



SIXTH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME PRIORITY 7

Citizens and governance in a knowledge based society
Call FP6-2004-Citizens-4

INTEGRATED PROJECT

DELIVERABLE 4.3: “WORKING PAPER 3”

Project acronym: **DYLAN**
Project full title: **LANGUAGE DYNAMICS AND MANAGEMENT OF DIVERSITY**
Proposal/Contract no.: **CIT4-CT-2006-02**
Operative commencement date of contract: **01/10/2006**
Date of preparation of D 4.3: **04/2008**

Authors: **Teams of Workpackage 4**

Nature: **O¹**
Dissemination level: **PU²**

¹ **R** = Report, **P** = Prototype, **D** = Demonstrator, **O** = Other.

² **PU** = Public, **PP** = Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services), **RE** = Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services), **CO** = Confidential, only for the members of the consortium (including the Commission Services).

INTRODUCTION	p.3
FRANÇOIS GRIN, WORKPACKAGE MANAGER	
1. RT4.1: UNIVERSITÉ DE GENÈVE	p.8
FRANÇOIS GRIN (TEAM COORDINATOR) MICHELE GAZZOLA	
2. RT4.2: UNIVERSITÄT WIEN	p.13
HEIKE BÖHRINGER CORNELIA HÜLMBAUER BARBARA SEIDLHOFER (TEAM COORDINATOR)	
3. RT4.3: FREIE UNIVERSITÄT BERLIN	p.19
MATTHIAS HÜNING (TEAM COORDINATOR) ULRIKE VOGL	

1. AN IMPORTANT STAGE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF WORK PACKAGE 4

This working paper is being produced at an important point in the development of the project. Two years after the project began, a certain number of concepts are falling into place, some preliminary results are emerging, and some problems, are becoming clearer. All three aspects have particular saliency in Work package 4, owing to its specificities, namely (i) the fact that contrary to the three other Work packages of the DYLAN project, it is not linked to a particular terrain; (ii) its focus on transversal questions that are assumed to emerge across the terrains studied by colleagues in other Work packages; (iii) its significant degree of internal interdisciplinarity.

Consequently, as was the case for the preceding working papers emanating from Work package 4, the general introduction is organised along slightly different lines than parallel documents produced in Work packages 1, 2 and 3. Given that the emphasis of the reports submitted by each team has been placed on crisp, specific results, this general introduction attempts to summarise key achievements and problems for each of its constituent research tasks (RTs), before venturing an integrative assessment of transversality in DYLAN.

2. RT4.1: EFFICIENCY AND FAIRNESS

At a conceptual level, the challenge confronting the RT4.1 research team can be characterised quite easily; however, the difficulty lies in moving from a fairly general notion of what 'efficiency' and 'fairness' are, and why they matter, to a set of specific and analytically rigorous concepts, and how to apply them to objects as complex as multilingualism or multilingual communication. Work carried out in the initial stages of the project has enabled us to define this challenge as follows:

Assessing the relative degree of efficiency and fairness (as generally defined in the field of policy analysis) of different ways of handling communication in multilingual settings — that is, of handling it in a more or less multilingual way (for example, communicating through a great variety of languages or, on the contrary, attempting to communicate in one language only, possibly one regarded as a lingua franca).

In order to describe and compare the relative efficiency and fairness of different ways of handling communication in multilingual settings, the RT4.1 research team is developing a set of indicators, which should exhibit the desirable properties of

indicators (and of indicators system), as outlined in the corresponding theory. Such indicators, which go beyond the standard linguistic indicators developed, for example, by various language policy agencies and boards around the world, are intended to constitute tools for the European Commission when it needs to compare (particularly in terms of their respective efficiency and fairness) competing scenarios for handling communication in various components of its internal operations, of, more generally, when it is called upon to make language policy choices that may have repercussions well beyond European institutions themselves.

Meeting the challenge required combining concepts and integrating distinct analytical perspectives, namely (i) economics-inspired *policy analysis*, which provides robust concepts of efficiency and fairness; (ii) *language economics*, which provides a framework for applying such concepts to language questions; and (iii) the *theory of indicators*, which helps to design measurement instruments meeting certain necessary technical requirements. The resulting set of *a priori* indicators should be assessed not only with respect to these requirements, but also against the backdrop of observations gathered by teams making terrain observations. This latter task has been at the centre of the work of RT4.1 since the preceding Working Paper was submitted. It has required extensive bilateral contacts with practically every team in Work packages 1, 2 and 3, and the questions of RT4.1, in each case, had to be adapted, to the extent possible, in order to fit into the context and method of data collection practised by each team. At this point, the three main results of RT4.1 since the beginning of the project can be summarised as follows:

- ▶ development of an innovative framework for the assessment of allocative and distributional effects of alternative ways of handling communication in multilingual settings (See Working Paper No. 1);
- ▶ establishment of a preliminary list of quantifiable indicators and indicator domains (see Appendix to Working Paper No. 1), with two strategies proposed to other teams for them to enter their feedback (see Working Papers 1 and 2);
- ▶ development of extensive bilateral contacts and alternative feedback strategy, generating pointers for amendments to preliminary indicators, and suggestions for additional indicator domains.

3. RT4.2 EMERGENT VARIETIES

RT4.2 is confronted with quite a different type of challenge, namely, to develop an understanding of 'emergent varieties', how they appear, and how they change, with a special focus on a very special type of 'emergent variety', namely, English *when it is used as a lingua franca* ('ELF'). At the same time, despite this focus, research on English as a *lingua franca* is intended to generate knowledge about emergent varieties at a more general level; hence, it is crucial to understand the *underlying processes* that explain and characterise the emergence of a 'variety'.

