



## UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

### The assessment of sociolinguistic justice: parameters and models of analysis

Iannàccaro, G.; Gobbo, F.; Dell'Aquila, V.

**DOI**

[10.1007/978-3-319-75263-1\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-75263-1_12)

**Publication date**

2018

**Document Version**

Final published version

**Published in**

Language Policy and Linguistic Justice

**License**

Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act

[Link to publication](#)

**Citation for published version (APA):**

Iannàccaro, G., Gobbo, F., & Dell'Aquila, V. (2018). The assessment of sociolinguistic justice: parameters and models of analysis. In M. Gazzola, T. Templin, & B-A. Wickström (Eds.), *Language Policy and Linguistic Justice: Economic, Philosophical and Sociolinguistic Approaches* (pp. 363-391). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-75263-1\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-75263-1_12)

**General rights**

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

**Disclaimer/Complaints regulations**

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

Michele Gazzola • Torsten Templin •  
Bengt-Arne Wickström  
Editors

# Language Policy and Linguistic Justice

Economic, Philosophical and Sociolinguistic  
Approaches

 Springer

*Editors*

Michele Gazzola  
Forschungsgruppe “Ökonomie und  
Sprache”  
Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin  
Berlin, Germany

Torsten Templin  
Forschungsgruppe “Ökonomie und  
Sprache”  
Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin  
Berlin, Germany

Bengt-Arne Wickström  
Andrássy-Universität Budapest  
Budapest, Hungary

ISBN 978-3-319-75261-7      ISBN 978-3-319-75263-1 (eBook)  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-75263-1>

Library of Congress Control Number: 2018946648

© Springer International Publishing AG, part of Springer Nature 2018

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Printed on acid-free paper

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer International Publishing AG part of Springer Nature.

The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

# The Assessment of Sociolinguistic Justice: Parameters and Models of Analysis



Gabriele Iannàccaro, Federico Gobbo, and Vittorio Dell'Aquila

## 1 Introduction

The current debate around the concept of *linguistic justice* shows that the topic is interesting under many different perspectives, especially for the fact that the subject has been discussed by scholars of different scientific branches. In his recent—and very welcomed—literature overview on the topic, Alcalde (2015, 2018) illustrates how the questions of linguistic justice are concern of a number of branches such as political philosophy, economics, law, sociology of language and linguistics (in particular, sociolinguistics, ecolinguistics and interlinguistics). According to this study, the concept of linguistic justice on the one hand covers a quantity of problems raised by the language diversity in international economic and political relations and, on the other hand, deals with power unbalance among languages in everyday life of single speakers, mostly in multilingual settings. Lately, it gains way the idea that defining a linguistic environment as ‘just’ (or ‘fair’, as preferred by some authors) should not only mean that people have equal access to public resources across the world but also that a less uneven distribution of linguistic abilities should be pursued in the linguistic reality of the everyday life of human societies as

---

G. Iannàccaro (✉)  
Stockholms Universitet, Stockholm, Sweden  
e-mail: [gabriele.iannaccaro@su.se](mailto:gabriele.iannaccaro@su.se)

F. Gobbo  
Universiteit van Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands

Università di Milano-Bicocca, Milan, Italy

Università di Torino, Torino, Italy  
e-mail: [f.gobbo@uva.nl](mailto:f.gobbo@uva.nl)

V. Dell'Aquila  
Centre d'Études Linguistiques pour l'Europe, Milan, Italy

well. Now, ‘justice’ in the sense employed here is usually referred to the effect of objective conditions or social constraints or policies that produce more or less just outcomes.

However, it does not mean, of course, that speakers should be forced to achieve a ‘just’ linguistic behaviour if they do not need it or choose to do so. Knowing the social norms that rule the use of linguistic varieties in the society and mastering them (see Sect. 3), i.e. the fact to be linguistically included in the society, is, ultimately, a situation that has to be pursued also individually—depending to speakers’ perceptions of the need, and in this respect nothing can be said—at least in a systematic view. But it is up to the whole society, as we will argue in Sect. 4, to provide the ideal conditions for a real achievement of this goal, if it is felt as needed.

For the discussion of the literature and the debate on linguistic justice, our main reference will be the survey by Alcalde already mentioned above, which we regard as the most complete and up-to-date overview on the subject so far. Thus, we will not duplicate here the vast reminds of the pertinent literature he examines, and we will consider as known the condition of the debate he outlines. Specifically, our considerations can be entailed in the field of studies he classifies as “sociolinguistics”. In particular, he notes that leading linguists often work on the documentation of linguistic situations, paying less attention to offer concrete proposals apt to overcome the language injustices they describe. However, there are some exceptions. For instance, Phillipson (2008) and Skutnabb-Kangas (2000) pledge for the application of linguistic human rights especially in the field of education, protecting and promoting indigenous and minority languages, often directly or indirectly threatened by the strong role played by English in this field. Also Bastardas i Boada (2010) argues that, while *glocalisation* is the force that spread English in the most prestigious domains of use, local languages are reconceptualised, thanks to the digital tools at disposition, which can be helpful to promote them, maintaining their vitality. The result should be a balanced bilingualism, which will hopefully reduce linguistic injustices. However, it should be noted that the dynamics of these two forces do not take into account another variable that strongly complexifies the picture, i.e. mobility, where secondary, adopted identities can emerge in second- or third-generation migrants—see, for instance, Gobbo (2014). Moreover, another factor to be taken into account is the *potentiality* in mobility—what Houtkamp (2014) calls ‘motility’: intuitively, the higher degree of *motility* people have, the higher is their motivation in foreign language learning, according to the desired destination of the potential mobility. What we want to underline is that there are some peculiarities in each given context where languages are in conflict—or at least in contrast—and therefore there is no ‘magic formula’ that can solve all the problems in whatsoever society. In our view, an in-depth analysis of the concrete sociolinguistic situations where linguistic justice is under scrutiny cannot be avoided.

In the debate on linguistic justice, several political philosophers, even the ones in favour of minority (linguistic) rights, still take for granted the ‘Westphalian model assumptions’—illustrated and challenged among the others by Beaulac (2004)—that state that in a given nation-state citizens are monolingual as the rule

and that the connection between language(s) and its use within the society is a secondary variable. In the Westphalian model, languages are mainly tools to perform nonlinguistic things, and they have essential characteristics, i.e. they do not change according to the context of use. However, this essentialist view may run the risk of underestimating the real conditions of communication by means of language within the communities. We think that it would be of some interest considering not the language itself as the primary unit of analysis, but on the contrary languages let emerge after the analysis of the linguistic habits and attitudes of the community under scrutiny. From a sociolinguistic point of view, communities are primarily *speech communities*, i.e. groups of people who regularly interact with each other by means of a common *repertoire* of linguistic signs, who share the same values about these linguistic signs and who know the norms that rule the use of them.

A couple of terminological clarification is here of some interest: we prefer the maybe old-fashioned notion of ‘speech community’ to that of ‘community of practice’ (or even more up-to-date equivalent labels) because we think that all communities are involved as a whole in the processes of sharing sociolinguistic norms. And that is true also for mobile people (migrants, expats, high-skilled professionals, civil servants, etc.): in her/his real life, a mobile person is necessarily obliged to have contacts also with people outside her/his primary network, and these may be as important as the ones she/he entertains with the inner groups.

In the same vein, we define ‘linguistic repertoire’ mainly as ‘the set of language varieties used in the speaking and writing practices of an individual or a speech community’. Therefore, a subdistinction will possibly be made throughout the chapter between ‘individual repertoire’ and ‘societal repertoire’. As a rule and after attentive consideration, we always refer to the main sociolinguistic concepts as they are intended in the mainstream of classical European sociolinguistics; definitions and discussions may be found in Ammon et al. (2006/2008) and Goebel et al. (1996/1997). Of the latter, a new and completely revised edition is about to be edited by Jeroen Darquennes, Joe Salmons and Wim Vandebussche.

