# Permeable and Impermeable Linguistic Boundaries: From Mass Media to Social Media in Policy and Practice in Minoritised[1] Language Contexts

*Hizkuntza muga iragazkor eta iragazgaitzak: masa komunikabideetatik sare sozialetako komunikabideetara hizkuntza gutxiagotuen testuinguruko poltika eta praktikan*

Fronteras lingüísticas permeables e impermeables: de medios de comunicación de masas a medios sociales en la política y en la praxis de contextos de lenguas minorizadas

**Elin Haf Gruffydd Jones**[2]

**Abstract**

This article examines the ways in which the language policies and practices of traditional mass media in minoritised language communities are changing in the face of new models of communication attributed to media convergence and to social media. It introduces the concept of permeable and impermeable linguistic boundaries as a framework for understanding the relationship between two languages in the media of bilingual communities. Using Wales as a case study, it argues that there is stronger linguistic gatekeeping in English-language

---

[1]  Terminology in this field is changeable and frequently questioned. Some researchers adopt the term 'minority language' which is by far the most commonly used to denote the field, while others increasingly prefer 'minoritised language' (especially those whose work is informed by the Spanish state context) to convey a sense of agency and process. Other terminologies, such as 'linguistic minorities' 'autochthonous', 'lesser-used', 'less widely known', 'regional' etc. are also used in the field. I shall use minoritised and occasionally minority, differentiating intentionally between the two.

[2]  Mercator Institute for Media, Languages and Culture. Aberystwyth University (Wales), esj@aber.ac.uk

than in Welsh-language media, and explores key developments in language arrangements as Welsh public service broadcasters become multi-platform content producers.

**Keywords:** social media, broadcasting, minority, minoritised languages, linguistic boundaries.

## Laburpena

Masa komunikabide tradizionalen hizkuntza politika eta praktikak medioen konbergentziari eta sare sozialetako komnunikabideei lotutako komunikazio eredu berrien aurrean nola aldatzen ari diren aztertzen du artikulu honek. Hizkuntza muga iragazkor eta iragazgaitzen kontzeptua proposatzen du, komunitate elebidunetako komunikabideetako bi hizkuntzen artean suertatzen den harremana ulertzeko oinarri gisa. Gales ikerketako gaitzat harturik, ingeles hizkuntzako ate zaintza (*gatekeeping*) galesezko komunikabideetakoa baino trinkoagoa dela defendatzen du. Halaber galeserazko telebista eta irrati publikoak multiplataformarako edukien ekoizle bilakatu direnez gero hizkuntza kudeaketan gertatu diren funtsezko aldaketak aztertzen ditu.

**Gako-hitzak:** sare sozialetako komunikabideak, irrati eta telebista, gutxiengoak, gutxitutako hizkuntzak, hizkuntza mugak.

## Resumen

Este art culo analiza las formas en que las pol ticas y la praxis ling sticas de los medios de comunicacin  tradicionales en las comunidades ling sticas minorizadas est n cambiando a ra z de los nuevos modelos de comunicacin  atribuidos a la convergencia de medios y a las redes sociales. Introduce el concepto de fronteras lingüísticas permeables e impermeables, como marco para la comprensin  de la relacin  entre dos lenguas en los medios de comunicación de las comunidades bilingües. Tomando a Gales como estudio de caso, argumenta que el gatekeeping ling stico del ingl s es m s severo que el de los medios de comunicacin  en lengua galesa, y explora las principales novedades en el r gimen ling stico a medida en que la radiotelevisión pública en galés se convierte en productora de contenidos multiplataforma.

**Palabras clave:** medios sociales, radiotelevisin,  minor as, lenguas minorizadas, fronteras lingüísticas.

## 0. Introduction

Social media have transformed many of the ways in which we communicate with each other. They are by now an integral part of the production processes and distribution strategies of the so-called traditional mass media. To what degree are the specific characteristics and paradigms of social media becoming increasingly manifest in the policies and practices of traditional mass media? Conversely, to what extent are the traditional mass media retaining their own identifiable features in an age in which everyone can produce and disseminate media content worldwide? This article focusses specifically on these issues in relation to language and examines the linguistic impact of social media paradigms on traditional mass media, both at policy level and in practice. It introduces the notions of 'permeable and impermeable language boundaries' of media content as an attempt to conceptualise, and indeed better understand, the policies and embedded practices of media in bilingual or multilingual communities. Its contextual focus is Wales, and in particular public service broadcasting which has a long-established tradition of using the both Welsh and English, albeit to varying degrees. The article examines the language policies of public service broadcasters and presents an overview of current practice in Wales.

## 1. The positive impact of media on minoritised language communities

In the context of minoritised languages, activists, researchers and policy makers alike maintain that the existence of media operating in the language has a significant and positive impact on the linguistic vitality of such language communities. The grounds upon which these claims are made echo many of the well versed arguments presented in writings on the role of the media in the construction of national identity (see for example (Anderson, 1983), (Billig, 1995), (Tomlinson, 2003)). Although these key commentators have contextualised their theories largely on state level nationalisms, it is also argued and evidenced that national identities are also constructed at sub-state levels (see for example (Nairn, 1977), (Schlesinger, 1991)). Indeed, many – though not all – of the so-called minority or minoritised language communities choose to express their collective identity in terms of a *national* identity, and claim that their (minoritised) language is indeed their own *national* language.