In this perspective, the strategy adopted by RT4.2 has been to link up the issue of "how *lingue franche* emerge" with the issue of "how *lingue franche* are used in

multilingual settings”, implying sustained attention to patterns and processes of *lingua franca* use.

At this time, the main results of RT4.2 since the beginning of the project may be summarised as follows:

- ▶ streamlining of the analytical framework for the study of the use of a particular language (e.g. English) in *lingua franca* capacity (see Working Paper No. 1), in parallel with the development of a strategy for data exchange with other teams;
- ▶ actual data exchanges, enabling some conceptual clarification (for example: *Eurospeak* vs. ELF; concept of ‘variety’); this has also prompted the drafting of an “FAQ” document about ELF (see Working Paper No. 2);
- ▶ analysis of data, showing that ELF interactions frequently include code-switching and transfer, which therefore emerge as important features of ELF in practice.

4. RT4.3: HISTORICAL DIMENSIONS

RT4.3 is significantly different from all other RTs owing to its emphasis on processes unfolding through time; in many ways, this is a fairly self-contained task, despite the fact that all the issues studied in the DYLAN project necessarily have a diachronic aspect (for example, the language practices observed by some, the representations examined by others, are the result of the unfolding of individual and collective action over time). However, there is relatively little literature addressing the history of multilingualism *beyond* specific case studies; therefore, RT4.3 is confronted with the very difficult challenge of coming up, if not with a full-blown theory, at least with some key elements of such a theory, presumably aiming at pattern detection, and explaining how language varieties emerge, stabilise, spread or decline. This investigation, centred on the identification of key actors, processes and moments, logically precedes confrontation with data of historical significance collected by other teams. In RT4.3 specific cases such as the historical sociolinguistics of Dutch are used as a starting point, but in recent months, the team has broadened the range of cases studied, in order to gain more generally applicable insights, and to generate typologies.

So far, the emphasis has been placed on explaining the emergence of a standard form of language in a given linguistic area (while other forms of language are excluded as ‘dialectal’, ‘local’ or other). This focus on ‘internal’ language dynamics ought to help in the understanding of ‘external’ language dynamics, namely how one language emerges as strongly dominant (language spread), while others are relegated to a secondary position and may be victims of attrition.

At this time, three different sets of results have emerged from RT4.3. These are:

- ▶ identification of likely candidates for the role of “determining factors or processes”; of course, factors can be ‘determining’ in the context of a particular theory, and for this purpose, the RT4.3 team has been considering using Rudi

Keller's application to language change of Adam Smith's "invisible hand" (see Working Paper No. 1);

- ▶ a closer examination of how languages 'unify' or 'fragment', showing that phases of unification and fragmentation seem to alternate; at the same time, the team is examining how actors position themselves with respect to such trends (See Working Paper No. 2);
- ▶ a closer examination of the role of factors that appear to be particularly important, such as urbanisation and norm development.

5. PROVISIONAL CONCLUSION

Work Package 4 is confronted with the difficult task of applying the very diverse questions of its constituent RTs to the core DYLAN question, that is, to identify the conditions under which a multilingual strategy, which is often perceived as expensive and disruptive, actually generates, all things considered, significant advantages. These advantages are asserted in many official European documents, and assumed in others; one underlying question is whether multilingualism can help achieve the goals of the Lisbon strategy.

At this time, we may say that some progress has been made, in Work Package 4, towards providing at least partial answers to the corresponding questions. Most centrally:

- ▶ RT4.1 is developing a set of instruments designed to meet the challenge of *systemically* comparing alternative ways of handling communication in multilingual settings, a necessary requirement for identifying what can reasonably be seen as 'asset' or, on the contrary, a 'drawback', and how to weigh them against each other;
- ▶ RT4.2 is uncovering many ways in which, even in the context of apparent relative uniformity (such as using English in *lingua franca* capacity), linguistic diversity in fact enriches ELF as an emergent variety and increases its fitness as a tool for communication in multilingual contexts;
- ▶ RT4.3, by looking at patterns of language dynamics, can help to identify determining factors that have, in the past, played a determining role in steering language areas one way or another (most notably, towards more or less standardisation). To the extent that these findings can be transposed to *external* language dynamics, they will help to pinpoint those factors that are most conducive to diversity maintenance — in keeping with the European principle of supporting its diverse linguistic heritage.

Bringing these efforts to fruition is not without difficulties, and these have been discussed, on the occasion of the Barcelona meeting, with outside evaluators. Difficulties encountered include, for example, obtaining information from some RTS from other Work Packages and using it to stabilise a set of revised indicators (RT4.1), generalising findings and linking them up with the project's core question (RT4.2) and

transposing findings on internal dynamics to external dynamics (RT4.3) with broader applicability. These issues will all be discussed at an additional intra-Work Package meeting bringing all three teams together in Vienna in mid-June 2009; it is hoped that this will help achieve substantial progress in the perspective of the next DYLAN general assembly to be held in Glasgow in November 2009.

1. INTRODUCTION

The goal of Research Task (RT) 4.1 'efficiency and fairness' is to compare the relative efficiency (interpreted here as a synonym of cost-effectiveness) and fairness of alternative models for handling internal and external communication in multilingual contexts, with particular emphasis on the three terrains investigated by other teams, namely, companies, European Union (EU) institutions, and educational systems.