We want to point out on ‘sharing the same values about linguistic signs’, because the term ‘values’ can refer to both the two main functions of language already mentioned, a communicative one and a symbolic one. The communicative value of a linguistic sign refers to its possibility to be successfully used for a specific speech act, while its symbolic value represents the potential of self-identification outlined by the use of a specific sign, or even a set of signs constituting a variety. As for an example of different symbolic values conveyed by the same communicative setting, we can take English. In the essentialist analyses, the English language is treated like a single variable, where all its internal variations are not considered important. In a non-essentialist view of English, such as the one proposed in Gobbo (2015), the value of English in multilingual contexts is different. According to the Kachruvian model of analysis of the value of English in terms of circles (for a recent account, see Kachru and Smith 2009) English plays, for example, different roles in Wales, Hong Kong and Sweden. While English can be considered native language in Wales, it is part of the inner circle and therefore it plays a key role in the sense of belonging, which is not straightforward there. In contrast, in Hong Kong, English is adopted,

as Hong Kong has been a British colony, his citizens being bilingual with Chinese diglossia (outer circle, for Kachru). Finally, in Sweden (part of the expanding circle), English is a pragmatic language, being perceived mainly as a commodity, as if there were no identity issue related with it. In other words, the symbolic value of English varies a lot, according to the context, and this variation cannot be neglected.

Now, the example was spotted on English precisely because the role of English as an international code for international communication—and particularly in academic or working environments—is one of the main present concerns of the literature on linguistic justice. However, our main concern in this chapter is to draw the attention on the sociolinguistic dynamics which affect the whole society and on the role they play in setting ‘just’ sociolinguistic scenarios for the speakers involved. According to this view, English used as a lingua franca is but one, albeit important, constituent of a complex interplay of factors that shape the sociolinguistic experience of a speaker, as we will focus in the following sections.

All human beings have a linguistic repertoire that includes all codes known by the community (languages, dialects, patois, registers and so on) and the social norms that rule the use of these codes. It is not important here to debate if multilingualism is something good or bad per se: as a matter of fact, we must take it in consideration when we analyse social discrepancies caused by linguistic acts. In every community, different linguistic varieties are used, and their use is ruled by binding sociolinguistic norms. In monolingual communities, we define these varieties as registers of the same language, while in multilingual settings, the varieties—even structurally quite different from each other—receive a specific name by the speakers themselves (like ‘dialect’, ‘language’, ‘patois’ and so forth). In fact in many parts of Europe (and as a norm in the world), the society is characterised by the use of more than one variety, both at the same time and in the same community, and these varieties necessarily show functional specialisation, what is broadly known as *diglossia*—for the purposes of this paper, we intend the notion of diglossia in a very broad sense, not taking into consideration the rather important differences between a proper diglossia and other situations like *dilalia*—where both high and low varieties can be employed in colloquial or informal situation while leaving the monopoly to formal and writing domains to high language; see Berruto (1995). We are of course not referring to the rare and maybe hypothetical cases of societal bilingualism, in which all the members of the community can speak and do use two languages for all verbal communicative purposes and situations, while diglossia is fairly common in Europe and in the world, as said above.

Sometimes speakers find themselves ‘at ease’ with their linguistic repertoire, but sometimes they experience difficulties. This depends on several factors, among the others the different communicative situations. For example, it is obvious that chatting with friends in a pub, or talking with teachers during lessons or in front of a civil servant, puts speakers in very different communicative positions that influence their linguistic performance. In an ideal world, no communicative situation impedes speaker’s performances in any way: relations are always fair, and collaborative and linguistic justice is always taken for granted. In reality, though, this it is not always the case. A communicative situation between a student and the teacher during school

lessons or a citizen in front of a civil servant can be more compelling. This is the reason why we want to focus here on the situations in which the insufficient mastering of a particular language and the lack of knowledge of the social norms that rule the use of linguistic varieties inside the society produce a personal *unease* to the speaker. With ‘linguistic unease’ we mean the counterpart of ‘linguistic ease’: a situation of linguistic unease, then, is a situation in which speakers feel that their pragmatic linguistic competence is not fitting the communicative requirements of the linguistic act they are about to perform—or even that the symbolic value of their speech acts is perceived as misplaced. The notion of ‘linguistic unease’ has interesting points of contact with the parallel one of ‘linguistic insecurity’ (Labov 1972; Bretegnier and Ledegen 2002). Linguistic insecurity, however, mainly refers to the perception of inadequacy that speakers nurture towards their own variety vis-à-vis a desired standard norm and often has (even if not always, see, e.g. Oakes 2007 or the parallel literature on creoles) an *intralinguistic* scope. Linguistic *unease*, in its turn, is a more relational and situational notion and often concerns more linguistic codes at the same time: in other words, it often has an *interlinguistic* scope. Moreover, the communicative failures it triggers rely more upon a communicative level than an identity or aspirational one—therefore it has much to do with linguistic *justice*. The concept of linguistic *justice*, then, is deeply rooted in the actual complexity of the linguistic communities, and it appears clear that in any communicative setting some languages, varieties or even registers are perceived by the speakers more adequate or more correct for a particular situation but also more useful and even more beautiful than others. Therefore, they may be stronger than others in terms of power.

For the purposes of this chapter, we will consider the *linguistic unease* of the speaker, defined as the set of situation in which the speaker’s linguistic knowledge is not adequate to the linguistic needs of the moment. In other words, linguistic unease happens whenever a gap exists between the individual repertoire of the speaker and the collective repertoire of the speech community. We will limit our discussion to the communicative unease caused by language, and we will exclude all other situations of unease caused by other factors like economical, cultural or racial discrepancies. Of course, we are fully aware of the fact that the linguistic aspects are inextricably intermingled with the other ones and that socioeconomical factors are in many cases more imposing—or at least more evident—than the linguistic ones, but the use of certain linguistic varieties symbolises the belonging of the speaker to a particular socioeconomic group. For instance, if a citizen cannot access the bureaucratic register of the language used in the local administration, his or her linguistic rights will be de facto severely limited. In our view, linguistic justice should take into account the sociolinguistic profiles and the concept of linguistic unease just presented. In order to distinguish our approach from the one presented in the literature—see the survey of Alcalde (2015, 2018), if needed—we can also refer to *sociolinguistic justice*. However, what we have defined as linguistic unease is but a possible *symptom* of linguistic injustice: it is not linguistically unjust per se. Also, the typology of linguistic unease can be quite varied: there are of course cases of unease which are so limited in situation and time as to be irrelevant for justice—for



example, unease during travelling abroad for leisure or insufficient mastery of an L2 in social or working situations in which this is not normally required. At the same time, but this is obvious, there is always the possibility of linguistic injustice which does not imply any uneasiness by the speaker.

In the following sections, we will identify the linguistic unease of the speaker through a set of situations in which the speaker's linguistic knowledge is not adequate to the linguistic needs of the moment, in other words whenever a gap exists between the individual repertoire of the speaker and the collective repertoire of the speech community. Through our analysis, we want to shed light to the necessity of reducing the *linguistic* inequalities among the members of the speech community, trying to (re)balance existing odds—in terms of power—of the varieties in the repertoire itself. The lower is the level of linguistic unease, the higher will be the level of sociolinguistic justice. However, it must be clear that a perfect situation of sociolinguistic justice, where all the members of the community do not suffer *any* linguistic unease, is socially not achievable, as well as is not achievable a socially and economically fully equal and just society. On the other hand, this theoretical impossibility does not imply that sociolinguistic injustice—through the reduction of linguistic unease of the speakers—should not be reduced at the minimum, whenever the conditions allow the fulfilment of this goal. The following discussion will be divided into two parts, the first dealing with static or consolidated situations, i.e. with settled communities, and the second with situations of mobility, i.e. in migration context.

## 2 Parameters of (Socio)linguistic Justice

The model presented here is intended as a cognitive tool for formalisation and interpretation of sociolinguistic reality that can show influence on linguistic justice; hence, it might also be possible to draw operational considerations, even if they are not the primary purpose of this chapter. In other words, what we propose here is a necessary first step in order to evaluate the level of linguistic justice of a given context through an analytical approach, with possible further socioeconomic considerations. The normative acceptability of linguistic injustice involves moral and legal considerations that cannot be taken into account here. Our main assumption is that the reduction of linguistic unease—as previously defined—is a valuable goal from a societal level, albeit proceeding from individual perceptions.

If we want to consider the above view of sociolinguistic justice, then the notion of repertoire turns out to be crucial, either considered from an individual perspective or a societal one. In fact, it looks quite reasonable that any consideration of linguistic justice should be based on the actual conditions of the repertoire in the speech community. To detect the sociolinguistic situations that may give rise to linguistic (un)ease of the speakers, we can rely on a number of parameters designed to provide a rather good description of the dynamics underlying the repertoire of a speech community.

We propose now some reflections driven from a scheme already offered in Dell'Aquila and Iannàccaro (2011—a previous version of the scheme was already presented in Iannàccaro and Dal Negro (2003)) originally planned to approach the study of language vitality in a framework of linguistic ecology. On that framework, we will graft considerations of linguistic justice, in order to build a model that may prove useful to identify possible moments of linguistic weakness of some of the speakers within the community.

