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Abstract

A growing body of literature has addressed the phenomenon of superdiversity (see Blommaert 2011) to account for the linguistic, socio-political, cultural and economic complexities, mobilities, flows, uncertainties and unpredictabilities of the current age. Heller (2010) argued that the globalized new economy is bound up with transformations of language and identity in many different ways (e.g. Bauman 1997; Castells 2000; Giddens 1990). This paper seeks to track the relative value of both Welsh and English and to explore the different social values associated with language varieties in particular contexts. It does this, by addressing the ‘new’ or ‘learner’ speaker, providing a lens through which to investigate the contemporary dynamics of minority language communities. These ‘new’ or ‘learner’ speakers have learnt a minority language through non-traditional routes and this article seeks to understand what linguistic varieties are capitalized by these students, how they characterise their own language knowledge and how these ‘new speakers’ are positioned in relation to mobility and the new globalised economy. Additionally, the paper seeks to explore how disparities in terms of access to resources can impact on new speakers’ trajectories – in other words, how different routes to bilingualism are perceived as opening or closing metaphorical doors.
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Symbolic and Linguistic capital

Heller (2010) argued that the globalized new economy is bound up with myriad transformations of language and identity (e.g. Bauman 1997; Castells 2000; Giddens 1990). In recent years the term ‘commodification’ has entered the sociolinguistic lexicon, used varying to refer to the process by which language is treated as ‘an objective skill, acquired and possessed, that affords status, recognition legitimacy, and ultimately material remuneration, to those who possess it’ (Block 2017: 6). This is not in itself new; Bourdieu’s classical conceptualisation of linguistic capital (1982, 1991) envisions language as a form of cultural or symbolic capital, in a general sense, a set of attributes that a person can accumulate in order to establish or improve their position in a group or in society (Eckert 1989). This calls to mind Ruiz’ (1984) notion of ‘language as resource’, one that forms an ‘economic defence of minority language maintenance’ (Petrovic 2005: 397) and one that represents an underlying belief about the ‘use’ of language that underlies efforts to influence linguistic behaviour through language policy and planning (see below for a discussion of the Welsh context). Magnet (1990) goes a step further in arguing that ‘languages can be maintained only to the extent that they are endowed with an economic value’ (p295). More recently, Hogan-Brun (2017) talks of ‘linguanomics’ to assert that ‘languages have a market value’ (2017:xii) and that language competency can be discussed in terms of ‘assets’ (2017:xii). These ‘attributes’ or ‘assets’ are available to be exchanged in the ‘marketplace’ of social interaction. Thus, Dagenais (2003)

1 My thanks go to the COST New Speakers Network whose generosity has contributed to this research.
argues that if/when learners invest in a language, they do so with the understanding that they will acquire a wider range of symbolic and material resources, which will in turn increase the value of their cultural capital. Norton (2000) equally suggests that learners expect or hope to have a good return on that investment; a return that will give them access to hitherto unattainable resources. (Norton, 2000:10)

So language may be seen as a resource, which can receive different values depending on the market. Costa (2015: 129) suggests that the price of minority languages (or the symbolic rewards for using such languages) is usually very low on unified linguistic markets (taken to mean one that is dominated by one official language), but they may receive a higher price on niche markets where they can index a sense of community, solidarity or authenticity (Costa 2015:129). Similarly, Sankoff and Laberge (1978) distinguish between a macro-market (society as a whole) and more diverse ‘micro-markets’ (e.g. families, peer-groups etc.). They suggest that it is in these ‘micro-markets’ that the value of a linguistic variety may differ and that contestation can appear. The usefulness of the micro-market concept, as a framework or a lens through which to see groups of language users, lies with the ability to acknowledge that linguistic markets are profitably conceived as multiple, in that they are grounded in social experiences, which are never uniformly distributed. Viewing linguistic market places as multiple and therefore contestable entities allows us to see and address the multiple interests that are invoked, as well as social divisions within socio-cultural groups.

This paper seeks to address one such group of young ‘new’ speakers (see below for more detailed discussion) of Welsh in a traditional heartland community in Wales. To what linguistic market (s) do the young people orientate to? What value do young people place on linguistic varieties both locally and on the global stage? Additionally, if language operates as a form of differentially valued cultural capital then having access to or being denied a certain ‘attribute’ could be an influential determinant of the life changes of an individual. Ultimately, there are exclusionary practices that are brought about by the construction of linguistic difference and the inequalities in knowledge production and dissemination and it is these inequalities that this research seeks to unpack and explore.

