738

Table 1. Lexical variation in (néo-)Breton (adapted from Jones 1995, 1998b)

néo-Breton	French borrowings	Standard French	English gloss
luc’hskeudennerezh	fotografiezh	photographie	photography
kaotigell	konfitur	confiture	jam
dibab	choaz	choisir	choose
trugarez	mersi	merci	thank you

Table 2. Lexical variation in Francoprovençal (taken from Kasstan 2013)

Neologised	French borrowings	Standard French	English gloss
new-speaker	into		
variants	Francoprovençal		
enversenc	setentriono	septentrional	northern
tela	Intèrnèt	Internet	Internet
yo-que-tè	portoble, natel	téléphone portable	mobile phone
frustrapot	armonika	harmonica	harmonica