Table 1 presents—in its second column—the considered parameters, followed by six prototypical situations that show different *repertoire* patterns (the coexisting codes in the speech community are labelled as A, B and C). The aim of these proposed situations is just to help the reader in understanding the parameters by means of some easily imaginable scenery. We can imagine that these prototypical examples correspond to (European) localities, albeit idealised—actual situations are of course more complex, with a number of marginal codes employed by the speech community (immigrant languages, English used as a lingua franca and so on). Since we are not discussing them here, we do not propose any binding identifications between a real community and the columns 'Situations'. Nonetheless, just for an initial orientation, and with assumption neither of correctness nor completeness, we suggest the following examples: for situation 1, Sevilla, Paris, Liverpool, Praha, Pécs, Kraków and Jyväskylä; situation 2, Zürich, Cairo and La Valletta; situation 3, Aosta/Aoste; situation 4, Rēzekne; situation 5, Oviedo, Stuttgart and Como; and situation 6, Dublin/Baile Átha Cliath and Cardiff/Caerdydd. The codes involved are thus what can be considered an abstract 'normality' of the of course more complex real situations: in the case of Zürich, for example, it is true that a number of (mobile) individuals can have overabundant repertoires, but the societal norm tends to a *diglossia* Hochdeutsch/Schwizertütsch (plus a non-compulsory English as a L2 for selected professional purposes).

Now, parameter 1 is but a list of the actual codes present in the ideal repertoire of the community (i.e. the shared repertoire, not the sum of individual repertoires). It is worth recalling that 'diglossic situation' refers to the fact that there is a shared norm for code usage within the community: there can well be diglossic repertoires involving two codes, but also others with three or more varieties.

Unlike for the other parameters, the list in parameter 1 is provided without any hierarchy in presenting the code. It means that at this first level of analysis, the researcher does not know yet how the codes interact within the society. All other parameters list the codes in hierarchical order, where the hierarchy comprises implication of use. For instance, parameter 3 shows that in *Situation 3* it is always possible to employ the code A as a spoken language within the community, while the use of C is subject to particular restrictions.

With the labels H(igh) and L(ow) used for parameters 2 and 3, we refer to the two functional ambits that share the domains of language use (or the social contexts of interactions). Literature on diglossia or post-creole speech *continuum* usually refers to *high* code(s) (or *acrolects*), the variety(es) that speech community employs for written, formal, official, cultural purposes, vis-à-vis to *low* code(s) (or *basilects*), variety(es) used for informal, familiar and peer-group conversation. In

**Table 1** First 12 parameters of code distribution in a speech community

Parameters	Situation 1	Situation 2	Situation 3	Situation 4	Situation 5	Situation 6
1	A	AB	ABC	ABC	AB	AB
2	A	AB	BA	AB	A	A
3	A	B	AC	C	B	A
4			B			B
5	A	A	AB	CAB	A	BA
6		B	C	C	B	
7			A	A	A	
8				B		
9			C	CB	B	B
10					B	
11			B			B
12	A	B	C	C	AB	A

our view, however, we set H and L as sociolinguistic positions (or spaces), set out by aggregations of domains. This way, H and L are in practice empty boxes, which may, depending on the characteristics of the investigated repertoires, be occupied by more than a language at the same time. In this case, the hierarchy of the codes appearing in each level is meant to describe complex situations of language coexistence. Within the two H/L levels of sociolinguistic space, the codes occupy the domains in a different way as regards, quantitatively, the number of domains and number of speakers and, qualitatively, the type of uses. This can give an account of complex situations in which other models accept intermediate levels (mesolects): for instance, in *Situation 3* it is always possible to employ code B for H domains, while A presents a narrower set of possibilities—in our prototypical example (*Situation 3* may be equated with Aosta), A (we may think of it as Italian) can always be used as high code, while B (French) is subjected to sociolinguistic restrictions; at the same time, though, A can be used also in low position (along with C (*patois*)), ambit which is not allowed to B. It is noteworthy, indeed, that the same code can appear in both in H and L position: indeed, with the important exceptions of strict diglossia *à la* Ferguson (1959), it is quite possible for the same code to be used both in high-status and low-status interactions—either because of a dilalic situation (see Berruto 1995; Iannàccaro and Dell’Aquila 2006) or because in the given speech community a code traditionally considered low is currently in rapid rise and/or is experiencing a quite effective standardisation.

Parameters 4, 5, 6 and 12 are written in italic: it is because these parameters are inherently *emic* in character, i.e. they illustrate the subjective perception of the community with respect to the proposed variables—see Pike (1967). On the contrary, the other parameters need to be fixed according to the observation of the researcher—spreading from her/his background knowledge, both of the territory and of the literature. Parameter 4, ‘ideological codes’ or *Wunschsprachen* (lit. ‘languages of desire’), depicts codes—quite often powerful and prestigious—which are not actually used by the members of the speech community, but which play a certain role in the society. In fact, ideological codes symbolically act as reference points for economic, cultural and social reasons. Sometimes, they were used in the past, and they can be linked to ancestral myths of folk positioning or they can be ‘new’, external languages, which are now gaining the consideration of the speech community due to economical or social factors. The speech community is highly receptive to eventual *Wunschsprachen*: innovations which involve such codes—in the event of neologisms or of deeper linguistic contact—will probably be accepted by the community members. They are good candidates to the role of high language. For example, in Ortisei (Gardena Valley, Dolomites), Ladin speakers complain that their language is Romance, like Italian, while they would prefer to have standard German as their *Dachsprache*, i.e. as the umbrella language reserved for the role of acrolect.

Inherently *emic* are parameters 5 and 6, which indicate the *perceived* role of the codes as experienced by the speech community itself. Varieties are normally seen by their speakers as *languages* or *dialects*, whatever this folk category label may mean. A ‘language’ is a standard variety, taught at school, which quite likely enjoys

high status and prestige; a ‘dialect’ is usually a low-status variety, used for family and peer-group interactions. If the same code appears in parameters 2 and 3 as well, it means either that the same name is used for two distinct varieties by the same community (for instance, the code called ‘Friulian’ is an official high language in Italian region Friuli-Venezia Giulia along with Italian; but also single low dialects of Friulian are locally called *Furlan* (Friulian) by their speakers) or that the same language enjoys both the status of ‘language’ and ‘dialect’ at the same time within the community. Namely, it means that the variety has a codified written form and chances of formal and official usage (and is therefore a ‘language’) but it is also used for informal and peer-group interactions—as a ‘dialect’, as it were. It is important to remark that the difference between parameters 2 and 3 on the one side and 5 and 6 on the other is that the first two refer to the actual use of the codes according to the speech community rules, while the second two refer to the image that the codes have in the society.

Parameters 7, 8 and 9 give indications of the possible evolution in the relations between the different languages and language varieties used within the communities. It is worth noting that while codes explicitly in expansion widen both the number of their speakers and their prestige, decline can be twofold. It is important to distinguish if decline is in the absolute number of speakers (e.g. because of emigration or death of older speakers, while the young already use other varieties) or if, on the contrary, it lies in the will of the community to (try to) exclude the language from normal usage, maybe because of its low status. In both cases, the language is moving towards endangerment, but the conditions of language (un)ease are strongly different in the two situations. It can also happen that a code is in decline of speakers in spite of its growing status. Many regional and minority languages which enjoyed revitalisation programmes in the last decades share this situation.

Parameter 10 is used to identify nonautonomous codes; it means that the code can be employed only in contexts of code switching/mixing or in formulaic strings like greetings. Actually, quite often even its speakers do not master completely the variety and need to perform insertions of the dominant code in everyday conversations. Formulaic strings are nonetheless employed to mark in-group relations. Of course, this is a case of severe endangerment in terms of language vitality. Prototypical examples may be many Walser German dialects, spoken in the northern fringes of Italy—see Iannàccaro (2010)—or *Dalamål* (Älvdalska), the Scandinavian variety spoken in the region of Dalarna.