But the economic arguments, outlined above, miss the moral perspective; what about the important connection between language and culture and language and identity? Heller (2010) suggests that we are seeing a ‘shift from understanding language as being primarily a marker of ethnonational identity, to understanding language as being a marketable commodity on its own and thus she distinguishes between ‘language as skill and language as identity’ (2010: 103). She claims both of these opposing ideas about language are or can be commodified. Relatedly, Ó Murchadha et al (2017), in discussing the motivations to learn a language as a ‘new’ speaker, distinguishes between ‘instrumentality’ (p5) as a motivating factor (e.g. gaining employment), so a functional/communicative argument that aligns with the instrumentalist perspective illustrated by De Schutter (2007) and Heller’s (2010) notion of marketable commodity, cited above. Others, Ó Murchadha et al (2017) argue identify a ‘symbolic motivation’ (p5), establishing the ‘integrative and identificational potential of language’ (ibid), constitutivism in De Schutter’s (2007) terms, one where language is seen as intrinsic to identity and of moral value.

Although note that it is not my intention to discuss whether or not there is any truth to or evidence against the idea that Welsh adds value - this paper is concerned with the perceived benefits, the ideologies and the positioning’s of young people.
This distinction is best viewed as an ideological one, a difference in ‘beliefs about language’ and the ‘rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use’ (Silverstein 1979: 193). Language ideologies therefore play a ‘crucial mediating factor’ (Irvine 1989: 255) in the link between language and the economy in that beliefs people have about language are inseparable from other elements of their lives and their social experiences. This article seeks to discover ideologies both in linguistic practice, which includes in explicit talk about language, that is in metapragmatic discourse and in ‘implicit metapragmatics’, ‘linguistic signalling that is part of the stream of language use in process and that simultaneously indicates how to interpret that language in use’ (Woolard 1998: 9). Kymlicka and Patten (2003) have demonstrated that intensified patterns of migration and mobility, which have resulted in increased (linguistic) diversity across Europe, have in turn, they suggest, amplified tensions between a constitutive and instrumentalist ideologies.

Whilst, this distinction will form the backbone of this paper, it should be acknowledged that it is overly simplistic and it is suggested that a more dynamic, nuanced understanding is needed, one that (as above) embraces the complexity of an individuals lived experience not least because identity is not a singular, fixed entity but rather something that encompasses participant roles, positions, relationships, reputations, and other dimensions of social personae, which are conventionally linked to epistemic and affective stances Ochs (1996: 424). Of particular relevance to this paper however, is the notion that our various group memberships, along with the values, beliefs and attitudes associated with them, define in part the kinds of communicative activities and the particular linguistic resources for realising them to which we have access.

Despite the somewhat simplistic nature of the distinction, it ‘represents a gap, or troubled space of contradiction’ (p103) between established nationalist discourse and the views of people ‘on the ground’ (Hornberger and Hult 2008:285). Heller (2010) suggests that this relationship is one that needs far closer investigation and this call for further ethnographically inspired research is taken up here, in no small part because ideologies presented in the taxonomy above have so far resulted in the implementation of different language policies and interpretations of linguistic justice (De Schutter 2007).

**Welsh Context**

It has been argued elsewhere (Selleck 2013) that Welsh language policy is characterised by an ideology of choice – choice as to whether to live your life ‘through the medium of either or both Welsh or English and where the presence of the two languages is a source of pride and strength to us all (Welsh Assembly Government 2003, 1). Selleck (2013) sought to shed light on the dichotomy between the inclusive nature of Welsh language policy and the ‘reality’ on the ground and in doing so established some fundamental inadequacies in defining bilingualism in terms of full and free choice. This paper seeks to build on this by questioning how this ideology of choice aligns with notions of language commodification. The ideology of choice is, it seems, a reflection of the market-driven demand for certain types of education and is inextricably linked, ideologically at least, to consumerism; you quite literally choose to buy into one or the other ideologies of bilingualism and in turn a medium of instruction and there is a sense that the ‘option’ of Welsh and/or English needs to be ‘sold’ to students. Indeed, in light of later policy statements (namely Iaith Fyw) Selleck (2013) argued that we see a marked shift towards an ideology of persuasion with talk of the need to ‘convince’ young people of the value of the Welsh language and ‘influence’ them (Welsh Assembly Government 2012, 13).
Thus, there is a strong link in policy terms between language commodification and the language revitalization effort, not least because there is also a need to adequately staff the public service departments that are legally required to make services available bilingually.