2. TYPE OF OBSERVABLES IN RELATION WITH METHODOLOGY

The cost-effectiveness of alternative language policies can be expressed through indicators. At a fundamental level, indicators are heuristic devices which may serve to compare situations in a systematic way, as well as to make better-informed general policy decisions. The relative efficiency of alternative language policies can be assessed by putting indicators of effectiveness in relation with the costs of language policies. The goal of our comparative analysis is not to assess whether a given language policy is cost-effective *per se*, but rather whether it is more or less cost-effective than significant alternatives. Indicators are not assumed to be necessarily the same across the three terrains analysed in the DYLAN project.

RT 4.1 is not designed to collect its own original data which should, for actual indicator production, be quantitative ones. Collecting such data implies additional methodological requirements and significant costs, for which there is no provision in DYLAN. RT4.1's mission, however, is not to provide actual indicator series ("populated" with actual figures), but the theory-based development of consistent indicators that can subsequently be populated. Fairness can also be characterised through indicators. In policy analysis, however, fairness is approached in terms of resource distribution (both material and symbolic) among relevant groups of individuals, identified according to their linguistic attributes (for example, their L1).

3. FINDINGS

RT 4.1's research has given rise to three main products so far. The **first** one is the theoretical construction of the object of study. Starting from the existing mainstream literature in welfare economics and policy analysis, RT 4.1 has developed an innovative framework for the assessment of the allocative and distributional effects of alternative ways of handling communication in multilingual settings. The features of this framework and its theoretical underpinnings have been discussed in detail in Working Paper No. 1, and will not be presented here.

The **second** result is a list of tentative examples of quantifiable indicators and a set of indicator domains (*cf.* Appendix of Working Paper No. 1). *Indicators* and *indicators domains* have not been developed *in abstracto*, but with respect to archetypal models of multilingual communication derived from the specialist literature in communication science. Partner teams were then invited to comment on and make suggestions regarding these indicators in specific multilingual situations, such as "internal work meetings in large companies, with a focus on decision-making process at management level".

RT 4.1 thus asked partner teams to: (i) comment on the general relevance of the proposed 'archetypal models' of multilingual communication and possibly suggest new or different archetypes; (ii) comment and suggest improvements on the initial indicators; (iii) test some of the indicators proposed informally during terrain observations, and suggest new types of indicators; (iv) suggest what type of fairness analysis (access, process, outcome) is more relevant for the analysis of the models proposed. However, the results of cooperation with respect to all these points have been mixed. RT 4.1 has received virtually no comments on the archetypes or on the indicators proposed, and no suggestions for new types of indicators have been made.

RT 4.1, therefore, has developed an alternative strategy for indicator design based on a more inductive approach developed through bilateral contacts. The detailed description of his approach has already been presented in Working Paper No.2. The outcomes of these bilateral contacts constitute the **third** main result of RT 4.1's research. The results of this bilateral collaboration are uneven. Several teams have provided inspiring and very detailed inputs (in particular when RT 4.1 was offered the opportunity to draft questions beforehand for written questionnaires and interviews); we wish to express our heartfelt thanks to the teams concerned. However, it is still proving difficult to receive some input from some teams.

In general, the information collected in this way is quite heterogeneous. Only a few of the inputs collected so far constitute a reliable source for formal indicator design. These restrictions notwithstanding, these inputs can prove useful for at least two reasons. First, these observations can be confronted with the (tentative) quantifiable indicators and with the indicators domains presented in Working Paper No. 1. In a

loose sense, this feedback provided an indirect and rough test of the relevance of the proposed indicators and indicator domains. Secondly, inputs provided by partner teams have been very valuable for thinking about additional indicator domains. Let us briefly discuss these two points in more detail.

3.1 WP1 – COMPANIES

As regards companies, the information made available to RT 4.1 emphasises that effective informatory communication between people with different L1s has often been described by informants as a communication with no (or little) 'loss of time'. Possible effectiveness indicators for internal communication, thus, could be conceptualised in terms of 'time lag' (the average time between the production of information and the moment when information is understood by all relevant target audiences), or through the inverse of the frequency of interruptions to ask for further explanations, etc.

Informants have sometimes stressed the importance of 'inclusive' communication. To 'include' need not imply speaking the same language, for at least two reasons. First, language skills are not necessarily symmetrically distributed among speakers (e.g., among work colleagues), and therefore it can be more efficient to switch from language A to language B according to the set (or the subset) of colleagues the speaker is addressing. Secondly, the use of several languages with code-switching can be functionally related to the creation of a participative, more relaxed atmosphere, in particular in informal meetings. For these reasons, an indicator domain such as 'productivity' could be promising. However, it is difficult to make any further claim, since to our knowledge, none of the terrain observations gathered in DYLAN establishes this point beyond mere plausibility.

As to external communication, the information made available to RT 4.1 emphasises, whether explicitly or implicitly, the strategic importance of languages in relation with, for example, customers and potential new employees. The relevance of our earlier indicators, such as 'number of potential (and/or current) customers', 'number of potential (and/or current) providers', and 'number of job applications received', therefore, would thus tend to be confirmed. Indeed, our a priori indicators view languages not only as instruments for conveying information, but also as a key to local culture and tastes. In addition, languages play a role in defining the external 'image' of the company, something closely related to strategic-type communication.

3.2 WP2 – EU INSTITUTIONS

The relevance of the (tentative) indicators and/or indicator domains presented in the first Working Paper also tends to be confirmed by several inputs provided by WP2.