Codes under special attention (Parameter 11) are the ones which state, regional or local institutions consider worth preserving or promoting. This parameter also indicates that the code under attention is perceived as relevant by the community leaders. However, special attention does not imply directly any actual growth in use or vitality: codes enjoying special attention can remain long severely endangered, but they get consideration for symbolic, cultural and political reasons. It is also important to evaluate the sense of belonging of all the codes in the repertoires (Parameter 12): here, the main point is that we consider that even high-status languages can be seen as a mean of identification and regarded as in-group codes, contrary to what stated by much of the literature on the subject, but according to

**Table 2** More parameters of code distribution in a speech community

	Parameters	Situation 1	Situation 2	Situation 3	Situation 4	Situation 5	Situation 6
$\alpha$	Unmarked in active oral use	A	B	CA	BAC	BA	A
$\beta$	Standard orthography	A	A	BA	AB	A	AB
$\gamma$	Non-written			C		B	
$\delta$	Vehicular language at school	A	B	A	A	A	A
$\varepsilon$	Present in media use	A	AB	AB	AB	A	AB
$\zeta$	Unmarked in media use	A	AB	A	AB	A	A

reality (consider, for instance, the position of Irish in Ireland or of Portuguese in Angola).

Indeed in considering linguistic justice, the latter is an important point, which applies to all the parameters in Table 2: there is no straightforward relation between the sense of belonging conveyed by a variety and the status of that variety. In other words, speakers can feel attached to the acrolect as an in-group code as well as to the basilect, with respect to their language identity. Identity feelings and reciprocal position of the codes in the repertoires are independent variables. For this reason, any evaluation of linguistic justice can not rely only on the mere position in terms of power of the languages in use in a given speech community measured through more or less objective instruments, but on the contrary, it should also take into account the relations between the codes from the perspective of the speakers.

Now, the first 12 parameters can be a way of modelling complex repertoires and therefore of understanding under which conditions it is possible to speak of sociolinguistic justice. We need, however, to further investigate the aspect of language in use within the society. This could be done by taking into consideration five more parameters that were not present in Iannàccaro and Dal Negro (2003). They are labelled by a Greek letter and devoted to investigate the actual use of the codes within the speech communities, more than their ideological position. Table 2 shows the additional parameters: Parameter  $\alpha$  is independent, while  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  are in oppositions; finally,  $\varepsilon$  and  $\zeta$  are alternative one to the other.

Parameters  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  give account of the diamesic axis, i.e. the variation of language use across physical means, typically orality and writing. Parameter  $\alpha$  measures the normality of active use of languages. Orality is the standard mean for human communication. As Lyons notes:

[although] no human society [has been] known to exist or to have existed at any time in the past without capacity of speech [...] the vast majority of societies have, until recently, been either totally or very largely illiterate. (Lyons 1981: 12–13)

Parameter  $\alpha$  accounts for the normality of active use of languages, and it is grounded in oral use because of its unmarkedness vis-à-vis the written practices of language. Passive understanding is usually higher than active use, but for vitality and sociolinguistic justice purposes, we spot on the active competence of speakers. Oral use is ‘unmarked’ when the variety in use passes almost unnoticed in some key situations, such as an adult addressing to children in a birthday party at home or a conversation between customers and shop assistants. Parameters  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  depict the use of language in writing, and they isolate the two extreme cases: the presence of a standard written code for the variety—which normally triggers the metalinguistic awareness of it being the ‘real’, ‘correct’ variety of language; parameter  $\gamma$  illustrates a context in which the code is not socially expected to be written by its speakers. Of course, individual attempts are always possible. In such situations, considering the terms of the schema of language standardisation by Kloss (1952), writing is limited to squares 1 (popular prose) and 2 (intrinsically related issues).

Parameter  $\delta$  is devoted to the whole area of schooling. In Dell’Aquila and Iannàcaro (2011) (aimed, as stated, to investigate (ethno)linguistic vitality), it was enough to consider only *vehicular* codes as a medium of instruction, for the reason that learning a language at school does not imply that the language itself is in active use. A quantity of languages, which are not part of the community’s *repertoire*, may be taught at school for cultural or identity reasons, like Latin, Ancient Greek and Sanskrit. Also a number of minority languages, even if taught at school, are not really actively used within the speech communities. What it was considered important is if a particular variety may be used at school as a mean of standard communication. In this respect, the standardisation of a variety is not a prerequisite for its use at school as vehicular mean of instruction, as, for Europe, the German-speaking Switzerland and Norway school usage attest. The parameter was focused on primary schools, where local languages have more chances to be spoken. If we want to consider linguistic *justice*, though, a more refined analysis is needed. This is the reason why we introduce here a set of four new sub-parameters, illustrated in Table 3.

With  $\delta 1$  we mean mainly the varieties in which the children are taught to write and read and that they end up considering their ‘mother tongue’, be it their code of first socialisation or not. It is essentially the variety to which the first experiences of metalinguistic reflection is bound and to which most of the normative drives of individual and society align.  $\delta 2$  and  $\delta 3$  are the situations of teaching a language as L2: in the first case, we mean a local language different from the tuition language and used in the same area or in a neighbouring region of the target community—examples are French in German-speaking Switzerland or Spanish in Catalan schools, while ‘international L2’ is a real foreign language. The letter D in the columns ‘Situation’ indicates that such a language is out of the traditional societal repertoire. Today, in Europe this is obviously the case of English, but still also French, German or Russian. Of course, the two typologies ( $\delta 2$  and  $\delta 3$ ) interact quite differently in terms of linguistic justice: on an etic level,  $\delta 2$  is normally introduced in schools systems for intrastate communicative purposes, while  $\delta 3$  is seen as a language for international communication. It is worth noting that a number

**Table 3** Sub-parameters  $\delta$  for school expansion

	Sub-parameters	Situation 1	Situation 2	Situation 3	Situation 4	Situation 5	Situation 6
$\delta 1$	Written medium of instruction	A	A	A	A	A	A
$\delta 2$	Compulsory local or other national language at school			B	B		B
$\delta 3$	Compulsory international L2 at school	B	C	D	D	C	C
$\delta 4$	Stigmatised L2 at school			C			

of studies on linguistic justice focus on this notion, which represents the *vexata quaestio* of an international lingua franca. On the other side,  $\delta 4$  is an emic parameter: here belong the codes which are taught at school as compulsory L2 (that, for social or political reasons, may be charged with negative images); if they exist, they coincide with a  $\delta 2$  or a  $\delta 3$ . Examples today are Swedish in the Finnish-speaking schools of Finland and Danish in Iceland or, until some decades ago, Russian in many parts of Eastern Europe.

At last, parameters  $\varepsilon$  and  $\zeta$  investigate the media. As in the case of parameters  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$ , the aim is to isolate the two extreme cases. Is it possible to receive inputs in the target language? If so, are these inputs considered ‘normal’ by the speech community? In this respect, we consider radio, television and the digital media more important than printed press. Among other reasons, they allow a fruition that is not directly bounded to the sociolinguistic norms of use of the codes, while printed press (i.e. written use) is a typical example of high language situation. Besides, the language employed in radio and TV often give the speaker occasions for metalinguistic awareness on the standard register and its pronunciation. Moreover, oral transmitted media can easily reach all the populations strata, even (eventual) illiterate or young children. It is worth remarking that in many countries, the international lingua franca (i.e. in most cases, English) is de facto present in the media and as in contemporary music beside the national languages, and in many cases, it is even unmarked. This has two interesting consequences in the countries where there is a tradition of subtitling movies or TV programmes and not of dubbing them: the lingua franca is commonly heard by nearly all the population, and there is an established habit of reading the standard national language as employed in non-formal communicative settings.

On the other side, the Internet gives access to a quantity of languages at the same time, from the lingua franca to a number of varieties or codes that—given the ‘normal’ conditions of literacy in the speech communities—would have not been written otherwise (see parameter  $\gamma$  in Table 2 above).



### 3 Towards the Estimation of Linguistic Unease

Linguistic unease shows the inadequacy of the speaker's repertoire in a given situation. If the researcher takes the collection of situations in which similar phenomena appear, patterns of linguistic unease can be identified at a community level. We believe that the careful consideration of the repertoires of a given community can lead us to better focusing the notion of sociolinguistic justice. This can be acquired by discussing the consequences at social level of the above-discussed parameters, i.e. showing the linguistic ease/unease potential they imply. The following tables are a first approximation in that direction: they show different typologies of linguistic unease, defined in terms of gap between the requests from the situation (which are community-driven) and the answers by the speaker (which are based on the individual repertoire). It is important to note that the linguistic consequences of the not complete command of the common repertoire are to be intended in situations where all the languages are part of the set employed by the speech communities as a whole. Parameters 1 and 11 are not in the table, because they do not look pertinent at this stage of elaboration of the theory.