The positive contributions that media in the language can make towards the wellbeing of a minoritised language have been identified, collated and conceptualised by academics over several decades. (For an overview of such writing, see Donald Browne and Enrique Uribe-Jongbloed 'Ethnic/Linguistic  Minority Media – What their History Reveals, How Scholars have Studied them and What We might Ask next' in (Jones and Uribe-Jongbloed, 2013: 128). In one of the earliest edited collections of case studies from across the globe, Stephen H. Riggins (Riggins, 1992: 283) concludes that 'ethnic minority media are making a substantial contribution to the continued survival of minority languages'. He emphasises specific linguistic factors, and it is observable that considerations to language are regularly mentioned in the context of minoritised language communities, but are seldom referred to in the context of academic writing on majority or dominant language media.

> The skills of imperfect speakers are improving, languages are being modernized by the addition of new technical vocabulary related to contemporary life, and many groups have been characterized historically by a variety of dialects and orthographies that are being standardized. (Riggins, 1992: 283)

Other 'positive' arguments have been identified by researchers: many have made the case that minoritised languages (like all other languages) must have a presence or existence in the 'public sphere'. Moragas Spà in an earlier discussion presented the argument that the (Catalan) language community needed to create a 'communicative space' (*espai de comunicaci*–) (Moragas Spà, 1988).  Moring (Cormack and Hourigan, 2007) (Moring and Dunbar, 2008) has conceptualised the notion of 'functional completeness' linking it to the process of 'normalisation' and also to the concept of institutional completeness as argued by Breton (1964) initially in the context of ethnic or immigrant communities where  the ethnic community could perform all the services required by its members' (Breton, 1964: 194). Grin (Grin et al., 1999, Grin et al., 2003), and others have focussed on the economic case pointing to empirical evidence of employment in the cultural industries where the minoritised language is both required and used. Cormack (Cormack, 2004) has summarised four important benefits of minority language media: 'their symbolic role', the 'economic' factor, 'creating a public sphere' and the  representational role both for the smaller minority language and wider external community'. Elsewhere (Jones, 2007: 190), I have identified 'five primary functions of television – communicative, cultural, economic, status and linguistic – form the basis of the arguments why this medium is essential for the well-being of any (minority) language community'. Ned Thomas (Thomas, 1995) has argued that  a language denied access to media is discriminated against, accorded inferior status, and is unlikely to survive', because '…language is a group of people speaking to each other, and (…) in modern conditions much of that communication occurs through the media'.

## 2. Towards identifying the optimum linguistic policies and practices

Despite these assertions that the use of the minoritised language in the media sustains and supports the use of the language in general, there is little discussion or explicit agreement on the exact linguistic arrangements – i.e. the policies and practices – that are needed in order to achieve optimum impact in favour of the language. Should minoritised language media simply aim to reproduce the same linguistic policies and practices as those of their counterparts operating in state languages? If so, how can this be possible, given the fundamental sociolinguistic differences between dominant, state languages and minoritised, non-state languages? If not, what kind of bespoke language policies and practices should the media adopt in order to acknowledge and accommodate the specificity of the community's linguistic profile? Indeed, what kind of 'accommodation' (Giles et al., 1991) of communication – both inter- and intra-language – should minoritised language media take into account when communicating with their bilingual and multilingual audiences?

    In minoritised language communities there is often an underlying public debate on the relationship between the fortunes of the language and the role of the specific

media organizations that operate in its territory. While this public debate can also occur in state language contexts, in particular with a view to what *kind* of language should be used in the media, the debate in minoritised language communities is particularly prevalent and is characterised by three specific features. Firstly, in the minorities language contexts, the relationship might even be perceived as fundamental and causal, drawing on concepts related to the study of 'moral panics' (Cohen, 1972) (as expressed in claims such as television/the internet/etc is killing the language). Secondly, public debate may possibly be more wide ranging and more acute in its polarities (the internet can save / destroy the language). Thirdly, there may be a presence in minoritised language contexts of the notion of whether media organizations should operate *in* the language or *for* the language?

If the academic debate on minoritised language media is typified by a positive attitude towards the media – with some notable exceptions[3] – then the public debate on the ground generally takes a more negative tone. These criticisms can stem from across the political spectrum and are as likely to come from the very activists who campaigned to establish such media (and who are engaged in all kinds of proactive activities to 'normalise' the language) as they are from groups and individuals who are known for their opposition to all kinds of aspects of public intervention aimed at normalising the language (such as education, official signage, language legislation etc). The role of *language* in these debates is central. Hardly surprising, perhaps, as the language itself, as argued by Amezaga et al in (Jones and Uribe-Jongbloed, 2013), 'is, in fact, an exclusive adjective for each of these [minority language] media organizations, as the only provider of television in their language, and is therefore one of their major brand values' (Amezaga et al., 2013: 253).

Minoritised language media organizations can be criticised simultaneously for being too monolingual or too bilingual; accused of excluding non-speakers and of making excessive allowances to the degree of doing a disservice to the language's fluent speakers. The language used by the media can be perceived both too formal and too informal, too correct, yet full of mistakes; too out of touch and too complex as well as too impoverished, depleted and infantilised. Too much use can be made of dialect forms or not enough attention paid to them; there can be too much or too little translation; the outlet can be in the hands of activists as well as being perceived to be in the hands of the state establishment. These binaries can be directed at the same media outlet at the same time, as it is indeed the predicament of minoritised language media to have to please all, and potentially not pleasing anyone.