As regards internal multilingual communication, for example, 'errors' or 'mistakes' are always mentioned as something hampering effective internal multilingual communication, confirming the relevance of indicator domains such as 'noise' or 'information losses'.

It is worth noting that misunderstandings in multilingual communication are attributed by interviewees to different factors, according to the language regime: (i) the lack of foreign language skills (both passive and active) of MEPs and/or civil servants; (ii) the mental fatigue caused by working in a foreign language; (iii) misunderstandings due to translation and interpretation. However, the latter are mentioned as a potential source of misunderstandings in particular when a relay system is used, or when language mediators do not yet have enough experience (as was the case for new languages after the 2004 EU enlargement). Further (essentially quantitative) empirical data are necessary to assess which factor has the larger impact on communication effectiveness.

'Time lag' is also often mentioned as a possible variable affecting the effectiveness of informatory communication.

We observe contrasting opinions on the effectiveness of multilingual communication as opposed to monolingual communication also with respect to 'cooperation' (that is, β -type communication). On the one hand, some interviewees stress that linguistic services improve cooperation between people, since people feel more confident if they are allowed to intervene in their mother tongue. On the other hand, other interviewees notice that having a common language (usually English) fosters cooperation because it allows more direct communication. Also in this case, carefully designed, quantitative empirical research remains necessary to assess which of the two effects prevails. As suggested in RT4.1's first Working Paper, 'speaking time', and the 'number of projects proposed and approved' (by people belonging to different language groups) are potentially relevant indicators. Some indicators for the assessment of language regimes are already used by the European Union's Court of Justice. RT 4.1 will contact the Court to have access to those indicators.

Finally, it has emerged that the choice of a language regime has distributional effects at the 'access' level (e.g. possibility for some language groups to read background documents before others), at the 'process' level (linguistic insecurity, 'comfort', etc.), as well as at the 'outcome' level (e.g. via language editing of final texts, a process in which some actors can play a greater role because a document is drafted and disseminated in their L1).

3.3 WP3 – UNIVERSITIES

Inputs provided by teams in WP3 have been very useful to assess the relevance of indicator domains such as 'internationalisation process' and 'international cooperation' (cf. Working Paper No.1). All universities studied in WP3 seem to be undergoing some kind of 'internationalisation' process, and indicators such as the 'number of potential students' or the 'number and proportion of scientific publications in journals regarded as international', suggested in Working Paper No. 1, often come up, implicitly or explicitly, in various university language policy documents or interviews. The 'quality of scientific publications' is a new possible indicator, although it raises the question of why a paper's intrinsic quality should be higher if published in language A than in language B.

Many of the fresh inputs for designing new indicator domains are related to internal communication, in the classroom or in students groups. In particular, we should mention 'impact on the use of different languages on the clarification of meaning', and the domain related to 'working load and mental fatigue'.

4. CONCLUSION

All the findings presented in the preceding sections are significant with respect to the overall goal of the DYLAN project, namely, to identify the conditions under which multilingualism is an asset rather than obstacle, because this raises the question of *what* counts as an asset, for whom, and why. First, the analytical framework for the assessment of efficiency and fairness in multilingual communication has been designed specifically for the DYLAN project. Secondly, several tentative examples of indicators and indicators domains have already been discussed. These indicators provide the necessary link between case-specific observations, quantitative empirical data (if, for example, the Commission decides that such data should be collected in the future) and the project's theoretical framework.

1. INTRODUCTION

Research task 4.2 'Emergent varieties' is concerned with the "*investigation of the linguistic and communicative changes that affect English as a lingua franca under increasing interaction with other languages in multilingual practices*" (Annex I, p. 35). This means that the key issues to consider are: (1) manifestations characteristic of the multilingual European contexts in which English as a lingua franca (ELF) is used, and (2) underlying processes by which these manifestations are brought about. At a later stage of the project this will ultimately lead us to the question: What do ELF findings indicate with regard to a more general understanding of lingua franca use in multilingual settings (cf. e.g. the use of Spanish as a lingua franca as observed by UAB, WoPa3).

2. TYPE OF OBSERVABLES IN RELATION WITH METHODOLOGY

As already stated in WoPa1 (p. 41), our investigations are carried out on spoken interactional language data (partly collected by the DYLAN partners) or, more precisely, their orthographic representation in the form of transcriptions. Spoken language is perceived to be closer to what Labov (1978) calls the 'vernacular' in that it is less influenced by standardizing forces than its written counterpart. This makes for increased flexibility in usage and thus for ad hoc innovation. Spoken ELF is assumed to exhibit most prominently the processes taking place in lingua franca communication, where speakers often have to spontaneously adapt to their multilingual environment and their plurilingual interlocutors in order to communicate 'successfully'. In addition, the reciprocity of interactional data makes it possible to observe communicative processes from different angles, accounting for the production as well as the comprehension side.

Ideally we envisaged working with data from every RT that had recorded spoken interaction via ELF. Unfortunately, due to confidentiality and other reasons this has not yet been possible in all cases (cf. also WoPa2, section 4).

3. FINDINGS: PLURILINGUALISM AS A RESOURCE

3.1 THE CASE OF 'CODE-SWITCHING'

As stated above, one of RT 4.2's foci is on other-language 'influence' in ELF. The most easily accessible manifestations of this are 'code-switches'. In the long run the concept of 'code-switching' will certainly have to be reconsidered with regard to the emerging understanding of an integrated multi-/plurilingualism that does not draw clear boundaries between languages (cf. WoPa1, p. 32; cf. also the discussion on hybrid forms in WoPas3 by LYON2 and PARIS3). The evidence points to the need for an alternative conceptualization, but none has so far been put forward.