We are not going to explain in detail all cases, since we believe that a close analysis of the scheme should give enough information per se. Nonetheless, a few general remarks are worth giving. Tables 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 illustrate the individual/community linguistic gaps, divided along with different dimensions of analysis. They show what we consider the most important points of friction between individual repertoires and societal one: here lies a number of questions over the management of linguistic justice issues within the communities. It is important to remind here that with 'code' we mean all kind of linguistic varieties of a given societal repertoire, from registers to structurally different languages: the more structural differences between the varieties, the higher could be the

**Table 4** Individual/community linguistic gaps: H and L codes

	Parameters	Case	Individual/community gap	Expected consequences
2	H code	2.1	Ignorance of all codes in H	Unease in all formal situations (standard case for linguistic justice literature)
		2.2	Ignorance of one or more, but not all, H codes	Possible unease in some formal relations: the kind of unease depends heavily upon socioeconomic characteristics of the speaker
3	L code	3.1	Ignorance of all codes (H and L)	Out-grouping (possible only as a temporary status: newcomer, foreigner, tourist and so on)
		3.2	Ignorance of all L codes	Severe unease in informal situations
		3.3	Ignorance of one or more, but not all, L codes	Unease in some informal situation, highly depending from the structure of the speech community (See 12)

**Table 5** Individual/community linguistic gaps: ideological codes, languages and dialects

	Parameters	Case	Individual/community gap	Expected consequences
4	<i>Ideological codes</i>	4.1	Ignorance of the <i>Wunschsprache</i>	No practical consequences; it should be a quite common situation
		4.2	Knowledge of the <i>Wunschsprache</i> (plus all the other codes employed by community)	Enjoys a strong social position
		4.3	Knowledge of the <i>Wunschsprache</i> only	Out-grouping, but respected; practical understanding unease
5	<i>Languages</i>	5.1	Ignorance of all the codes which are considered 'languages'	See 2.1 and 6.2; unease in formal situations; the speaker is perceived as quite disfavoured on socioeconomic basis
6	<i>Dialects</i>	6.1	Ignorance of all the codes which are considered 'dialects'	Possible unease in some in-group relations ('you are losing your heritage')
		6.2	Only knowledge of codes which are considered 'dialects'	This is the reverse of 5.1

**Table 6** Individual/community linguistic gaps: codes in expansion or decline codes

	Parameters	Case	Individual/community gap	Expected consequences
7	Codes in expansion	7.1	Ignorance of the code in expansion	See 3 and 12 possible unease in some in-group relations ('I feel left behind in society')
8	Code in decline (status)	8.1	Only knowledge of the codes in decline (status)	Unease in some in-group relations ('they are modern; I feel lost in tradition'); see also 6.2
		8.2	Ignorance of (all) codes in decline (status)	No practical consequences per se
9	Codes in decline (speakers)	9.1	Only knowledge of the codes in decline (speakers)	Depends on the nature of the code(s); possible severe unease in formal or informal situation
		9.2	Ignorance of (all) codes in decline (speakers)	Possible unease in some in-group and family relations

**Table 7** Individual/community linguistic gaps: nonautonomous and in-group codes

	Parameters	Case	Individual/community gap	Expected consequences
10	Nonautonomous codes	10.1	Ignorance of the nonautonomous code	Light unease in some (in)formal relations (some identity markers are unknown); cf. 3.3
12	<i>In-group codes</i>	12.1	Ignorance of all the in-group codes	Severe unease in the in-group relations

**Table 8** Individual/community linguistic gaps: school and the media

	Parameters	Case	Individual/community gap	Expected consequences
$\alpha$	Unmarked in active oral use	$\alpha.1$	Ignorance of the standard orthography of any code user for written purposes	Unease in formal acts, e.g. administration
$\beta$	Standard orthography	$\beta.1$	Ignorance of all the standard orthography of one of the codes used for written purposes	Possible unease, strongly dependent upon the nature of the speech community and upon the official language policy
		$\beta.2$	Ignorance of the standard orthography of one of the codes used for written purposes	Possible unease, strongly dependent upon the nature of the speech community and upon the official language policy
$\gamma$	Non-written	$\gamma.1$	Proficiency in writing the code	Either local cultural leadership or stigma in some in-group situations
$\delta$	Vehicular language at school	$\delta.1$	Ignorance of vehicular languages	Severe unease (leading even to cognitive disease)
		$\delta.2$	Ignorance of some vehicular languages	Unease with peers; transient, if helped
		$\delta.3$	Personal ignorance of all vehicular languages, some of which are nonetheless known in the family	Possible unease, strongly dependent upon the nature of the speech community and upon the official language policy
$\varepsilon$	Media use	$\varepsilon.1$	Ignorance of all codes in the media	Possible light unease in some in-group situations
		$\varepsilon.2$	Ignorance of some codes in the media	Possible light unease in some in-group situations

individual/community linguistic gap. Most kinds of unease belong to the diaphasic axis (formal vs. informal situations), which governs the formality or informality of the situation. It is easy to forecast that ignorance of high prestige codes can lead to unease in formal situations of various kind; see Table 4—of course, ignorance of all acrolects (2.1) is worse than ignorance of only some of them (2.2), and a quite common case is no command at all of written varieties, which are traditionally related to formal situations (see also  $\beta.1/\beta.2$  below).

**Table 9** Individual/community linguistic gaps: school and the media

	Parameters	Case	Individual/community gap	Expected consequences
δ1	Written medium of instruction	δ.1.1	Ignorance of the written mediums of instruction	Severe unease (leading even to cognitive disease; professional unease)
δ2	Compulsory neighbour or other national language at school	δ.2.1	Ignorance of one of these codes	Specific communicative unease in out-group communication; professional unease depending on the official language policy
δ3	Compulsory international L2 at school	δ.3.1	No command at all acquired in the international language	Professional unease in highly specialised jobs or at academic level; possible occasional unease in professional life in international settings; specific unease in touristic settings
δ4	Stigmatised at school	δ.4.1	Ignorance of the stigmatised language	No effect per se in school environment; could lead to light <i>peer-group</i> unease
		δ.4.2	High proficiency and use of the stigmatised language	Could lead to the exclusion from the in-group

**Table 10** Typology of linguistic unease

Source of unease	Types of unease	Corresponding cases
Situation	Unease in formal situation	2.1/2.2/5.1/6.2/8.1 9.1/β.1/β.2/δ.1/δ.2/δ1.1–3
	Unease in informal situation	3.2/3.3/6.1/10.1/12.1/α.1 δ.2/δ.3/ε.1/ε.2/δ1.1–3
Sense of belonging	Unease in in-group relations	6.1/7.1/8.1/9.2/10.1
	Out-grouping as an unease	12.1/ε.1/ε.2 3.1/4.3/12.1/α.1/δ.1/δ4.2
Schooling	Unease in writing	2.1/β.1/γ.1/δ.1/δ.1–3
	Unease at school	All the δ cases

It may look like that ignorance of high-level codes leads to practical linguistic unease, while insufficient competence in the low-level ones implies only a less smooth communication in the peer group. We believe, however, that this is an oversimplifying view: the full participation in the linguistic life of the speech community is at least as important as the access to higher linguistic abilities; the particular combination of rules governing the codes' coexistence within speech communities should be maintained as a whole, and this is an important issue for linguistic justice.

But it is also interesting as noted in Table 4 that ignorance of low languages leads to 'unjust' situations of linguistic unease mainly through a non-proper command of intergroup relations (3.1/3.2/3.3). These cases are quite intriguing, because the particular unease to which they may lead to is depending upon the socioeconomic characteristics of the speaker and the rules governing the use of codes within the

speech community at the same time. In particular, case 3.2 shows that ignorance of all L codes can lead the semi-speaker to severe unease in informal situations.

An interesting sociolinguistic situation, illustrated in Table 5, arises when the only code mastered by the speaker in the linguistic panorama of the speech community is exactly the *Wunschsprache*, i.e. the ideological code which acts as a point of reference for the speakers (case 4.1). In this case, the speaker is still out-grouped, but she/he can enjoy a good communicative status because of the ideological code. For instance, many monolingual English speakers living abroad in countries where the language is mastered enough, at least passively, can skip for a quite long time the acquisition of the local language(s), if English plays the role of the desired language of the community. It should be noted that not all the situations lead to individual unease or to failures in the smooth communication among the speakers: some cases show no practical consequences (4.1/8.2), and others even indicate an advantage in the communications skills (4.2/maybe  $\gamma$ .1)—in general, however, the more codes a speaker masters (both as high varieties and as low ones), the better it is. Moreover, ignorance of dialects (6.1) can lead to a loss of language loyalty: from the perspective of the peers the speaker can be accused to lose the ancestral connection to the heritage of the speech community.