Echoes these sentiments are identified in the critical observations of academics on the language policies and practices of minoritised language media at theoretical level and in specific case studies. O'Connell (O'Connell, 2007) has highlighted the perils of 'lexical simplification' as a result of an overdependence on translations in the case of Irish language dubbing of German (and other) language children's animation. She has also pointed to the evidence that subtitling in the majority language does not aid

---

[3] Many scholars note that eminent sociolinguist Professor Joshua Fishman claimed the minority language activists had a 'fetish for mass media'. However, for a new reading of Fishman's writing on media see Elin H.G. Jones 'Brezhoneg overtakes Cymraeg in the 21st century' in JONES, E. H. G. & URIBE-JONGBLOED, E. 2013. *Social media and minority languages : convergence and the creative industries,* Bristol, Multilingual Matters.

with learning the minoritised language and may in fact hinder the process of improving the language skills of 'imperfect speakers' as Riggins claimed. Alexandra Jaffe (Jaffe, 2007: 149) has observed that the introduction of acquisition planning as a mandate for minority broadcast media adds complexity to this situation'. She notes that '[t]he Corsican data illustrates that the introduction of minority languages into the discursive and social space of the media does not have a single, predictable outcome for those languages' (p150). She concludes that 'media practices and representations in more formal genres [are] advancing a monolingual purist Corsican norm' (p170). However, in the context of Basque, Irish and Sámi language media, Kelly-Holmes, Pietikäinen and Moriarty conclude that these cases 'illustrate a shift…to more fluid and polycentric notions of normativity and policing' and 'from multilingualism, as conceived in of-ficial policy as a type of parallel monolingualism, to an understanding of multilingual-ism as lived heteroglossia.' (Kelly-Holmes et al., 2009: 239).

   In addition to observations on the language policies and practices that are mani-fest in media content and output, commentators and academics alike have drawn attention to the need to engage with a macro level of language policy and prac-tice within the institutions of minoritised language media. For example, O'Connell (Jones and Uribe-Jongbloed, 2013) makes the case for a broad language policy, from internal communication to public procurement policies in order to maximise the im-pact of the media as work environments that contribute to the overall status and the use of the language in society. O'Connell's statements on the importance of a holistic language policy reiterate some of the broader arguments of contributors to the debate the impact of media as a key player in the economy and in particular in the cultural industries sector for minoritised languages.

## 3. Changes in linguistic practices in the converged media landscape

The characteristics of media convergence and the paradigms of social media and Web 2.0 have been conceptualised and documented by many commentators. One of the recurrent themes is that of 'participation'. Henry Jenkins (Jenkins, 2006: 3), has ar-gued that media convergence should not be understood primarily as a technologi-cal process' and that it does not 'occur through media appliances'. He maintains that media convergence has less to do with devices and technological advances and more to do with cultural practices and heightened levels of participation and interactivity'. Tim O'Reilly too states that the web has evolved from being a platform for 'publish-ing' to one that supports 'participation' (O'Reilly 2005). Hinchcliffe (2006, cited in Androutsopoulos, 2010) comments that web 2.0 environments are indeed shaped by an 'architecture of participation that encourages user contribution'. (Androutsopoulos, 2010: 207). Increased participation carries with it considerable linguistic implications and possibilities of renegotiating language arrangements and hierarchies. Yet, these considerations are seldom at the forefront of mainstream writing on the subject. The linguistic implications are, of course, even more far reaching in the context of complex linguistic dynamics such as those of minoritised language communities.

   One of the most notable features of the converged media landscape is the blurring of the boundaries between broadcast media and print media (Flew, 2007). In the context of the media of state languages, operating monolingual policies and practices,

this phenomenon does not result in reopening the negotiations of linguistic arrangements. However, in the case of minoritised language communities, the broadcast media (radio and television) have traditionally been able to override the low levels of literacy in the language (Thomas, 1995) that are the consequences of the language being marginalised or absent in education and other spheres of public life. Minoritised language broadcasters have predominantly used non-literacy-dependent means of communicating with the audience, with the exception of onscreen textual graphics in television and paraphernalia. However, as a result of media convergence, minoritised language broadcasters have had to embrace literacy-based practices on a much wider level as they increasingly communicate with their audiences through the written text of their websites, Twitter feeds and Facebook pages. Hence, these broadcasters have had to make linguistic decisions – in terms of policy and practice – as part of the process of media convergence. One of results is the renegotiation of the linguistic arrangements, and in the Welsh context this has led to a change in policy and in practice of the minoritised language broadcaster, as will be illustrated later in this article.

Equally, the production and distribution of media content are no longer held exclusively by professional workers and the traditional divide between producer and audience has also been obscured. As a result, there are linguistic implications, and these maybe more extensive for minoritised language communities than for the media operating in majority, state language communities. This is illustrated when non-media-professionals – from 'ordinary people' to political representatives and celebrities – take part in professionally produced media content such as radio phone-ins or appearing in television programmes. In these instances, the participants, by and large, observe the expected linguistic norms and practices of those media environments. However, as participatory models become more widespread, increased numbers of participants are commenting on, responding to and redistributing professionally produced media content in public contexts using social media tools. These acts – as we shall see in the Welsh case studies in Section 5– take place with different negotiations of expected linguistic norms and practices. Language norms and practices in social media platforms (such as Twitter, Facebook, Instagram etc) are complex in bilingual and multilingual contexts, and further research in the Welsh contet at least is required. (Cunliffe et al., 2013b).

## 4. Case study: language policies and practices in the media in Wales

Preliminary research was conducted during 2012-2013 to examine the language policies and practices of public service broadcasters in Wales as firmly established multiplatform content producers and social media players in a converged media landscape. This study focussed on identifying conceptual shifts in the language policies and practices by analysing policy documents, sampling current output and semi-structured interviews with experienced practitioners.