Analysing the data we obtained from some of our DYLAN partners we found that 'code-switching' is a widespread phenomenon in ELF – an observation that has been corroborated by other studies on related types of data and settings (cf. e.g. Cogo & Dewey 2006; Klimpfinger 2005, 2007; Meierkord 2002; Pölzl 2003, 2005). In the course of our investigations, we identified several instances of this multilingual strategy fulfilling different functions with regard to the communicative/interactively oriented character of ELF speech. The following analysis of a selected extract serves as a (necessarily short) illustration of our approach.

Example 1

(L1s: S1 = Catalan/Spanish, S2 = Greek, S3 = Greek)

S3: <3> there is </3> a shops are exactly for this thing?
S1: ye:s <4> in: </4> (1)
S3: <4> for (private home) </4>
S1: <L1ca> **ferreteries** {hardware stores} </L1ca> (.) it's <5> called </5>
S3: <LNca> <5> ferr</5>eteries? </LNca>=
S2: =<un> xxxx? </un>
S1: it's like the <6> place </6>
S2: <6> (can) </6> (do that) (.)
S2: <un> xxxxxxxx </un> <7> @@ </7>
S1: <7> NO NO </7> <L1ca/es> <un> xxxxx </un> </L1ca/es>=
S3: =@<1>@ </1>
S1: <1> i'm </1> i'm calling (.)
S1: i'm: (telling) you the name of this shop=
S3: =mhm?
S1: it's <L1ca> ferreteria {hardware store} </L1ca>
S2: <2> <LNca> ferreteria {hardware store} </LNca> </2>
S3: <2> <LNca> ferreteria {hardware store} </LNca> </2>
S1: from <L1ca> **ferro ferro** {iron} </L1ca> mean:s (.) metal (.)
S3: A:H=

(data source: GREIP team, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona)

This extract was taken from a recording made by the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona team at a Welcome Point for international students. It captures part of an interaction between a Greek couple (S2 and S3) and a local (S1) providing them with information they need for finding their way in the still unknown city. Example 1 is of interest for a number of reasons. First of all, by coming up with the expression *ferreteries* rather than the English equivalent *hardware stores*, S1 does not only assist S3 in filling what could be perceived as a linguistic gap but moreover delivers a lexical point of reference – a resource – for orientation in town. The English word would not be of practical use for the two ERASMUS students since it would probably not enable them to actually find the type of shop in question.

The 'temporary borrowing' *ferreteria* moreover represents a "marked switch" (Klimpfinger 2005: 79, comp. "flagging" Romaine 2001: 153) in that it is followed by the phrase *it's called* (and, later on, even more explicitly, *I'm telling you the name of this shop*). The speaker thereby "emphasises the status of the switched term as if it were a proper name or borrowing in contrast to mere signs of low proficiency" (Klimpfinger 2005: 79). Yet, looking at the lines following the first 'code-switch', it obviously takes the Greek couple a while to understand the meaning of *ferreteries*, resulting in a repetition of the word with rising intonation and them negotiating it in their own mother tongue afterwards. Acoustically, both Greek speakers seem to have understood as they simultaneously take up the word. Nonetheless, in order to support comprehension and provide a processing aid, S1 then resorts to explaining the expression by stating its root *ferro*, which is another 'code-switch' – this time, however, for meta-linguistic reasons. By delivering *ferro* and the corresponding English translation *metal*, S1 makes the unknown Catalan term more transparent. The more concrete mental picture of 'metal' appears to enable them to (semantically) relate to it, which in turn makes the expression *ferreteria* more comprehensible and memorable. It is only then that S3 shows a clear sign of understanding (A:H) of what S1 has been talking about. The strategy applied by S3 shows a certain degree of meta- as well as cross-linguistic awareness on her side which seems to influence her attempts of accommodating to the needs of her co-conversationalists. She makes use of different resources in her plurilingual repertoire in order to arrive at a communicatively successful result.

3.2 THE CASE OF 'TRANSFER'

Europe's multilingual contexts and the plurilinguality of the speakers involved do not only manifest themselves in ELF in explicit processes like switching techniques, but also in more covert ways. Lingua franca speakers can be assumed to activate their plurilingual resources while appearing to communicate via one language only, for example English. Moreover, if one takes into account Cook's theory of the "integration continuum" (2002: 18), which implies that the languages in the plurilingual mind cannot be clearly separated from each other, a 'one-language-at-a-time' (henceforth. OLAAT) approach certainly seems outdated.

RT 4.2 has come to perceive cross-linguistic influence as an inherent and essential feature of lingua franca communication. As effective ELF talk does not depend on

native-like performance but rather on situational factors determined by the linguaculturally diverse speakers themselves, plurilingual resources can be exploited as appropriate to the communicative context. Approached from this perspective, 'transfer' phenomena, which have tended to be regarded negatively in traditional applied linguistics, can appear in a new light when observed in ELF talk. This is illustrated in example 2:

Example 2

(S9: L1 = Italian; other participants' L1s: English, French, German, Japanese, Latvian, Spanish)

S9: one of the major er er points there under discussion is er (.) e:r the r- the the problem of er carbon leakage (.) e:r and a solution for that to that e:r the two alternatives that have been studied **grossly** are (.) either (.) to give er to to grant a FREE e:r er carbon credits to er er big e:r industry (.) e::r are highly er which i- which uses a lot of e:r energy (.) OR (.) to er establish e:r tariffs sort of tar- ch- <spel> c o </spel> two tariffs for e:r e:rm: goods and and imports from countries that DON'T APPLY (.) e:r this er e:r system.