Tables 6 and 7, on the other hand, show that if the ignored code is in expansion, the speaker can feel to be nonmodern or left behind in a quickly transforming society (7.1). Different is the case of no knowledge at all of a declining variable: here, the (younger) speaker can experience losses in communications towards elderly people, even in her/his own family. Similarly, if the only codes mastered are the ones in decline, the speaker can perceive herself/himself as bearer of a tradition which can act as a barrier towards social and linguistic innovation (8.1/9.1).

Another interesting case is when the speaker is able to write a language variety or a dialect that it is not normally written by the speech community: graphisation is one of the first important acts of language planning, as Haugen (1959) already noticed. Planning a normative writing implies that the code is considered apt to be used in a lot of contexts of modern life, rather than being only for in-group communication, a typical domain of orality. Paradoxically, language activists involved in such a planning effort can be considered (opinion) leaders by some fringes of the speech community, while for others such an effort is considered ‘strange’, and the activist can even be ostracised ( $\gamma$ .1). Case  $\gamma$ .1 in Table 8 states that the proficiency in writing a code which is regarded by the community as mainly non-written can lead the proficient individual either to local cultural leadership (to be perceived as a ‘local intellectual’) or to social stigma in some in-group situations—(‘you believe you are better than we are’). Case 10.2 does not appear in Table 7 as it is logically impossible, given the nature of the codes involved.

A lighter form of unease is failing to follow the codes used in the media. The media often act as cultural markers within the community: the voice of the radio speaker and the plot of the radio or TV comedy in the language—for example, the BBC programmes in Welsh—are topics of the conversation in the in-group code. If the speaker does not anything of them, she/he simply fails to follow the

conversation, even mastering the code. This form of unease is not insurmountable (cases  $\varepsilon.1$  and  $\varepsilon.2$  in Table 8).

Finally, a typical domain of linguistic unease is the school (cases  $\delta.1$ ,  $\delta.2$  and  $\delta.3$ ). These forms of unease, illustrated in Table 9, can be more or less transient, if there is some form of help in the community or the institution to overcome the language barrier of the pupils. Of course, the role of the parents should not be underestimated: proficiency and attitudes towards the target language by the family member play a crucial role. In particular, the ignorance (or the lack of sufficient mastering) of the written language used at school (parameter  $\delta 1$ ) produces in the pupil severe unease in the learning process. Teaching how to write and read is one of the main tasks of any school: a situation in which a person does not master the written language is symptom of some other social problem. The lack of mastering of the L2 taught at school (parameters  $\delta 2$  and  $\delta 3$ ) can lead to different communicative unease in single specific out-group situations, like professional difficulties in certain jobs or in international settings. It is a matter of fact that in several European countries, the mere school acquisition of a foreign language does not guarantee even a basic command of such a language. Instead, the high proficiency of a stigmatised language can lead, in extreme cases, to the exclusion from the in-group (but without real communicative unease).

Table 10 summarises the possible types of linguistic unease. Essentially, the sources of linguistic unease are of three kinds: (1) unease in formal and/or informal situations, when some languages, varieties or dialects are missing in the individual repertoire, but present at a community level; (2) unease connected with the sense of belonging; and (3) specific kinds of unease, linked to particular important domains in the society. All of these unease situations are, we believe, a direct concern of linguistic justice. The importance of language policy and planning in order to reduce the linguistic unease and therefore sociolinguistic injustice is clear: actions should be taken only if language proficiency, attitudes and most of all desires of the target population are well described, through a fine-grained work in the field. However, the majority of the models in the current literature in linguistic *justice* does not take into account the sociolinguistic variables, in particular the diaphasic axis or the sense of belonging from the speaker's perspective; but without taking into account a definite situation of analysis, it is impossible to enucleate precise socioeconomic effects.

## 4 Sociolinguistic Justice and New Forms of Mobility

The above applies in those situations that we have labelled as 'consolidated'—in which the societal multilingualism is well established and the repertory rules of the speech community have been commonly shared for quite a long time. Nowadays, though, Europe—as well as other parts of the world—is facing the most important population movement since the Second World War, both in terms of internal mobility and of immigration from abroad, and this poses important questions concerning the new-developing repertoires of the communities and hence of (socio)linguistic

justice. Migrants from different places and, what is more important for us, with different background repertoires and different attitudes towards the language(s) and the society to which they are moving arrive in already multilingual communities—with all the characteristics mentioned above—altering their consolidated rules of codes' distribution.

Here, the notion of 'inclusion' is pivotal: any policy devoted to raise the level of linguistic justice in the society should tend to include the more possible speakers into their recipient linguistic communities. This process shows nonetheless two main facets: from one side, mobility and (linguistic) inclusion have potentially conflicting goals. Mobility fosters change, 'new' varieties entering in the repertoire and 'old' (but maybe highly traditional and extremely important for peer-group relations) ones disappearing, while inclusion means accepting norms and rules of an already existing community by newcomers. It should not be taken for granted that both parts wish or are able to manage the potential disrupting force of such a close and sudden linguistic contact. On the other side, language education represents a crucial aspect in the development of an acceptable trade-off between mobility and inclusion—but it should be clear that different kinds of education (formal, non-formal, informal) as well as different attitudes and motivations towards language learning lead to completely different results and pose different problems as regards (socio)linguistic justice.

This concern is not unknown to institutions: in general, local institutions in the hosting area are sensitive to the importance of the development of language skills for people in mobility and often actively promote initiatives (language courses, cultural activities and so forth) to this purpose. Nonetheless, despite how inclusive the institutions might be, this is not necessarily mirrored in the society: while we may have strict and precise requirements on the institutional level (e.g. knowledge required to obtain citizenship, languages needed at school, etc.), social and actual linguistic contexts may be de facto more fragmented; on the other hand, even if institutions favour de jure a certain degree of interaction with people in mobility, on the societal and language-in-use level, actual inclusion is usually harder to achieve.

Language needs of mobile people, as well as of the speakers of the recipient society, represent a potential of ease/unease factor in any linguistic interaction of a speech community. We have developed a set of parameters—or 'dimensions'—which can be of some use for identifying the language characteristics of mobile speakers and therefore a number of issues related to linguistic justice.

Tables 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16 present the dimensions considered, which are (*wrk*) work and working conditions in Table 11, (*dir*) direction of mobility (within EU or from outside) in Table 12, (*lr*) linguistic repertoire of mobile persons at the beginning of their mobility process in Table 13 as well as (*ra*) linguistic repertoire of the hosting area in Table 14, (*scl*) sociolinguistic condition in the target community in Table 15 and finally (*lv*) a set of variables strictly connected to language learning, such as language attitudes, educational background and language learning activities already undertaken after arrival in the hosting area; see Table 16. An additional dimension (*out*, see Table 17) represents the outcomes of the examined process, resulting from the combination of the observed variables. These dimensions are

**Table 11** Dimensions of mobility: wrk

Work/working condition			
Students	Mobility caused by family movement		wrk 11
	Mobility of the students for educational purposes	Short term	wrk 121
		Long term	wrk 122
	Mobility to reach a desired job		wrk 13
Workers	Type of migration: executives, basic workers, job search, ideal/ideological reasons		wrk 2
Retired	Mobility for pleasure (possible variable: strong/weak economy)		wrk 31
	Travel back to homeland		wrk 32

**Table 12** Dimensions of mobility: dir

Direction of mobility throughout Europe		
*EU → *EU	Between economically similar countries	dir 11
	Between economically dissimilar countries	dir 12
*EU → *EU	From an economically strong country	dir 21
	From an economically weak country	dir 22
*EU → *EU → *EU . . .		dir 3
*EU → non *EU (possible, but beyond the scope of our investigation)		dir 4
*EU → non *EU (possible, but beyond the scope of our investigation)		dir 5

**Table 13** Dimensions of mobility: lr

Linguistic repertoire at the beginning of the mobility process		
Monolingual	Strong language	lr 11
	Weak language	lr 12
Average L2 competence	Strong language	lr 21
	Weak language	lr 22
Bilingual	Two strong languages	lr 31
	Strong language(s), weak language(s)	lr 32
Diglossic	Internal diglossia	lr 41
	External diglossia	lr 42

**Table 14** Dimensions of mobility: ra

Repertoire typology of the recipient area		
Nearly/approximately monolingual		ra 1
Nearly/approximately diglossic		ra 2
Nearly/approximately multilingual	Two strong languages	ra 31
	Strong language(s), weak language(s)	ra 32



**Table 15** Dimensions of mobility: scl

Sociolinguistic conditions in the target community			
Typological distance between languages	Impossible intercomprehension or lingua receptiva		scl 11
	Possibility of intercomprehension or lingua receptiva		scl 12
Lingua franca	Widely used in the host society		scl 21
	Known by the migrant		scl 22
Social network	No/feeble		scl 31
	Dense, multiplex	Open to the recipient society	scl 321
		Excluding the recipient society	scl 322
Communities of practice	Open to the host society		scl 41
	Excluding the host society		scl 42

**Table 16** Dimensions of mobility: lv

Learning variables					
Attitudes	Towards integration within the recipient area			lv 11	
	Instrumental (e.g. strictly related to working or study necessities)			lv 12	
Educational background	Spontaneous			lv 21	
	Formal			lv 22	
Language learning after arrival	Spontaneous	Goal: 'Only survival' language skills	Willingly	lv 3111	
			Unwillingly	lv 3112	
		Goal: enriching or improving language skills		lv 312	
	Formal	At school			lv 321
		Lifelong learning	Institutional	lv 3221	
			Private	lv 3222	

detailed in a set of subclasses. \*EU indicates the actual States of EU, as well as other States that can easily be paired with EU (EFTA and so on).