May (2000: 108) and Lewis (2010) identify that, as early as the 1990s, efforts were made to characterise Welsh language competency as a valuable skill, like any other, deemed necessary to ‘discharge relevant occupational duties’ (Davies and Davies 2015: 71). The Welsh Assembly Government, in their recent publication, A million speakers by 2050 (Welsh Assembly 2017) talks of Welsh and bilingual ‘skills’ and in doing so suggests that ‘education and training’ are the principal agencies for changing the language situation3, with young people once again being put at the centre of this discussion. In turn, Careers Wales (2018) attempts to persuasively ‘sell’ Welsh language skills to young people by positioning it as a valuable skill in young people’s employability repertoire, suggesting that it has six main advantages, which include ‘standing out from the crowd’, opening up new opportunities, providing good service, and increasing earning potential. In this sense then it appears that the development of Welsh Language skills throughout the education system needs to have tangible and visible ‘benefit’ (Welsh Assembly Government 2017: 47) and this is linked to employability; ‘young people will need to be aware of the benefits of continuing to develop their Welsh language skills in preparation for the workplace’ (2017: 41). This position reflects an instrumentalist view, with education as no more than a tool for getting a job.

Wales has a complex system of school categorisation, with schools ordered according to the language that is used as the medium of instruction and in the normal running of the school (Welsh Assembly Government 2007). The various systems at play (of which this paper addresses only a category 2A Bilingual School and an English-Medium school) offer different routes to bilingualism. That is, schools in Wales don’t differ in their belief that it is important for students to learn both Welsh and English, where they differ is in how they manage the bilingual repertoire of their students via the curriculum and via the less structured ideologies of language that govern their practice. It has therefore been argued elsewhere (Selleck 2013 and Selleck 2015) that the schools at the heart of this paper, can be characterised as having different ‘ideologies of bilingualism’ (Blackledge and Creese 2010, 111), with the English medium school having been characterised as one that favours an ideology of ‘flexible bilingualism’ (Blackledge and Creese 2010), where the school encourages the use of two languages through the importance they place on bilingualism and bilingual practice. Conversely the Welsh medium school has been characterised as one of ‘separate bilingualism’ (Blackledge and Creese 2010), the traditional notion of keeping languages separate and exercising a choice between them. These different routes to bilingualism, it will be argued, provide access to different resources, different opportunities and different ways of acquiring linguistic capital.

Thus, education has long been considered a powerful means of providing access (or limiting this access) to valued symbolic resources, such as bilingualism (De Mejía 2002:37) and in turn education is a powerful means through which to push through various policy aims and aspirations as well as the norms, values and power of the socially ‘elite’. Bourdieu (1991) argues that this ultimately forces a sense of ‘separation…[and] legitimates distinction’ (1991: 167). In this sense the school itself can be viewed as a linguistic market place. Parents, in making a ‘planned and purposeful’ (Baker and Prys Jones 1998: 15) decision to opt into a bilingual education are recognizing (or perceiving) that bilingualism represents a definitive

---

3 Something that is not new – Education has long been positioned as the primary agency for changing the language situation in Wales (Farell et al 1997).
advantage, socially and economically, and in choosing a school for their child, believe that they will gain access to power by ‘committing… (them) to particular media of instruction and ways of learning languages’ (Martin-Jones and Heller 1996:129). Thus, Bourdieu and Passeron (1970) have argued that, schools play a key role in the production and reproduction of social identities and unequal relations of power.

This paper seeks to explore how disparities in terms of access to resources can impact new speakers’ trajectories. However, considerable caution is needed when making this somewhat simplistic connection between the commodification of a minority language as an economic resource and the language revitalisation effort. Ricento (2005) identified a number of shortcomings of the ‘language as-resource orientation’ (Ruiz 1984), arguing that whilst it may lead to a flurry of short-term government-driven initiatives, longer term, ‘wider and more sustained popular support for such programmes will require significant modifications in the underlying values and ideologies’ (Ricento 2005: 348). May (2005) also highlights that an over reliance on this idea of rational instrumentality of language provides an inadequate explanation for language usage, choice and maintenance and he argues that we need to allow for the salience of language as a ‘significant or constitutive’ though not ‘inevitable feature of identity’ (2005: 330). There is a need to question how this plays out ‘on the ground’ (Hornberger and Hult 2008:285), what exactly is the reach of language policy and planning measures?

**New Speakers**

At the heart of this debate are those ‘elective bilinguals’ (Valdés and Figueroa 1994), ‘individuals with little or no home or community exposure to a minority language’ (O’Rouke et al 2015: 1), who instead, ‘choose’, for whatever reason, to ‘acquire it through immersion or bilingual educational programmes’ (ibid: 1). Within the Welsh context it has been argued (Selleck 2017a) that young learners of Welsh identify ‘boundaries around languages and language users, resulting in clear divisions between “English” and “Welsh” students’ (Selleck 2017a: 60) and it has been shown that ‘new’ speakers of Welsh often ‘struggle to position themselves in terms of the national category of being Welsh’ and that there is a strong sense of a ‘perceived hierarchy’ of Welshness. What is less certain however, are the motivations that drive these ‘new’ speakers to acquire Welsh.

Historically, regional languages such as Welsh, have been ‘largely excluded from the modernizing influences of capitalism and liberalism’ (O’Rouke et al 2015:5) and young people have been shown, within the Welsh context, to associate an ‘old, local, rural, heritage culture…with speaking Welsh and the opposing urban, ‘new’ culture… with English (Selleck 2015:9). Whilst globalisation is no doubt impacting on and reflected in linguistic practices, little work has been done to investigate the motivational and affective profiles of such learners (Comanaru and Noel 2009) and this paper seeks to go some way towards redressing this imbalance.

It is these ‘new’ speakers that find themselves caught in a ‘gap between the capital they possess and the capital they need to acquire’ (Heller 1994:97) but equally they are the driving force behind language revitalisation and in turn find themselves playing a pivotal role in the design and implementation of new market values; they show clear signs of adapting their linguistic resources as a form of new currency (Selleck 2017a). This paper seeks to understand what linguistic varieties are capitalized by these students, how they characterise their own language...
knowledge and how these ‘new speakers are positioned in relation to mobility and the new
globalised economy?

Methods and Data
This study addresses the concept of the ‘new’ or ‘learner’ speaker from the standpoint of a
situated, ethnographic analysis, drawing on research that was carried out in two contrasting
secondary schools in south-west Wales; an English-medium (EM) school and a designated
Welsh-medium (WM) school. This study forms part of a larger ethnographic project
investigating the interplay of linguistic practices, linguistic representations, language
ideologies and social inclusion between students at these two schools. The data for this study
came from periods of fieldwork carried out between September 2008 and January 2011. This
research is characterised by the use of three principal methods: ethnographic observational
fieldwork, ethnographic chats (Selleck 2017b), and audio recordings.

Language as a resource vs. language as an identity marker – Welsh-medium School

Whilst the focus of this paper is the ‘new’ or learner speaker of Welsh the perceptions and
experiences of the students at the Welsh school first needs unpacking. Here the students
discuss what it means, for them, to be Welsh.

Extract 1 ‘Welsh School’, Sixth-form students - Iola, John and Gitoll

1 G: I think Ardwyn is English but (.). as we know people that
2 are from Ardwyn and (.). they can talk a little bit of Welsh
3 I: it’s not an everyday language though (.). really
4 G: no
5 I: it’s subject Welsh (.). because they took they took Welsh up
6 as a GCSE second language (.). so they have studied it to an
7 academic degree but never to an oral (.). like real language
8 J: a friend (.). a couple stayed in the first stream till GCSE
9 but then she took it up for second language at A-level (.).
10 which I don’t get
11 G: it’s because of the grades
12 I: yeah
13 J: they’ll get A in second-language Welsh and it looks really
14 good (.). better than C in first-language Welsh (.). looks
15 better on a CV

The Welsh language is commonly positioned ‘as a defining dimension of Welsh identity for
both Welsh speaking and non-Welsh speaking Welsh people alike’ (Livingstone et al 2009:
298) but here the students identify that speaking just a ‘little bit of Welsh’ is not sufficient to
be considered ‘fully Welsh’. The students problematise the concept of an ‘authentic Welsh
identity’, positing the notion that not speaking Welsh as an ‘everyday language’; instead
choosing to learn ‘subject Welsh’ results in you being considered as English. Clear power
differentials are implied here between those considered as ‘novices’ and those considered
‘masters’ of the language. Relatedly, it has been argued that students at the English school


perceive that students at the Welsh school ‘know Welsh’, as opposed to learn Welsh (Selleck 2017a).

Research on learners of Welsh has highlighted the processes of inclusion and exclusion that are at work between Welsh learners and first-language Welsh speakers (see Bowie 1993; Trossett 1986; Trossett 1993; Mann 2007; Roberts 2009; Selleck 2013). Within this discourse we see evidence of an exclusionary attitude of first-language Welsh speakers to Welsh language learners’ ‘in-authentic’ Welsh speech. So whilst they acknowledge that some of the students at the English school are able to speak Welsh (albeit a decontextualised subject Welsh) they are still ‘more English’ and fail to meet purist criteria.

Towards the end of the extract it emerges that there is a perception that, for students at the English school, the Welsh language is a commodified resource (a measurable skill like any other) in that they are apparently able to move between the first and second-language examinations in order to achieve higher grades, and in this sense they are once again, considered less authentic by these students at the Welsh school. These students are obviously opposed to this orientation to examinations in terms of grade outcomes and as we’ll see in the following extract make their position clearer, arguing that Welsh is integral for identity purposes and this therefore reflects Heller’s dichotomy between ‘language as a skill’ and ‘language as identity’ (Heller 2010: 103).

Extract 2 ‘Welsh School’, Sixth-form - Iola, John and Gitoll

Iola: Welsh is special to this school (.) it’s special to us here at this school
John: yeah if you don’t speak Welsh you’re missing one of the main attributes of being Welsh in the first place
Iola: yeah
Gitoll: you are Welsh not Cymro (‘Welshman’)
John: yeah (.) you’re Welsh not a Welsh person sort of thing
Iola: yeah

Iola, John and Gitoll make strong claims for Welsh as a marker of their own identity, emphasising their personal attachment to the language, something that is fundamental to who they are. What we see clearly in this discourse is issues of value, legitimacy, and authenticity being made explicit by the young people. The students perceive that you are not truly Welsh if you don’t speak Welsh (you are Welsh not Cymro (Welshman), line 6). The word Cymro is lifted from the phrase ‘Cymro di Gymraeg’ (literally ‘Welshman without the Welsh language’). Phrases like this re-open long running discussions of language and national identity. These students largely by-pass the possibility of articulating Welsh identities through English (although English is the first or only language of about 80% of Welsh people) or through various syncretic or hybrid uses of Welsh and English. By comparison, the students at the English school engaged much more openly with a Welsh identity without the need for Welsh – their use of ‘Wenglish’ was viewed as one way in which they could negotiate a position themselves within the national category of being Welsh (Selleck 2017a).

It has been argued elsewhere (Selleck 2013) that students at the Welsh-medium school readily identify that the school is invested in the revitalisation effort and recognise that as an institution it constructs and implements ‘linguistic norms which are understood as part of the school’s political and nationalist mission, embedded within a minority struggle for power’ (Selleck 2013: 32). It is perhaps unsurprising, therefore, that these particular students from
the Welsh-school strongly align with a sense of Welsh for identity purposes and clearly distance themselves from the commodification of Welsh, as associated with the English-medium school. In relation to the English-medium school, where students have mostly acquired their Welsh languages competencies through and as a result of the education system, however, questions remain. Do they position Welsh as a commodifiable skill like any other and if so, how do they position themselves and others in relation to the linguistic marketplace?

Language as a resource vs. language as an identity marker – English-medium School

In the following extract, Abi and Clara, two sixth-form students discuss their choice, their reasoning and their reflections on the decision to attend the English-medium school.

Extract 3 ‘English school’, Sixth form - Abi and Clara

Abi: we only really had two choices (. ) Welsh or English (. ) and we looked at both and kinda thought where’s best (. ) where am I going to be happiest but also where is going to help me do best with my school work and like where will I stand a good chance of getting good grades and stuff (. )

Clara: yeah same

Abi: (. ) and like (. ) don’t know about you but both my parents really felt that I could shut doors if I just went to the Welsh school (. ) perhaps its really narrow and what if I changed my mind or wanted to go off to uni and do a particular course or something (. ) and at like (. ) at eleven I needed to keep my options open (. )

Clara: yeah so true (. ) but not sure everyone sees it like this (. ) but yeah I’m really glad that’s what I did as well (. ) I feel like (. ) umm that this school is the best of both worlds (. ) I’ve had good teaching (. ) good English teaching, learnt Welsh and obviously all the other subjects and I feel like (. ) it’s a good mix (. ) the range like sets me up for getting a job and stuff

Abi: Yeah like education is all about getting you ready for the next thing (. ) obviously not that I saw it like that when I was younger (laughter) and so its all about learning stuff and getting skills and experiences and so I’m really glad that I chose here (. ) just feel that all the skills I’ve got (. ) like some Welsh (. ) sport (. ) my music stuff and everything made a real difference in getting me to uni to do law (. ) they’ve sort of made me stand out from other people applying to a competitive course

Clara: yeah but I guess we are also a bit different to some because our parents all went to uni in England (. ) we know there is a whole world out there (laughter)

The two girls opening discuss their ‘choice’ to embark on a partially Welsh-medium education. They (or their parents) clearly invest in language as a skill, like any other, something that they perceive has a value and that they hope will (or believe has) given them a competitive edge in their life beyond compulsory education. In this regard, there is a sense of ‘eliteness’ (Barakos
and Selleck in preparation) in that they were fortunate to be in a position of choice and to be able and encouraged to buy into something, to gain an additional skill, but also in the sense that they recognise that others either couldn’t or didn’t recognise the value of this skill (lines 13-14). In other words, the choice to learn Welsh is largely one of aspiration and enhancement, of recognizing the value of Welsh in a linguistic market place and investing in language learning for this reason.

Data from the most recent school census in Wales (2018) indicates that only 19.7% of secondary-aged students choose to access Welsh-medium education (StatsWales 2018). It has therefore, arguably become associated with an exclusive group of people. Aitchison and Carter (1997) claim that a ‘new bourgeoisie Welsh speaking elite’ (Aitchison and Carter 1997:357) exists, with this elite being defined as mostly ‘middle-class families’ (Fevre et al. 1997: 561). Gorard confirms this, arguing that Welsh-medium schools have been perceived by some as ‘perpetuating the old grammar schools’ (Gorard 1997: 19), schools to serve the ‘ethnically conscious intelligentsia’ (Webster 1990: 183) and schools that are perceived by others as providing a superior education. Similarly, Mann’s (2011) short account of stakeholder data for the Wales institute of Social & Economic Research, Data & Methods (WISERD) reported that perceptions of Welsh being a middle class, elite-ist phenomenon were high (Mann 2011: 10). Equally, studies have identified that the social position of parents impacts on the choice of medium of instruction, with parents lower in social position often ‘making do’ with the local school regardless of its medium of instruction (Ball 1993; Gewirtz, et al. 1995). The implication is that the choice of medium of instruction is effectively removed from this group of parents and thus language choice becomes a privilege and a class interest. This is made even clearer in the following fieldnote entry from the English-medium school.

Extract 4 Fieldnote from ‘English school’

During a meeting the Headteacher explains that the Welsh stream consists mainly of the higher ability students, it is apparently ‘tantamount to the top set’ and consists mainly of ‘good language learners’ rather than the first-language Welsh speakers (which he says generally come from agricultural backgrounds and are therefore often less able and consequently placed in the lower or ‘learner’ sets.

The Headteacher’s comments immediately call into question the authenticity and legitimacy of the Welsh language form. There is an obvious contradiction between a space that caters for ‘good language learners’ but to the disadvantage of the ‘first-language Welsh speakers’, who are effectively marginalized and excluded from the Welsh language within the school, with these students apparently stripped of any claim to authenticity and legitimacy. Furthermore, it institutionally endorses a view of Welsh as a commodified, acquirable skill that is desired by certain members of the school community and sets this against the perception that rural, agricultural ‘Welsh’ families are often less able and therefore placed in lower, or learner sets.

What becomes clear then, is that the marketisation of Welsh-medium education, the appeal to the market mentality has then, in many ways, led to the exploitation of the minority language and some minority language users. The marketisation has given the upper hand to the already more privileged student, so we see the Welsh stream at the English-medium school catering for the language majority students. Petrovic (2006) argues that ‘without careful implementation and without consideration of issues of power and privilege…dual immersion programs have the potential of becoming the Epcot Center of foreign language curriculum, providing majority
students an opportunity to view live specimens of the second language’ (2006:406). So whilst for some there are perceived advantages to learning Welsh as a new speaker for others there is a real sense of disadvantage. In other words, the rhetoric of choice hides the fact that there are winners and losers in competitive markets (Fairclough 2006:60) and that language ‘becomes an instrument of power’ (Bourdieu 1977: 648).

The following extract provides further evidence that some new speakers of Welsh equate bilingualism and knowledge of Welsh with marketable resources in local and national economies but that the relative value of these skills is dependent on place.

**Extract 5 ‘English School’ (Welsh form), Sixth-form – Abi, Hannah**

1 Abi: it's obvious that if you want a job around here (.) in this backwater (.) then yeah you’ll need to speak and read
2 Welsh (.) like proper Welsh
3 Hannah: doesn’t mean they’re best for the job though does it (...)
4 my sister in Cardiff says that you can get a job with our Welsh there because we speak it so much better than most of the local students (.) like we’ve grown up here so of course we speak more Welsh than the guys in Cardiff
5 Abi: but it’s like Ffion (.) you know Welsh Ffion (.) she always picks up the best summer jobs because she’s really Welsh and like that hotel up in Hafod where she worked last summer (.) they like Welsh speakers so they look cool and hip (...)
6 well that’s what I’ve heard anyway (.) she said they don’t even interview unless you’re like fluent in Welsh (.) they interview in Welsh so you can’t blag it (.) just more competition around here I guess

Here students in the Welsh form at the English-medium school once again discuss the notion of Welsh as an acquirable commodified skill and reflect on the varying prospects of finding a job that uses their language skills. It emerges within this discourse that a hierarchy of Welsh for employment purposes emerges, with students identifying that there are differences in what is acceptable and desirable in different markets. In other words, language receives different values depending on the market and in Costa’s (2015) terms the price of minority languages (or the symbolic rewards for using such languages) is perceived by these students as lower on ‘unified linguistic markets’, taken to mean one that is dominated by one official language, i.e. their local, ‘heartland community’ but that ‘their’ Welsh skills (broadly defined as Welsh that is less fluent or in their terms ‘not proper’ Welsh) may receive a higher price on ‘niche markets’, (i.e. Cardiff) where there is a perception that they can still index a sense of community, solidarity or authenticity (Costa 2015:129) but where crucially the demand outstrips supply. Thus, it seems that the ‘new speaker’ perspective enables these students to have both a more nuanced and a broader view of bilingualism, one that takes into account the relative value of languages in different ‘communities’.

The students in the above extract establish that, for them, Welsh makes you somehow different or unique and that this quality makes you stand out in the competitive employment market. They perceive that it gives you an advantage over those who don’t speak it and that it metaphorically opens doors. This aligns with the aforementioned policy and the push from within organisations like Careers Wales (as cited above). This sense that away from the
heartland communities, their Welsh is more valuable, poses a worrying trend in terms of population movement. If young people perceive that ‘their’ Welsh (as the students here do) isn’t sufficient for the local job market then they may feel they have to go elsewhere resulting in a ‘net brain drain’, an “outflow of well qualified Welsh residents” (Drinkwater & Blackaby 2006:19) after education (see also Bristow et al. 2011).

Thus, in contrast to the very positive and empowering discourse seen in Extract 3, there is a sense that for these ‘new’ speakers of Welsh, not only is ‘their’ Welsh somehow inferior to their Welsh-medium peers but that there is also a strong sense of perceived inequality with students identifying that linguistic competency is not always an indicator of ability in the workplace (lines 4-5). Additionally, there is some indication of discrimination in the workplace, with certain organisations reported to only recruit ‘fluent’ Welsh speakers (line 14), something that Sayers (2014) in his discussion of the ideological directions of Welsh language policy also established, arguing that there ‘identifiable acknowledgements and justifications of new forms of social exclusion created by promoting Welsh’.

That said, Extract 6 highlights that for some students it is not having the necessary or sufficient skills in English that limits opportunities, rather than not having sufficient competency in Welsh.

**Extract 6 ‘English’ school, Sixth-form, Alice, Betsan and David**

1 Betsan: yeah but I knew somebody who couldn’t really speak
2 English (. .) properly (. .) they had trouble with it because they
3 were so Welsh
4 Alice: yeah
5 Betsan: they haven’t got the full English
6 Alice: I know some people like that as well
7 David: yeah cos they do all their lessons in Welsh (. .) sort of
8 maths sciences all in Welsh
9 Betsan: then they go home and speak Welsh (. .) they’ve got no
10 English
11 David: nowadays that is not so good cos people move around
12 more
13 Betsan: you’re missing out opportunities
14 Alice: they’re limited to being in Wales and it’s not a bad
15 thing (. .) but wouldn’t they want to know (. .) go outside and
16 experience different things (. .) get better jobs
17 David: if you want to stay in the area it’s fine (. .) but if
18 you want to spread your wings and move away a bit then
19 (. .) you’re stuffed (laughter) if you can’t speak it
20 Alice: but I think if they go to [the Welsh school] they’ll be
21 fine (. .) think they’re more comfortable anyway with the
22 language and staying around here anyway (. .) so it’s not such a
23 big deal

The students clearly perceive that they are in some ways more bilingual than people at the ‘Welsh’ school because they have ‘full English’ (line 5) (note that on this occasion they don’t use the term bilingual). There is no sense of equal competency or in Heller’s (2006) terms ‘parallel monolingualism’ (Heller 2006) but rather that one language continues to carry more value than the other. In some ways then, the marketisation of language learning can be
seen to lead to a devaluation of bilingual skills and ‘language as resource’ (Ruiz 1984) strategy to language planning, one that involves an association of language with social and economic status, seems to ‘result in a preservation of the status quo’ (Petrovic 2006). For these students, having English as your first or dominant language, in this context, seems to yield positive returns. The minority language speaker discussed in lines 1-3 is judged to be marginalised (seen as a marked case) with a lack of ability in Welsh more explainable for these students than lack of ability in English. In other words, not having the necessary or sufficient skills in English is what, in their view here, limits opportunities, rather than not having sufficient competency in Welsh. Once again, this seems to have potential ramifications in terms of population movement, with the possibility that young Welsh speakers feel in someways enclosed, through the Welsh language, in West Wales (line 17 - 18), indicative of an ideology of separation.

It emerges that they view English as a form of linguistic capital, a means of escape from parochialism and a demonstration of having embraced the ‘modern’ way of life. Consequently, English is seen as the language of advancement, allowing you to move away and experience new things. Furthermore, the students ideologise Welsh as a language of (on the whole undesirable) social exclusion, even if it is a form of exclusion that they think some will be ‘comfortable’ with (line 21). In their view, going to a ‘Welsh’ school doesn’t equip you with the necessary skills to function outside of the immediate locality. Thus, although there is agreement about the ‘advantages’ of individual bilingualism (see Extract 5) (primarily for increased employment prospects), there are questions about the different ‘advantages’ or ‘disadvantages’ stemming from the different routes to bilingualism.

In sum, within this data a tension emerges between language being commodified as a form of capital linked to social mobility and language as an expression of national identity, with the students here questioning ‘what counts as competency, who gets to define what counts as competence, who is interested in acquiring that competence, and what is considered the best way to acquire it’ (Heller 2002: 47).

Conclusion/Discussion

In applying constructs of language as economic and social capital to an analysis of young new speakers’ discussions of their language learning and language needs, it has been seen that there is considerable overlap between these constructions. The complexity of the linguistic choices made by young people has been illustrated, with students making multiple associations between language, education and employment and therefore investing in a variety of strategies to secure resources for themselves. They seemingly view bilingualism as linguistic capital convertible to economic capital on local and national markets, but notably in different ways. However, it also seems that how a young person values a language varies considerably, depending on whether the young person has acquired the language at home or through the education system.

Arguments have been put forward around the ‘duality of anglicisation’ (Williams 1990: 45). It is on the one hand ‘a competitive set of instruments through which English hegemony was established over vast parts of Wales’ (ibid: 45) and therefore perceived as inferior to Welsh by these students when addressing their local needs, principally in terms of finding employment. On the other hand, students identified that competency in English is perceived as a liberating force that permits entry into a wider social order. In other words, for new speakers at the English-medium school not having the necessary or sufficient skills in English
is what limits opportunities, rather than not having sufficient competency in Welsh. It emerges that they view English as a form of linguistic capital, a means of escape from parochialism and a demonstration of having embraced the ‘modern’ way of life. Thus, although there is agreement about the ‘advantages’ of individual bilingualism there are questions about the different ‘advantages’ or ‘disadvantages’ stemming from the different routes to bilingualism. A tension emerges between language being commodified as a form of capital linked to social mobility and language as an expression of national identity, with the students here questioning ‘what counts as competency, who gets to define what counts as competence, who is interested in acquiring that competence, and what is considered the best way to acquire it’ (Heller 2002: 47).

Within the complex bilingual context, the negotiation between global and local is inflected by language choice. Thus, the ‘students’ have to negotiate their relationships with the nationalist ideologies that often characterise Welsh-medium schooling, but also with more global ideologies, mainly mediated by English. Further research is needed that empirically investigates the link between language skills and mobility; to what extent is the Welsh education system fully equipping students (and or young adults) with the skills they perceive they need to function in the wider world?

In sum, the aforementioned reliance on a discourse of commodification of Welsh for revitalisation purposes may have unintended and unpredicted consequences not least because the marketisation of language education (and education in general) makes the intellectual purpose of education subservient to economic ones, schooling not to ‘challenge the status quo but to provide students with skills to find their place’ (Petrovic 2005: 408) in an existing system. Additionally, the continued reliance on a neoliberal ideology of choice and continuation of the marketisation of language learning, it is suggested, shifts the power to the already more powerful in society. Put differently, a linguistic ‘elite’ (Barakos and Selleck in preparation) emerges, with some more readily having access to valued linguistic codes than others and in turn, some being able to capitalise on these prized resources. Whilst, it has been argued that the commodification of minority languages, by these new elite speakers of Welsh, can be destabilizing’ (Da Silva, McLaughlin and Richards 2006) in that the use of the minority language can challenge existing language ideologies it can equally be ‘restabilizing (Kelly-Holmes and Pietikainen 2013: 224) in that certain linguistic resources for commodified purposes simply reinforce and re-create existing linguistic regimes.

Further critical sociolinguistic research is needed in order to better understand the complexities that arise and the impact it has on young people and their language use. Whilst this research has contributed to the debate around bilingualism in Wales, it is not yet fully clear where we are ‘in terms of the new bilingualism in Wales’ and where we might ‘be heading’ (Coupland and Aldridge 2009: 6).
Transcription Key

(·) An untimed, short pause
(3.0) A timed pause, in seconds
Speech Transcribed speech
[text] Clarification
(text) Commentary
“speech” Voiced speech
'speech' Direct speech quoted in field notes
Cymraeg Text in Welsh
('English’) Translation of Welsh text

References


Aitchison and Carter (1991) posit the notion that a heartland area is one where 70-80% of the population report an ability to speak Welsh. Unlike the Gaeltacht in Ireland, these areas are not however, officially recognised within Wales. That said, the Welsh Assembly Government (2008) does partition Wales into a number of distinct regions or areas arguing that ‘traditional heartlands of the Welsh language’ exist (Welsh Assembly Government 2008).

Note that all names have been anonymised.