(data source: EU audiovisual archive)

S9 is a journalist who asks a question/provides a comment during an EU press conference held by the International Atomic Energy Agency on the status quo of oil and gas resources in Europe. In the course of his turn he produces *the two alternatives that have been studied grossly*. While *grossly* would in a native-speaker environment carry a meaning like 'extremely' and would especially be used negatively for referring to unpleasant qualities, this does not seem to be the case for S9's utterance. Rather, the most likely interpretation is that the speaker is referring to alternatives which have been studied 'by and large'. Considering the motivation for S9's selection of the adverb *grossly*, Italian as his first language background offers a potential resource: *grosso modo*, which in form relates to the English adjective *gross*, but renders the meaning 'by and large' or 'on the whole'. It thus seems plausible that S9 produces the utterance under cross-linguistic influence from his L1.

From a monolingual or OLAAT perspective focussing on English, the 'transfer' product *grossly* could be regarded as communicatively 'problematic'. Since in an ELF situation, however, the interactants have plurilingual resources at their disposal, the situation becomes more multi-faceted (cf. Hülmbauer 2007, forthc.). Not only can S9 exploit his L1 when producing the term *grossly*, the other participants who also bring their diverse first and other language resources to the interaction could potentially make use of these resources for comprehension. For example, there are a French as well as a German native speaker among the interlocutors. French has constructions such as *en gros* as opposed to *en detail*, which has also been borrowed into the German language. This could facilitate the 'transfer' process and the inference of the intended meaning of the 'transfer' product for these two speakers. This seems even more likely considering the heightened degree of meta- and cross-linguistic awareness which plurilinguals are reported to have (cf. Jessner 2006: 32ff.). An additional factor might also be the general wide-spread nature of French in institutional EU contexts such as

this press conference. If one extends the concept of intercomprehension (cf. Klein & Rutke 2004), i.e. the exploitation of linguistic similarities within language families for receptive competences, and applies it to ELF, passive knowledge of French expressions such as *en gros* could be regarded as fostering understanding when an interactant is confronted with the term *grossly* produced under influence from Italian. In sum, thus, we have to be aware of both the wide range of potential resources at an individual plurilingual's disposal as well as the situational factors influencing intercultural communication (cf. also UNIBZ's WoPa3).

4. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it seems that for plurilingual language users in the linguistically diverse European contexts, a new conceptual framework is needed – an issue that constituted a major point of discussion with the other RTs in the transversal workshop 'lingua francas' in Barcelona. Approaches based on both (1) monolingualism and (2) the OLAAT perspective, i.e. multilingualism with languages as separate/added competences, seem outdated (cf. also UAB's WoPa3) with regard to the integrated/holistic use of plurilingual resources by the speakers in RT 4.2's data set (cf. Hülmbauer, Böhringer & Seidlhofer 2009, Seidlhofer forthc.). The fact that language boundaries appear to become more and more fluid in intercultural communication – as illustrated in the examples of 'code-switching' as well as 'transfer' in section 3 – will also make a reconceptualisation of these processes necessary. This is where RT 4.2 will have most to contribute to the goals of the DYLAN project.

REFERENCES

- Cogo, Alessia; Dewey, Martin. 2006. "Efficiency in ELF communication: from pragmatic motives to lexico-grammatical innovation". *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 5/2, 59-93. (Available at <https://gupea.ub.gu.se/dspace/handle/2077/3148>)
- Cook Vivian. 2002. "Background to the L2 user". In Cook, Vivian (ed.). *Portraits of the L2 user*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1-31.
- Hülmbauer, Cornelia. 2007. "'You moved, aren't?' – The relationship between lexicogrammatical correctness and communicative effectiveness in English as a lingua franca". *Vienna English Working PaperS* 16/2, 3-35. (Available at http://www.univie.ac.at/Anglistik/Views_0702.pdf)
- Hülmbauer, Cornelia. forthc. "'It's so horrible... I mean, I love it' – The shifting relationship between correctness and effectiveness in ELF communication". In Mauranen, Anna; Ranta, Elina (eds.). *English as a lingua franca: Studies and findings*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Press.
- Hülmbauer, Cornelia; Böhringer, Heike; Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2009. "Introducing English as a lingua franca (ELF): Precursor and partner in intercultural

communication". In Cali, Chantal; Stegu, Martin; Vetter, Eva (eds.). *Enseigner – apprendre - utiliser le français langue internationale en Europe aujourd'hui: pour une perspective comparatiste. Synergies Europe 3/09*, 25-36. (Available at <http://ressources-cla.univ-fcomte.fr/gerflint/Europe3/hulmbauer.pdf>)

Jessner, Ulrike. 2006. *Linguistic awareness in multilinguals: English as a third language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Klein, Horst G.; Rutke, Dorothea (eds.). 2004. *Neuere Forschungen zur europäischen Interkomprehension*. Aachen: Shaker.

Klimpfinger, Theresa. 2005. *The role of speakers' first and other languages in English as a lingua franca talk*. MA thesis, University of Vienna.