Here, as well as for the previous tables, we would like not to insist in describing every cell of the following tables, which evidently represent different (socio)linguistic parameters that can be combined to create (or imagine) actual linguistic situations, each of them with its potential of linguistic ease or unease: we will instead only describe the general structure of each section of the table in order to make clear which parameters they are based on.

A first important variable concerns the age at the time of migration; this is strictly connected with the main motivation for mobility (study, job, retirement, family reunification), which is, on the other side, connected to more general causes of migration that might concern groups instead of single persons (e.g. war, economic crisis, persecution in the country of origin). Of course, age is crucial in any process of L2 acquisition.

**Table 17** Dimensions of mobility: F (outcomes)

Outcomes				
On the original repertoire	Complete maintenance		out 11	
	Loss of one or more varieties	Originally bilingual contexts	out 121	
Complete unease in both original and target language		Originally diglossic contexts	out 1221	
			Loss of the high variety	
			Loss of the medium/low variety	out 1222
	Also oral		out 21	
On the languages belonging to the recipient area	Only written		out 22	
	Acquired bilingualism		out 31	
	Average L2 competence		out 32	
	Incomplete acquisition	For evident necessity		out 331
		For insufficient evaluation of the necessity	Passive command suffices	out 3321
			Mutual understanding between the languages	out 3322
	For non-integrative language attitudes		out 333	

A second noteworthy aspect is the duration of the mobility period, or more precisely the specific life plans of people in mobility: their intention to stay for a short or long period, to return to their countries of origin and so on. We must also consider the linguistic repertoires of both the countries of origin and of the hosting area, which might facilitate or hinder inclusion due to specific favourable or unfavourable conditions.

Situations may vary greatly according to the language repertoire of the hosting area, with multilingual areas showing a more variable and multi-faceted context, probably more suitable or giving more opportunities to certain types of mobility.

Another factor that intervenes in the inclusiveness of people in mobility is the structural distance between the L1 of the people in mobility and the language(s) of the host society. In particular, the structural distance is perceived by both population as short, and strategies of so-called *lingua receptiva* can emerge, i.e. verbal communication among persons speaking each his/her variety without the help of a third common one. This strategy of receptive multilingualism can possibly favour mobility ('I will be understood even without any language teaching') and foster inclusion ('I understand the newcomers; hence, they are not so different from me').

In our perspective, there is also another aspect particularly significant for the definition of a typology of language needs for people in *mobility* and its correlation with inclusion: as stated above, the language attitudes and motivations towards language learning play a major role in linguistic integration of mobile people. We define motivation as a set of psychological attitudes and intentions which, given certain circumstances, might lead to specific actions and behaviours. Motivation has been widely observed in studies on language learning. It represents an extralinguistic factor strongly affecting acquisition, in particular for what concerns foreign languages—cf. Gardner and Lambert (1972).

In these studies, motivations are examined through two basic levels of observation: type of motivation and intensity. There are two principal types of motivation, which represent opposite poles: *instrumental motivation*, which concerns an ancillary interest of the individual towards the language (for instance, the language is useful to access job opportunities), and *integrative motivation*, which concerns the intention of the individual to be part of the community speaking that language or the local languages in diglossia (thus, language(s) represent a primary tool to become integrated in the community).

These motivations might drive future behaviours according to their intensity: more intense motivations represent intentions which have higher probability to be realised in the future. Literature on this field abundantly shows that an integrative motivation is usually stronger and has higher and long-lasting effect on language acquisition.

In order to understand better how to use the dimensions illustrated in the tables, let's give a couple of examples out of ongoing research for the MIME project (<http://mime-project.org>). The first example refers to a field research of ex-Yugoslavian migrants in South Tyrol, conducted by the use of language biographies elicited through semi-structured interviews. While in the past families moved because of the

war, more recently they often move because of unemployment from an economically weak situation (*wrk* 2 of Table 11, *dir* 22 of Table 12). Usually their jobs last for a season, as they are in the agricultural sector; therefore, these migrants are commuters with the countries of origin, South Tyrol being not too far. Their age can vary: however, both adults and children usually encounter difficulties in acquiring an L2 and in maintaining their L1, as passive command suffices (*out* 3321, Table 17), according to their non-integrative language attitudes (*out* 333, Table 17). In fact, their learning attitudes are instrumental (*lv* 12 in Table 16), and learning is spontaneous and only for basic needs (*lv* 3111 in Table 16). In particular, mobile people from Kosovo are often originally bilingual (*lr* 31 from Table 13), while the hosting society presents two strong languages, German and Italian, with German in diglossic relations with local Germanic varieties (*ra* 32, Table 14). According to different evaluations, the degree of integration of mobile people in South Tyrol is quite high, but there is no possibility of mutual intercomprehension between Albanian and the three languages spoken in South Tyrol (*scl* 11, Table 15). However, Italian is evaluated by the majority of the participants to be more similar than German to their languages of origin, and this perception often positively influences the motivation to learn Italian before German after moving in South Tyrol.

The second example refers to the *expat* community working for large international companies in the bilingual town of Vaasa/Vasa in western Finland, where it constitutes up to 10% of the overall population of the town. All the expats moved there for normally temporary, voluntary, high-skilled professional reasons (*wrk* 2, Table 11); the majority of them comes from countries which are economically balanced with Finland (*dir* 11 in Table 12), and their original linguistic repertoire is quite varied, ranging from monolingualism (*lr* 11, *lr* 12; see Table 13) to diglossia (*lr* 41, 42, also Table 13). Vaasa/Vasa itself is an officially bilingual town, with two locally strong languages of high prestige, Swedish and Finnish (*ra* 31, Table 14). Any kind of intercomprehension or *lingua receptiva* is impossible with Finnish (*scl* 11, Table 15), while in some cases, a good knowledge of Germanic languages could lead to some intercomprehension with Swedish (*scl* 12, Table 15). However, English is quite widely used in the host society as *lingua franca*, and it is known by all the mobile people (*scl* 22, Table 15). There are cases of social networks and communities of practices open to the host society (*scl* 321, *scl* 41; see Table 15), in particular with the Swedish-speaking community. On the whole, the attitudes for learning the local languages are instrumental (*lv* 12, Table 16), and the approach to Finnish or Swedish passes almost exclusively through formal education (*lv* 322, Table 16). The situation leads to the complete maintenance of the original repertoire and linguistic identity (*out* 11 in Table 17) and normally to an incomplete acquisition of one of the local languages in the best cases because passive command suffices (*out* 3321, Table 17).

In our perspective, different types of motivation are mirrored by different orientations of people in mobility towards inclusion: persons interested in being included in the social context tend to develop an integrative motivation towards learning the language(s) of the hosting area, while instrumental motivation might more easily be seen in people merely oriented towards inclusion in the job market. We will

therefore distinguish three profiles or ‘degrees’ of orientation towards inclusion, placing an intermediate degree between the two poles: ‘instrumental’ inclusion in the job market, ‘interactional’ inclusion in the hosting area and ‘integrative’ inclusion in the society. It is noteworthy to remember here that ‘unease’ is intended as a personal condition of the speaker, who can or cannot feel the need of mastering a particular set of the linguistic varieties available in the society—provided that institutions created the ‘just’ conditions for this goal to be eventually achieved. However, linguistic unease is caused not only by the personal condition of the speaker but also by the concrete situations of the civil society. In our view, reducing linguistic unease is a duty of the public institutions. In fact, they should raise the attention of the civil society towards the sociolinguistic needs of the mobile people, so that the latter will be more and more keen to be integrated—in the sense seen just above—into the hosting society as much as possible. The strategies to apply this goal depend on the context, and there is no “one-fit-for-all” language policy that can make everybody feel at ease.