### 4.1. The Media in Wales

According to the Census of 2011, Wales has a population of 3.1 million usual residents and nearly one fifth (19 per cent, 562,000) aged three and over reported that

they could speak Welsh and over 99% of the population aged three or over could speak English. Both languages have official status in Wales and although they are used to varying degrees in the education system, public administration and governance, English is by far the dominant language.

Although there is no regular and systematic audit or census of the Welsh media landscape, the various studies conducted and commissioned over the past two decades ((Williams, 1997), (Jones, 1999, Barlow et al., 2005), (Davies et al., 2008), (ap Dyfrig et al., 2006), (Hargreaves et al., 2010) have shown that the Welsh media landscape is dominated by English language content – in particular in terms of public consumption, with most media produced outside Wales. There is an identifiable Welsh language media sector in and the most significant amount of Welsh language content is produced by public service broadcasters with a limited presence in commercial radio, print and online material, more often than not produced with public investment or in association with public service broadcasters. Welsh language media content is available in public service radio (BBC Radio Cymru) and in some commercial radio (Heart FM), public service television (S4C) but no commercial or local television to date, weekly printed publications (Golwg, Y Cymro), no daily printed newspapers and an online daily news service (Golwg 360). The online presence of the language is largely due to public sector language policies, with Welsh language Twitter users approximated at around 14,000 users (Indigenous Tweets, September 2013) and varying participation on Facebook and youtube etc (see (Cunliffe et al., 2013a). Hence, examining the language policies and practices employed by public service broadcasters is a key part of understanding the current linguistic arrangements of the Welsh media environment.

## 4.2. Public Service Broadcasters: BBC Cymru Wales

According to its own statements (BBC Cymru Wales 2013), 'BBC Cymru Wales is the nation's broadcaster, providing a wide range of English and Welsh language content' and offers 'two national radio stations, BBC Radio Wales in English and BBC Radio Cymru in Welsh.' Hence, officially, the linguistic arrangements of public service broadcasting produced in Wales constitute two distinct systems, a Welsh language service and an English language service, evoking an apparent 'parallel monongualism' as expressed in the context of other comparable countries (Kelly-Holmes et al., 2009).

BBC Radio Cymru is a general radio station broadcasting from 5.30am to midnight. All programmes are identified as Welsh language programmes. Yet there is regular music content in English (across all programmes where music is played, with few exceptions) and very occasionally brief news clips without voice over (the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom) and the rare occurrence of longer speech clips, voiced over into Welsh (e.g. Declaration by the Muslim Council of Great Britain 16/09/2012).

BBC Radio Wales is a general radio station broadcasting from 5.30am until 1.00am in English. Occasional words and greetings in Welsh are used by some presenters and guests on some programmes, especially between those who, off-air, would speak Welsh rather than English to each other. No news clips or vox pops are played in Welsh and Welsh language music is rarely played in English language shows on BBC Radio Wales.

The differences in language permeability in policy and practice in the case of television in Wales are even more accentuated than it is in the case of radio, with Welsh language television showing a far greater degree of linguistic permeability than English-language television output produced in Wales. Public (and professional) perceptions point to a widely held opinion that Welsh language television output – for better or worse – is highly regulated linguistically in comparison to English language television produced in Wales. Upon further examination, however, it is evident that the English language output operates under conditions of de facto monolingualism and maximum impermeability to the inclusion of Welsh (or indeed other languages) into its programmes. No Welsh language material was used in English language news programmes produced in Wales during the observation period (no vox pops, no interviews with politicians, no excerpts in Welsh from debate at the Senedd[4] etc). In fact, it could be argued that very little attention is paid to Welsh language events and culture – for example, English language coverage of the Wales Book of the Year (parallel competitions for English- and Welsh-language poetry, prose and creative non-fiction) focusses almost exclusively on the English language award to the point of neglecting to name one of the Welsh language prize winners. Initial observations of practice in the Basque Country point to quite different linguistic arrangements between Spanish and Basque, with Spanish language television channel ETB2 regularly using Basque language greetings in programmes ('Gabon' as well as 'Buenas noches'etc), Basque language footage and clips (such as brief speeches in Basque in the Basque parliament) and Basque language titles for Spanish language programmes ('Eguraldia', 'Ongi etorri' etc). This suggests a much higher level of linguistic permeability in the case of the Basque language in Spanish-language content produced in the Basque Country than exists in the case of the Welsh language in English-language content produced in Wales.

## 4.3. Public Service Broadcasters: S4C

Welsh language television output is broadcast on S4C, and its content is produced by the BBC, ITV Wales and the independent production sector. It has an explicit set of Language Guidelines (S4C, 2008) with which all audiovisual content must comply. A high proportion of programmes (over 80% of non-repeats) are subtitled into English (S4C, 2013) The Language Guidelines were introduced in 1996, some 14 years after the channel first started broadcasting, and some thirty years after there had been regular Welsh language television broadcasting across a wide range of programme genres. It can be argued that these language guidelines constitute a post-hoc policy formulation and are indeed a codification of existing practice rather than a prescriptive set of (new) principles to be implemented. Interviews conducted with established practitioners (television producers) suggest that there exists within the industry a substantial degree of tacit knowledge of the linguistic arrangements in Welsh language television. During the interviews, each of the producers described the main concepts expressed in the Language Guidelines and also on several occasions used the exact wordings found in the document. Each of them was able to do this whilst also recognising that they do not, as a matter of course, refer to the Language

---

[4]  The Senedd houses the debating chamber of the National Assembly for Wales.

Guidelines as part of their regular working practices. The sense of continuity and tacit knowledge can be further attested by the fact that since 1996, only very few minor changes (in 1998, 2003 and 2008) have been made to the Language Guidelines, mainly to reflect changes in the terminology used for internal posts at S4C.

### *4.3.1. S4C s Language Guidelines for Audiovisual Broadcast Output*

The Language Guidelines are organised into five sections, each representing different aspects of linguistic arrangement. Since there is no official English language version of these guidelines, all translations are my own. Section 1, entitled The Welsh Language on S4C, establishes principles relating to the kind of Welsh to be used in programmes 'simple… correct… clear… natural' (S4C, 2008: 1.5), embracing notions such as 'communicating with the audience in its totality' (S4C, 2008: 1.3) and recognising 'different levels of language ability in Welsh' (S4C, 2008: 1.2). The guidelines differentiate clearly between the channel's linguistic expectation of professional contributors, (e.g. 'to use gender nouns correctly') (S4C, 2008: 1.7) and participation by members of the public, and in particular Welsh speakers who feel that 'their Welsh is not good enough' (e.g. 'any suggestion of a requirement to use rich Welsh should be avoided') (S4C, 2008: 1.8). The guidelines make reference to dialect use, with the proviso that  dialect words and sentences can be acceptable to a wide audience if they are presented more slowly and with effective and clear speech techniques'(S4C, 2008: 1.5). They also recognise that 'language changes and constantly evolves' (S4C, 2008: 1.6), that there is room to be 'creative and to experiment with new forms' (S4C, 2008: 1.6) and refer to the role that S4C has in 'facilitating the broadening of the use of contemporary Welsh vocabulary' whilst reminding producers that  the use of new or unfamiliar terms can prevent the programme from being understood' (S4C, 2008: 1.10). Similarly, a specific caution is raised with regard to scripted voice-overs to ensure that  literary language and styles should not be used' but rather 'correct oral forms that are natural to voicer˙. (S4C, 2008: 1.9)

The Second Section is entitled  The Use of the English Language in Welsh Language Programmes' and focusses on its own sub-title 'The occasional use of English words or clauses'. In this section, the guidelines recognise from the outset that '[t]his [using English words and phrases] is a very common feature of the spoken language and S4C does not claim that there are any final answers' (S4C, 2008: 2.19). They also draw attention to '[r]esearch [that] shows that viewers generally (a) wish S4C to manifest and uphold high linguistic standards (b) believe that some programmes are too difficult (c) welcome programmes that use language similar to their own oral language' noting that  [T]here is no consistency between the three perceptions but they are important to bear in mind when considering the vocabulary of a programme.' (S4C, 2008: 2.2.) Once again, the complexity of the linguistic reality is recognised. The next subsections focus on the balance between 'rich Welsh vocabulary' and ensuring that 'the language used in a programme is totally intelligible to its target audience' (S4C, 2008: 2.2) and also on the 'great variation on what is considered to be acceptable, desirable and common in different sections of society' (S4C, 2008: 2.3). The producers' role in emphasised to 'review the use of English words' (S4C, 2008: 2.3), to 'ensure that the use of English words and phrases do not increase without consideration' and also in the

need to  encourage professional presenters to extend their knowledge and command of the language so that they can contribute creatively on all occasions' (S4C, 2008: 2.6).

The Third Section 'Other uses of English in Welsh language programmes' establishes general principles regarding the prolonged used of English in Welsh language programmes, such as interviews in news, current affairs, documentary and magazine programmes, in fiction and drama as well as in programmes aimed at young people, children and pre-school. The Guidelines acknowledge that the use of English can 'enhance the scope' of some television programmes (S4C, 2008: 3.1). They also state that 'it could appear to be quite easy for a producer to justify the use of English for editorial reasons under many different conditions' (S4C, 2008: 3.2). However,  any use of English in a Welsh language programme can undermine its validity as a Welsh language programme that contributes to a Welsh language television service'. Furthermore, the Guidelines note that '[t]here is a boundary that is difficult to define, mainly because it is subjective, between what is acceptable and what is excessive. This boundary exists within individual programmes and also across the service as a whole'. (S4C, 2008: 3.3). The sub-section proceeds to give detail on how producers can identify an increased number of Welsh speaking participants and under what circumstances it may be expected to use contributors who can only speak English in News, Current Affairs, Documentary and Magazine programmes.

In the case of Drama and Comedy, the Guidelines note that S4C wishes to  promote the creative and vibrant use of the Welsh languageÉ whilst recognising that there may be occasions when the use of English could contribute in specific and differing ways to the programme's aims' (S4C, 2008: 3.11.ii). They also note that '[in] general, the aim of reflecting the world as it is would not be considered a sufficient reason for the inclusion of English in drama' (S4C, 2008: 3.11.ii).

Finally, in this section, specific guidelines are given for programmes aimed at children and young people. For pre-school children's programmes (0-5 years old) the guidelines stipulate that  Welsh is the only language that should be used in Welsh language programmes for this age group' (S4C, 2008: 3.11.iii.a). For children's programmes (5-10 years old), it notes that 'In general, [my emphasis] Welsh is the only language that should be used…' (S4C, 2008: 3.11.iii.b), and proceeds to mention exceptional circumstances. Finally, for programmes aimed at young people (10-15 years old), the guidelines acknowledge that it is important for the language used to be 'modern and simple and reflect the viewers' ways of life'. Also, it is noted that '[t]he use of English must be justified for editorial reasons', and also that 'living in a bilingual country there will be use of English' (S4C, 2008: 3.11.iii.c).

The Fourth Section, 'Non Welsh-speaking viewers' refers to the channel's statement that  S4C and the Welsh language belong to the whole of Wales including non-Welsh speakers'(S4C, 2008: 4.1) noting that this is achieved through subtitling, making the programmes attractive and relevant to this audience as well as using new technology to provide English language commentary sound tracks. It reiterates its motto 'A Welsh language channel for the whole of Wales' (S4C, 2008: 4.1).

The fifth and final section refers to the use of other languages in Welsh language programmes, noting that this – like many other aspects to previous sections – is a matter to be discussed with the Content Editor who decides whether the contribution should be dubbed or subtitled.

These guidelines demonstrate an understanding of the complexities of producing television programmes and providing a broad television service in a minoritised language on a single channel. They reflect an awareness of how the specific medium of television can be used to communicate with an audience that is actively acknowledged to be heterogenous in term of language skills. They also show relatively high levels linguistic permeability due to the fact that a Welsh-language programme can contain contributions in English. However, there is a clear objective that the permeability should not undermine or negate the integrity of any individual programme as a Welsh language programme. This in turn is reflected across all programmes and ultimately is of central significance to the identity of the channel itself as a Welsh language television channel.

### *4.3.2. S4C s Language Guidelines for Web-based Material*

Although S4C's online presence can be dated back to 1996 with regular webcasting of television programmes since 2006, ahead of other UK public service broadcasters. The current S4C Website Guidelines: Editorial (henceforth 'Website Guidelines') were introduced in 2010 (S4C, 2010) and are the channel's linguistic policy for online material. Section 6 of the document is entitled 'Language' and outlines the language policy for online services. Unlike the Language Guidelines that are only available in Welsh, this document is available in English and in Welsh.

The first sub-section is entitled 'Bilingualism' and the opening sentence states that '[a]ll content must be published in both Welsh and English.' (S4C, 2010: 6.1.). This statement differs significantly from the Language Guidelines in two specific ways. Firstly, it makes a clear statement that S4C produces online material in English as well as in Welsh, and that both are of equal measure. Secondly, its discourse is one of simplicity and prescription, which is in contrast with the detailed considerations of the Language Guidelines that recognise the complexities of the linguistic situation in Wales. The sub-section continues noting that '[the] only exceptions to this are when content is user-generated' (S4C, 2010: 6.1.). This is followed by another condition that stipulates bilingualism However, this type of content should still be presented in a bilingual framework' (S4C, 2010: 6.1.). The guidelines proceed to explain the kind of bilingualism required, noting that:

> The only time two languages should appear on the same page is on the front page or entry page approved in advance by S4C's Web Editor or if specific material for [Welsh] learners appears on the website. (S4C, 2010: 6.1.). [My translation: this sentence is not included in the English version of the Web Guidelines]

The preference for two parallel language frames on the web suggests that, in the context of online services, S4C identifies two target audiences – one which will read in English and one which will read in Welsh. The audiovisual material used in the online services is produced under the same conditions as material for television

programmes and is subject to the Language Guidelines. Linguistic permeability is increased in the sense that the English language frames contains audiovisual material produced primarily in Welsh. This is of course the output of a branded Welsh language television broadcaster. Conversely, no Welsh language web frames are used to present English language audiovisual production from Wales, with the exception of a Welsh language interface for the BBC's Iplayer, available on some platforms.

The second sub-section refers to the 'Language Style' to be used in online material noting that the '[c]ontent, style, language and dialect must reflect the style of the programme, the language used and the target audience's expectations as set out in the Editorial brief'(S4C, 2010: 6.2.). The third and final subsection specifies that '[t]ranslation must be done to an acceptable standard in both languages. The finished work should be of equal standing whichever the original source language'(S4C, 2010: 6.3.). The Welsh language version of these guidelines states that the Web Editor should not be able to detect which was the original language (though this sentence is not present in the English language version). Therefore, it could be argued that these guidelines indicate a shift away from the model of broadcasting, where subtitles are acknowledged to be the translated version of the original, onscreen language towards a model where the English version is no longer the (subordinate) translation of the original Welsh content.

## 4.4. Online content produced by Welsh public service broadcasters

Initial research into the language practices of a sample of online content production (Webpages, Twitter feeds and Facebook pages) associated with radio and television output of public service broadcasters in Wales was conducted during 2012 and 2013. Five specific television programmes were selected and an additional four different BBC Cymru Wales Twitter feeds were monitored over this period. The television programmes were: BBC Wales Today (Daily news programme: English language: BBC Cymru Wales), BBC Wales Weather (Weather: English language: BBC Cymru Wales), Fferm Ffactor (Light Entertainment: Welsh language: S4C), Pethe (Culture: Welsh language: S4C) and Sgorio (Sport: Welsh language: S4C). The Twitter feeds were: @bbccymru (with 5,236 followers in September 2013), @bbcradiocymru (6,701 followers), @bbcwales (35,971 followers) and @bbcradiowales (18,292 followers).

On the BBC Wales Today website at http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b006mj49 the only Welsh language content was in the form of two links to BBC Radio Cymru and BBC Newyddion. There was no symbolic use of Welsh, such as brief greetings or Welsh versions of place names etc. The Twitter feed for this programme @bbcwalestoday showed three instances of Welsh in one hundred tweets. The three tweets that contained between one and three Welsh words each were primarily in English, and could be classified as User Generated Content as they were retweets of original tweets posted by two Welsh-speaking journalists who were not working on the programme. None of the programme's own material was in Welsh. The very limited Facebook page BBC Wales Today contained a very brief section in English only (again no Welsh greetings or place names) and no user generated content at all. The online content associated with BBC Wales Weather showed no Welsh language content at all. English language place names were used at all times.

With the Welsh language television programmes (Fferm Ffactor, Pethe and Sgorio), all three had separate bilingual interfaces on their websites, as required according to S4C's Web Guidelines, and all material produced by the teams were in both English and Welsh. There was no user generated content on these pages: http://www.s4c.co.uk/ffermffactor/ http://www.s4c.co.uk/pethe/ http://s4c.co.uk/sgorio/ . The corresponding Facebook pages however, included some user generated content as well as content produced by the programme team. In the case of Sgorio (football programme), Facebook content produced by the production team was bilingual on the same page, with comments in Welsh and in English, in similar proportions by other Facebook users. In the case of Pethe (culture programme), only Welsh language material was posted by the production team. Very few comments were posted by other Facebook users, some in Welsh and some in English. In the case of Fferm Ffactor (television competition based on farming skills), some of the production team's posts were bilingual, for example at the beginning of the series, while the rest was in Welsh only, and the vast majority of material posted by other Facebook users was in Welsh.

Analysis of the four Twitter feeds, produced by BBC Cymru Wales, two in English and two in Welsh, showed different results in terms of linguistic permeability. The @bbccymru feed, an automated news feed, was entirely in Welsh and contained no retweets and no interaction with other users. The @bbcwales feed, again an automated news service, entirely in English with significant numbers of retweets though none of these included any Welsh. No other interaction with users was detected. The @bbcradiocymru feed was entirely in Welsh consisting of production tweets promoting BBC Radio Cymru radio programmes and a significant number of retweets, a number of them produced by individual journalists and others from listeners or other participants. The @bbcradiowales feed, again consisted of production tweets promoting BBC Radio Wales programmes, with programmes and a significant number of retweets, a number of them produced by individual journalists and others from listeners or other participants. This feed was entirely in English with the exception of one Welsh word – 'Diolch' [Thank you] – in one tweet from a user outside the BBC in response to an English language programme presented by a well-known Welsh speaker.

These initial results show that no Welsh language presence was found in the online content produced by the English language television programme teams, although 3% of tweets (of the twitter feed @bbcwaleestoday), posted originally by other users (Welsh-speaking journalists), contained a few words of Welsh. This indicates that the high levels of linguistic impermeability persist in English language public service media content. Conversely, it is evident that online material produced by Welsh language television is more linguistically permeable, with English language material posted by production teams and other users alike.

In the case of the general Twitter feeds (@bbccymru and @bbcwales), the content of both reflected the two monolingual parallel services as stated by BBC Cymru Wales (see 5.1), and no linguistic permeability was detected in either feed. In the Twitter feeds associated with BBC Cymru Wales radio services (@bbcradiocymru and @bbcradiowales), no linguistic permeability was found in the Welsh language feeds and very little (one word of Welsh, generated by a user) in the English language feed.

## 5. Conclusions

The initial findings from this research suggests that there is some degree of change in the linguistic arrangements in the Welsh context as a result of media convergence, the use of social media and the increased presence of online material. More English language content is being produced (for example, material for S4C's programme websites) on the part of the Welsh language television channel, S4C. It could be argued that this is a development that has grown from the relatively high level of linguistic permeability that has been present in Welsh language television. S4C's Language Guidelines emphasise the need for television producers and S4C executives to consider the complex linguistic profile of their audience. English language media production continues to operate without any such linguistic consideration, and is almost without exception monolingual, and gives little or no recognition to the linguistic profile of its audience. The linguistic permeability in Welsh public service output therefore continues to be largely one-way (English into Welsh contexts) and increased permeability in one direction has not yet led to more permeability in the other direction (Welsh into English contexts). Contrary to popular belief, therefore, it can be argued that linguistic gatekeeping of English language material is by far the more robust of the two, as the linguistic boundaries of English language output are quite impermeable and rarely permit any kind of material in Welsh into programmes.

Further research is needed in order to identify how these changes are influencing the Welsh language public sphere, or the 'espai de comunicació' (Moragas Spà, 1988). To what extent is the Welsh language's position as the major language of communication in S4C's television output being compromised by the channel's investment in bilingual material for its online services? Should the channel develop more elaborate Language guidance and policy for online material, as is the case for audiovisual output, in order to reflect the complexities of communicating with a heterogenous linguistic audience? Also, how appropriate is it in an officially bilingual society for an English-language public service content provider to operate such high levels of linguistic impermeability in its online and broadcast output.

## References

AMEZAGA, J., ARANA, E., AZPILLAGA, P. & NARBAIZA, B. 2013. Languages: Obstacles and Brand Values in the Age of Media Convergence. **In:** JONES, E. H. G. & URIBE-JONGBLOED, E. (eds.) *Social Media and Minority Languages: Convergence and the Creative Industries*. Bristol: Multlingual Matters.

ANDERSON, B. R. O. G. 1983. *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*, London, Verso.

AP DYFRIG, R., JONES, E. H. G. & JONES, G. 2006. The Welsh Language Media.

BARLOW, D. M., O'MALLEY, T. & MITCHELL, P. 2005. *The media in Wales : voices of a small nation*, Cardiff, University of Wales PrBILLIG, M. 1995. *Banal nationalism*, London ; Thousand Oaks, Calif, Sage.

BRETON, R. 1964. Institutional Completeness of Ethnic Communities and the Personal Relations of Immigrants. *American Journal of Sociology,* 70**,** 193-205.

COHEN, S. 1972. *Folk devils and moral panics : the creation of the Mods and Rockers,* London, MacGibbon and Kee.

CORMACK, M. 2004. Developing minority language media studies *Mercator Media Forum,* 7 3–12. .

CORMACK, M. J. & HOURIGAN, N. 2007. *Minority language media : concepts, critiques, and case studies,* Clevedon, Multilingual Matters Ltd.

CUNLIFFE, D., MORRIS, D. & PRYS, C. 2013a. Investigating the differential use of Welsh in young speakers' social networks: A comparison of communication in face-to-face settings, in electronic texts and on social networking sites. **In:** JONES, E. H. G. & URIBE-JONGBLOED, E. (eds.) *Social Media and Minority Languages: Convergence and the Creative Industries*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

CUNLIFFE, D., MORRIS, D. & PRYS, C. 2013b. Young Bilinguals' Language Behaviour in Social Networking Sites: The Use of Welsh on Facebook. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 18**,** 339-361.

DAVIES, G. T., MORRIS, N. & INSTITUTE OF WELSH AFFAIRS. 2008. *Media in Wales: serving public values,* Cardiff, Institute of Welsh Affairs.

FLEW, T. 2007. *Understanding global media,* Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.

GILES, H., COUPLAND, J. & COUPLAND, N. 1991. *Contexts of accommodation : developments in applied sociolinguistics,* Cambridge ; New York, Paris, Cambridge University Press; Editions de la Maison des Science de l'homme.

GRIN, F., REGINA, J. & Ó RIAGÁIN, D. 2003. *Language policy evaluation and the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages,* Basingstoke, Hampshire, Palgrave Macmillan.

GRIN, F., VAILLANCOURT, F. & EUROPEAN CENTRE FOR MINORITY ISSUES. 1999. *The cost-effectiveness evaluation of minority language policies : case studies on Wales, Ireland and the Basque Country,* Flensburg, European Centre for Minority Issues.

HARGREAVES, I., ALLARD, G. & WALES. WELSH ASSEMBLY GOVERNMENT. 2010. *Calon Cymru ddigidol : adolygiad o r diwydiannau creadigol ar gyfer Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru = Heart of digital Wales : a review of creative industries for the Welsh Assembly Government,* [Cardiff, Welsh Assembly Government.

JAFFE, A. 2007. Corsican on the airwaves: media discourse in a context of minority language shift. *In:* JOHNSON, S. A. & ENSSLIN, A. (eds.) *Language in the media : representations, identities, ideologies*. London ; New York: Continuum.

JENKINS, H. 2006. *Convergence culture : where old and new media collide,* New York ; London, New York University Press.

JONES, A. F. 1999. *Y cyfryngau wedi r Cynulliad,* Talybont, Y Lolfa.

JONES, E. H. G. 2007. The Territory of Television: S4C and the Representation of the 'Whole of Wales'. *In:* MIKE CORMACK, N. H. (ed.) *Minority Language Media: Concepts, Critiques and Case Studies x*. Multilingual Matters.

JONES, E. H. G. & URIBE-JONGBLOED, E. 2013. *Social media and minority languages : convergence and the creative industries,* Bristol, Multilingual Matters.

KELLY-HOLMES, H., MORIARTY, M. & PIETIKÄINEN, S. 2009. Convergence and divergence in Basque, Irish and Sami media language policing. *Language Policy,* 8**,** 227-242.

MORAGAS SPÀ, M. D. 1988. *Espais de comunicaci—: experi ncies i perspectives a Catalunya*, Barcelona, Edicions 62.

MORING, T. & DUNBAR, R. 2008. The European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages and the media. *Regional or Minority Languages*. August 2008 ed.: Council of Europe.

NAIRN, T. 1977. *The break-up of Britain : crisis and neo-nationalism*, London, NLB.

O'CONNELL, E. 2007. Translation and Minority Language Media: Potential and Problems: An Irish Perspective. **In***:* CORMACK, M. & HOURIGAN, N. (eds.) *Minority Language Media: Concepts, Critiques and Case Studies* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

RIGGINS, S. H. 1992. *Ethnic minority media : an international perspective*, Newbury Park, Calif ; London, Sage Publications.

S4C 2008. Canllawiau Iaith [Language Guidelines].

S4C 2010. S4C Website Guidelines: Editorial.

S4C 2013. Adroddiad Blynyddol a Datganiad Ariannol / Annual Report and Statement of Accounts. S4C.

SCHLESINGER, P. 1991. *Media, state and nation : political violence and collective identities*, London, Sage.

THOMAS, N. 1995. Linguistic Minorities and the Media. **In**: LEE, P. J. (ed.) *The Democratization of Communication*. Caerdydd / Cardiff: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru / University of Wales Press.

TOMLINSON, J. 2003. Globalization and Cultural Identity. **In***:* HELD, D. & MC-GREW, A. G. (eds.) *The Global transformations reader: an introduction to the globalization debate*. . Cambridge: Blackwell.

WILLIAMS, K. 1997. *Shadows and substance : the development of a media policy for Wales*, Llandysul, Gomer.