Klimpfinger, Theresa. 2007. "'Mind you sometimes you have to mix' – The role of code-switching in English as a lingua franca." *Vienna English Working PaperS 16/2*, 36-61. (Available at http://www.univie.ac.at/Anglistik/Views_0702.pdf)

Labov, William. 1978. *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Meierkord, Christiane. 2002. "'Language stripped bare' or 'linguistic masala'? Culture in lingua franca conversation". In Knapp, Karlfried; Meierkord, Christiane (eds.). *Lingua franca communication*. Frankfurt/Main: Language, 109-133.

Pözl, Ulrike. 2003. "Signalling cultural identity: the use of L1/Ln in ELF". *Vienna English Working PaperS 12*, 3-23. (Available at <http://www.univie.ac.at/Anglistik/views.htm>)

Pözl, Ulrike. 2005. *Exploring the third space: negotiating culture in English as a lingua franca*. PhD dissertation, University of Vienna.

Romaine, Suzanne. 2001. *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. forthc. "Common ground and different realities: World Englishes and English as a lingua franca". In Berns, Margie; Seidlhofer, Barbara (eds.). Symposium 'Englishes in World Contexts' in *World Englishes 28/2*.

1. INTRODUCTION

RT 4.3 is concerned with providing a historical background for the DYLAN-project. The FUB team was assigned the task of preparing an overview of multilingual policies, practices and of discourse on multilingualism through European history. One of the most salient characteristics of the linguistic landscape of present-day Europe is the existence of a great number of standard languages, a substantial amount of them serving as official languages of nation-states. Their development can be traced back to the late Middle Ages when, in addition to Latin, the first forms of uniform written languages, based on local vernaculars, were used in chanceries all over Europe. Different stages of the selection process ultimately resulting in today's standard languages are the main focus of the research of RT 4.3.

One reason for taking the development of the standard languages as a starting point is the fact that the history of the individual European standard languages is (in most cases) quite well documented – at any rate better documented than for example the development of lingua francas or the position of migrant languages through history. This is a crucial point considering the fact that the intended overview is based on existing research (cf. 2).

More importantly, when researching the history of the European standard languages topics like lingua francas or the role of migration actually are very relevant. In the first stage of their development, (the forerunners of) German, Dutch, English, Italian, French etc. mainly served as (written) lingua francas across dialect areas. Moreover, language contact between autochthonous groups and 'newcomers' played an important role in the development of standard languages.

The relevance of the historical overview for present-day discussions on multilingualism is mainly a matter of putting present-day views on language into perspective. It is neither realistic nor useful to look for the perfect 'model' of language policy or practice in the European past. Rather, we are intending to demonstrate that our perception of language and multilingualism has been subject to change and is neither universal nor fixed. This can help opening up new avenues in today's discussions on topics like the status of national languages, minority languages, migrant languages and the role of English as a lingua franca (cf. 3).

2. TYPE OF OBSERVABLES IN RELATION WITH METHODOLOGY

The methodological approach of RT 4.3 consists mainly in making an inventory of existing studies on the selection process of standard languages and in extracting and comparing findings regarding relevant factors in this selection process.

On the one hand, there is a vast number of studies (papers as well as monographs) dealing with various aspects of the history of one specific language (for example De Vries et al (1993) on Dutch). Moreover, some publications contrast the development of different members of one language family (e.g. of the Germanic language family, cf. Vandebussche & Deumert (2003)). On the other hand, there are also studies approaching the standardization process as a common European process, embedded in a common European political, cultural and societal context (cf. Baggioni 1997, Burke 2004, Van der Horst 2008).

RT 4.3 focuses on both the common development and the differences in the standardization processes of the European languages. It aims at making a first draft of a typology of European 'standardization histories'. This typology is based on the context within which standardization took place from the late Middle Ages onwards (until the present day) (cf. 3).

3. FINDINGS

Stages in the development of the European standard languages which are central to this project are the following: the development of uniform written languages in the late Middle Ages; the codification of written languages in the Early Modern period; the selection of spoken standard languages from the 18/19th centuries onwards; current tendencies towards status loss and diversification of standard languages across Europe ('destandardization').

The selection of specific varieties as *lingua francas*, H-varieties or codified norms can be linked to certain motives of groups of speakers (e.g. the desire, by using a certain variety, to be understood). These groups of speakers are the actors in the selection process; in the context of early standardization of the European languages actors included for example governors, printers, writers, scientists and clergymen. We seek to investigate the roles they played in the selection of a language as 'standard'. Most importantly, we want to find out about the political, cultural, societal and religious context within which their choices were made.³

3. The theoretical framework these assumptions are based on is inspired by Keller's invisible hand theory (Keller, 1994) and was discussed at length in WoPa 1.

3.1 URBANIZATION

Characteristic for the context of early standardization is an increasing integration of different regions of Europe (and the world) in terms of politics, culture, economics and also religion – a development which can be subsumed under the term '(early) globalization'. Corresponding keywords are technological progress (the invention of printing and new insights in the fields of shipbuilding and navigation), religious reformation movements (Luther), the spread of non-clerical education (founding of universities) and urbanization.

The last factor, urbanization, has been paid special attention to during the past months of the project. Overall, the development of new urban centres was a crucial factor in the emergence of standard languages as such: urban centres with their growing populations from mostly different dialect backgrounds created new communicative spaces requiring communication between different dialect communities (cf. Baggioni, 1997). On the other hand, however, different patterns of urbanization have contributed to differences regarding the genesis of standard languages across Europe. For example, language areas with several, equally prestigious urban centres (as e.g. in Germany or Italy) tended to develop a polycentric standard which cannot be clearly linked to one geographic area. The existence of one main urban centre, in contrast (as for example in the case of London and Paris) has fostered the function of one urban variety as a role model for the whole language area (cf. Auer, 2005).

However, it is not only the role of urban centres in early standardization that makes urbanization a relevant factor in the history of European standard languages. In some regions, urban varieties (mostly those of the higher classes) also became the role model for pronunciation standards (for example the cities of Holland for the Dutch speaking area). Moreover, the current changes in the relationship between standard languages and other varieties (regiolects, dialects) can partly be related to urban centres (cf. Auer, 2005; Ploog & Reich, 2006). This makes 'urbanization' a particularly interesting factor which allows for an integrated investigation of different stages of the standardization process, including recent developments.

3.2 LANGUAGE NORMS FROM A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Apart from the above named factors subsumed under 'globalization' there is at least one other comprehensive factor relevant to the rise of standard languages, viz. changes in language ideology, especially in the Early Modern Period. As already explained at length in WoPa 2, we consider it important to analyze the process of language standardization against the background of an interaction between unifying and diversifying forces, viz. a view of language based on the ideal of uniformity and a language view based on the ideal of diversity. In WoPa 2, we identified the 17th century as a period in history when the ideal of a uniform language gained ground in circles of writers, scientists and also printers.

This desire for uniformity was accompanied by a strong wish to have a fixed norm for each language. Strict adherence to such norms was propagated as a moral necessity, as crucial for being part of the civilized world (cf. Burke, 2004:89).

Today, in many discussions on language matters, the high status of language norms is presented as an undisputed fact, as universal and objective: foreign language learners are, on the long run, supposed to become near-native speakers; migrants' language competence is measured as to their mastering of 'the norm' (standard/good/correct German etc.). Moreover, discussions on the future of Europe's standard languages often centre on the fear that established language norms might be under threat (this is for example applicable to the case of Belgium where, in official documents on educational language policy, Standard Dutch is presented as being under threat by French as well as by regional varieties of Dutch (cf. VUB's Working Paper 3)).

Meanwhile, language practice reveals that in some communicative contexts 'effective' communication does not necessarily imply the 'correct' use of a language. This especially holds true for lingua franca communication (cf. Hülmbauer, 2007 and also UNIVIE's Working Paper 3). However, even in the context of English as a lingua franca, norm violation is still regarded as a 'deficit'.

4. CONCLUSION

In sum, the foremost aspect of the findings of RT 4.3 refers to the integration of the historical perspective into current research on multilingualism and to its relevance to current controversies on language issues. According to these findings, it is in particular the conceptualization of multilingual communication in terms of 'plurilingual resources' (as for example discussed in Working Papers 3 of UNIVIE and UAB) which could profit from a historical perspective.

Research (e.g. Rutten, 2006; cf. also Burke 2004 & Van der Horst 2008) shows that many aspects of Europeans' 21st century view on language only developed from the 17th century onwards: the (above named) emergence of a strictly normative view on language is one of them; another aspect is the territoriality principle - the exclusive linking of one language to one nation which gained ground in 19th century Europe (cf. Baggioni, 1997). This 'territoriality principle' still influences language policy and practices in many regions of Europe - as also became apparent during discussions in the transversal workshop on 'historical perspectives' in Barcelona.

A historical perspective helps contextualizing research as well as public discourse on multilingualism in Europe. It suggests that, for example, language norms should be taken for what they are: something that only gained importance in a certain political, cultural and societal context and is not an intrinsic aspect of language.

REFERENCES

- Auer, Peter (2005). Europe's sociolinguistic unity, or: A typology of European dialect/standard constellations. In: Delbecque, Nicole; van der Auwera, Johan; Geeraerts, Dirk (eds.): Perspectives on variation: Sociolinguistic, historical, comparative. [meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea in Leuven 2001]. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 7–42.
- Baggioni, Daniel (1997). Langues et nations en Europe. Paris: Payot (Bibliothèque scientifique Payot).
- Burke, Peter (2004). Languages and communities in early modern Europe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horst, Joop van der (2008). Het einde van de standaardtaal. Een wisseling van Europese taalcultuur. Amsterdam: Meulenhoff.
- Hülmbauer, Cornelia. 2007. 'You moved, aren't?' – The relationship between lexicogrammatical correctness and communicative effectiveness in English as a lingua franca. Vienna English Working PaperS 16 (2), 3-35. (Available at http://www.univie.ac.at/Anglistik/Views_0702.pdf)
- Keller, Rudi (1994). On language change. The invisible hand in language. London: Routledge.
- Ploog, Katja & Reich, Uli (2006). Urbane Prozesse. Migration und Variation in Lima, São Paulo und Abidjan. In: Krefeld, Thomas & Melchior, Luca (eds.): Modellando lo spazio in linguistica / Modellierung sprachlicher Räume, Frankfurt: Lang (VarioLingua), 215-256.
- Rutten, Gijsbert Johan (2006). De Archimedische punten van de taalbeschouwing. David van Hoogstraten (1658-1724) en de vroegmoderne taalcultuur. Amsterdam, Münster: Stichting Neerlandistiek VU; Nodus Publikationen. (Uitgaven Stichting Neerlandistiek, 52).
- Vandenbussche, Wim & Deumert, Ana (eds.) (2003). Germanic Standardizations: past to present. Amsterdam, New York: John Benjamins.
- Vries, Jan de et al (1993). Het verhaal van een taal. negen eeuwen Nederlands. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Prometheus.