In order to evaluate the success of language policies, it is good to start from the possible outcomes in terms of linguistic repertoire. Table 17 in particular illustrates the *Outcomes*, in which the possible consequences of the interaction of the variable *wrk* through *lv* are synthesised. We should consider at first the consequences on the original repertoire of the migrant: it could be completely maintained or, more commonly, one (or more) of the original codes can be lost, especially in cases in which the original context was diglossic. For example, we can imagine an Arabic-speaking person born in a diglossic area with French, standard Arabic and local Arabic moving to France: in the migration process, she/he can lose competence in one of the codes, most likely standard Arabic (the no more useful high code).

Attention should be given also to the acquisition of the repertoire of the host society: the new codes can be acquired (*out31*) so that the person is considered a mother tongue speaker (it happens often only in second-generation migrants); or (*out32*) the codes can be acquired as an L2, i.e. the pragmatic competence of the migrant speaker is possibly very high, but some interferences with the language situation of origin remain; or (*out33*), language acquisition is incomplete under different aspects. In the worst cases, the socioeconomical circumstances that have caused the migration as well as the education policy of the recipient country can lead to a situation of complete unease in both original and target language(s). It means that the linguistic competence of the speaker is not fitting the communicative requirements of the linguistic act she/he is about to perform, both in the language of origin and in the language(s) of the society in which she/he is living. At the same time, the symbolic value of her/his speech acts, if this linguistic uncertainty is not only related to the written language, is always perceived as misplaced. The last possible outcomes lead to different kind of severe linguistic unease—societies should take particular care in trying to avoid them.

## 5 Conclusions and Further Directions of Research

We argue that the assessment of sociolinguistic justice should pass through the promotion of linguistic ease. Multilingualism should be considered a natural state of humankind, not a kind of Babelic curse to be eradicated. Researchers should go beyond the Westphalian model of nation-state, which already proved to be insufficient to tackle the complexity of globalising and localising forces of the contemporary world, and therefore treat languages as socially constructed dynamic abstractions rather than static entities. It is therefore useful a fine-grained view of the linguistic intricacies in complex multilingual situations. Linguistic unease, we argue, essentially manifests along three axes: the diaphasic axis, i.e. along the formality of situations; the identity axis, represented by the sense of belonging and in-group relations; and, finally, special domains like school, writing and—possibly—administration. The impact of the three axes of linguistic unease in economic terms highly depends on the context of analysis, e.g. on the society, region or country under scrutiny. For instance, a state of high linguistic unease in formal situations can hinder efficiency in the public administration as the citizens feel insecure while relating to the public officers. Another example is linguistic unease at school. In fact, several tasks in schools are mainly language-based (e.g. geography, history but also art or philosophy), and such a linguistic unease can severely interfere with the overall performance and grades of the learners. On a societal level, these examples of linguistic unease will eventually influence the economic state of the society itself. The concrete application of linguistic unease may be explored in further research.

It is worth noting that linguistic ease as an absolute state of being is impossible to achieve in the real world; rather, a realistic goal is to reduce linguistic unease at the minimum whenever possible, unless major reasons intervene to justify special cases of linguistic unease in specific contexts. For example, it is perfectly acceptable to pass through linguistic unease during the learning process of an L2 in formal education such as in school, as that context is transitory, limited and highly controlled by the teachers. The same can be said for situations like very short stays within a community, either for travelling or short-term migrations—left alone the non-willingness of inclusion or the personal lack of unease feeling. In these particular cases, linguistic unease does not interfere with linguistic justice *per se*. However, generally speaking, linguistic unease is often a symptom of the fact that we are in a situation of linguistic injustice. For this reason, we hope that in the future the literature will take more into account sociolinguistic variables in the discourse around linguistic justice, having at the centre of their analysis not abstractly defined languages, but rather actual speakers and their language environment.

**Acknowledgements** The research leading to the present paper has received funding from the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme under grant agreement No. 613344 (Project MIME). The content and opinions expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the institutions supporting them.

## References

- Alcalde, J. (2015). Linguistic justice: an interdisciplinary overview of the literature. *A'dam Multiling*, 3, 27–96.
- Alcalde, J. (2018). Linguistic justice: an interdisciplinary overview of the literature. In M. Gazzola, T. Templin, & B.-A. Wickström (Eds.), *Language policy and linguistic justice* (pp. 65–149). Heidelberg: Springer.
- Ammon, U., Dittmar, N., Mattheier, K. J., & Trudgill, P. (Eds.). (2006/2008). *Sociolinguistics/Soziolinguistik. An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society/Ein internationales Handbuch zur Wissenschaft von Sprache und Gesellschaft* (Vol. 3, II ed.). Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bastardas i Boada, A. (2010). *Language and identity policies in the 'glocal' age: New processes, effect, and principles of organization*. Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Autònoms.
- Beaulac, S. (2004). The westphalian model in defining international law: Challenging the myth. *Australian Journal of Legal History*, 9, 181–213.
- Berruto, G. (1995). *Fondamenti di sociolinguistica*. Bari: Laterza.
- Bretegnier, A., & Ledegen, G. (Eds.). (2002). *Terrains et approches diversifiées, propositions théoriques et méthodologiques en hommage à Nicole Gueunier*. Paris: L'Harmattan/A.U.F.
- Dell'Aquila, V., & Iannàccaro, G. (2011). Numeri soggettivi. Spunti sulla vitalità linguistica da inchieste e trattamenti quantitativi. In B. Moretti, M. E. Pandolfi, & M. Casoni (Eds.), *Vitalità di una lingua minoritaria. Aspetti e proposte metodologiche/Vitality of a minority language. Aspects and methodological issues* (pp. 152–192). Bellinzona: Osservatorio Linguistico della Svizzera Italiana.
- Ferguson, C. (1959). Diglossia. *Word*, 15, 325–340.
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivations in second-language learning*. Roxley: Newbury House.
- Gobbo, F. (2014). Review: of Bastardas i Boada (2010). *Language Problems & Language Planning*, 38(1), 87–90.
- Gobbo, F. (2015). Transnational communication in a 'glocalized' world: In search of balanced multilingualism. *JKI Language, Communication, Information*, 10, 121–131.
- Goebel, H., Nelde, P. H., Starý, Z., & Wölck, W. (Eds.). (1996/1997). *Kontaktlinguistik/Contact Linguistics/Linguistique de Contact* (Vol. 2). Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Haugen, E. (1959). Planning for a standard language in modern Norway. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 1, 8–21.
- Houtkamp, C. (2014). Integrating language in theories on long-distance movement: Migration vs mobility and the concept of motility. *A'dam Multiling*, 2, 16–26.
- Iannàccaro, G. (2010). *Lingue di minoranza e scuola. A dieci anni dalla legge 482/99. Il plurilinguismo scolastico nelle comunità di minoranza della Repubblica Italiana*. Quaderni della Direzione Generale per gli Ordinamenti Scolastici e per l'Autonomia Scolastica 1. Roma: Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca.
- Iannàccaro, G., & Dell'Aquila, V. (2006). Survey ladins. *Usi linguistici nelle valli ladine*. Trento: Regione Autonoma Trentino-Alto Adige/Südtirol.
- Iannàccaro, G., & Negro, S. D. (2003). 'Qui parliamo tutti uguale, ma diverso'. Repertori complessi e interventi sulle lingue. In A. Valentini, P. Molinelli, P. Cuzzolin, & G. Bernini (Eds.), *Ecologia linguistica* (pp. 431–450). Roma: Bulzoni.
- Kachru, Y., & Smith, L. (2009). The karmic cycle of World Englishes: Some futuristic constructs. *World Englishes*, 28(1), 1–14.
- Kloss, H. (1952). *Die Entwicklung neuer germanischer Kultursprachen seit 1800*. München: Pohl.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lyons, J. (1981). *Language and Linguistics: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Oakes, L. (2007). Whose French? Language attitudes, linguistic insecurity and standardization in Quebec. In H. Martin (Ed.), *Language issues in Canada: Multidisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 64–86). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.
- Phillipson, R. (2008). Lingua Franca or Lingua Frankensteinia? English in European integration and globalisation. *World Englishes*, 27, 250–284.
- Pike, K. L. (1967). *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behavior*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education, or worldwide diversity and human rights?* Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate.