



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Social Inclusion and Multilingualism: The Impact of Linguistic Justice, Economy of Language and Language Policy

Marácz, L.; Csata, Z.

Publication date

2021

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Social Inclusion

License

CC BY

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Marácz, L. (Guest ed.), & Csata, Z. (Guest ed.) (2021). Social Inclusion and Multilingualism: The Impact of Linguistic Justice, Economy of Language and Language Policy. *Social Inclusion*, 9(1). <https://www.cogitatiopress.com/socialinclusion/issue/view/214>

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.

Social Inclusion

Open Access Journal | ISSN: 2183-2803

Volume 9, Issue 1 (2021)

Social Inclusion and Multilingualism: The Impact of Linguistic Justice, Economy of Language and Language Policy

Editors

László Marác and Zsombor Csata

Social Inclusion, 2021, Volume 9, Issue 1

Social Inclusion and Multilingualism: The Impact of Linguistic Justice, Economy of Language and Language Policy

Published by Cogitatio Press

Rua Fialho de Almeida 14, 2º Esq.,

1070-129 Lisbon

Portugal

Academic Editors

László Marác (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands / L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Kazakhstan)

Zsombor Csata (Babeş-Bolyai University, Romania / Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Hungary)

Available online at: www.cogitatiopress.com/socialinclusion

This issue is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY). Articles may be reproduced provided that credit is given to the original and *Social Inclusion* is acknowledged as the original venue of publication.

Table of Contents

Social Inclusion and Multilingualism: Linguistic Justice and Language Policy Zsombor Csata and László Marác	1–4
Translation as a Communication Strategy in Representing National Culture Aizhan Akkaliyeva, Baktigul Abdykhanova, Lyazat Meirambekova, Zhanar Jambaeyva and Galiya Tussupbekova	5–13
Multilingualism and Social Inclusion in Scotland: Language Options and Ligatures of the “1+2 Language Approach” Argyro Kanaki	14–23
Linguistic Diversity as a Challenge for Street-Level Bureaucrats in a Monolingually-Oriented Organisation Elisabeth Scheibelhofer, Clara Holzinger and Anna-Katharina Draxl	24–34
Controlled Multilingual Thesauri for Kazakh Industry-Specific Terms Ainur Bayekeyeva, Saule Tazhibayeva, Zhainagul Beisenova, Aigul Shaheen and Aisaule Bayekeyeva	35–44
Language Provision in the Scottish Public Sector: Recommendations to Promote Inclusive Practice Róisín McKelvey	45–55
Multilingual Education in the Republic of Kazakhstan: Problems and Prospects Nurmira Zhumay, Saule Tazhibayeva, Azhar Shaldarbekova, Botagoz Jabasheva, Ainur Naimanbay and Aigul Sandybayeva	56–62
Members of the Polish Language Council on the Problems of Linguistic Diversity and Linguistic Inclusion in Poland Tadeusz Wallas and Bartosz Hordecki	63–74
Two Linguas Francas? Social Inclusion through English and Esperanto Federico Gobbo and László Marác	75–84

Editorial

Social Inclusion and Multilingualism: Linguistic Justice and Language Policy

Zsombor Csata ^{1,2,*} and László Marác ^{3,4}¹ Centre for Social Sciences, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, 1097 Budapest, Hungary; E-Mail: csata.zsombor@tk.mta.hu² Faculty of Sociology and Social Work, Babeş-Bolyai University, 400604 Cluj Napoca, Romania³ Faculty of Humanities, University of Amsterdam, 1012 CX Amsterdam, The Netherlands; E-Mail: l.k.maracz@uva.nl⁴ Department of International Relations, L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, 010000 Astana, Kazakhstan

* Corresponding author

Submitted: 17 December 2020 | Published: 14 January 2021

Abstract

Multilingual or linguistically heterogeneous societies are increasing around the globe. Socio-political processes, like Europeanization and globalization, are responsible for this expansion. Universal norms and standards for language use and identity are spreading, mediated by international organizations and charters. In this view, multilingualism can be seen as a challenge to national social cohesion, though it remained undisputed before the development of global multi-level governance. In many places, languages of traditional territorial minorities have been recognized and given official status, leading in some cases to new forms of local, regional, and national governance. Furthermore, the proliferation of multilingualism is boosted by a variety of forms of mobility, where mobility is understood as physical migration or new forms of virtual mobility connected to digital networks. Mobility in this sense underpins the linguistic and transnational identity of the migrants who bring new languages with them. One of the questions in need of analysis is the circumstances and conditions that lead to the inclusion/exclusion from society of specific linguistic groups with shared linguistic features. This thematic issue wants to address the apparent schism between multilingualism and social inclusion as well as the language policy and planning pursued by supranational institutions, states, and societal organizations in their efforts tackle it. In this issue, the focus of study of linguistically diverse societies will be on the closely interrelated dependencies which impact language policy and planning.

Keywords

communication strategies; economy of language; language policy; linguistic justice; mobility; multilingualism; social inclusion

Issue

This editorial is part of the issue “Social Inclusion and Multilingualism: The Impact of Linguistic Justice, Economy of Language and Language Policy” edited by László Marác (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands / L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Kazakhstan) and Zsombor Csata (Babeş-Bolyai University, Romania / Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Hungary).

© 2021 by the authors; licensee Cogitatio (Lisbon, Portugal). This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY).

1. Introduction

In the context of globalization and its ensuing superdiversity, creating fair and effective linguistic governance is a very complex challenge and there are no ‘one size fits all’ solutions. Several attempts have been undertaken so far to categorize and to create comprehensive typolo-

gies of these strategies. One of these initiatives is the toolkit for multilingual and transnational communication (henceforth referred simply as the Toolkit; Jørgensen, 2011) which describes four communicative strategies that can be used in situations where speakers of different mother tongues converse together. These are the English as a lingua franca, the use of a regional lingua franca,

receptive multilingualism and code-switching (Marácz, 2018). A Toolkit approach can be developed and implemented in a number of ways. First, it can inspire a fundamental rethinking and reorientation of the traditional 'foreign language' field in education systems. Its philosophy can also be fitted into the framework of citizenship courses for migrants and other newcomers, as well into the development of adult education in general, as part of a life-long learning concept. The European language policy recommendations (Commission of the European Communities, 2003), for instance, the "1+2" Barcelona formula for language learning, should be accommodated by the Toolkit, which is a more complex containment strategy to guarantee that global English and other multilingual and transnational communication strategies do not limit but rather support mobility and inclusion.

A variety of strategies presented above are critically evaluated by the authors of this issue. Most of these policies propose multilingual solutions relying on actors being committed to the protection and promotion of cultural diversity based on the principles of fairness and dignity—objectives which are, however, often neglected by the utility-based hierarchization of languages as a result of the pressure from neoliberal governmentality in education and in public management. Another set of solutions offered by the authors in this issue to address the schism between multilingualism and social inclusion revolve around the use of a lingua franca in communication. English is on the rise as a global lingua franca, but there are concerns that it is not a perfect solution to avoid creating a range of asymmetries and hierarchies in linguistically diverse societies. Furthermore, there is uncertainty as to whether global English is adequate to create a more just and fairer world. Alternatives involving other lingua francas (Esperanto, Russian, etc.) are offered. Below, these solutions are presented in more detail through the lenses of the authors and their case studies.

2. Multilingual Solutions

Marketization and neoliberal governmentality have an increasing impact on how linguistically diverse societies operate. The dominance of neoliberal market principles in large parts of the world might result in the proliferation of multilingualism and linguistically diverse societies, but it hardly leads to more linguistic justice, mostly because of negative externalities stemming from individual decisions regarding the provision of language-related goods (Gazzola, Wickström, & Templin, 2018, p. 34).

Countries promoting multilingual solutions, as evidenced by most of the articles in this issue (i.e., Austria, Scotland, and more recently also in Poland) largely acknowledge that there is a need for coordinated action from the governments to deal with this issue, and the public sector has a crucial role to play in this process. However, the effectiveness of public intervention is hampered by the fact that linguistic policies on education and

public services themselves are set to increasingly follow the rules of a chronically underfunded new public management, organized along with the neoliberal principles of efficiency.

Signs of neoliberal governmentality have already emerged in the underlying ideologies of language policy-making. In this respect, the study of the Polish Language Council is eloquent (Hordecki & Wallas, 2021). In the public narratives of the Council, the preservation of linguistic identity and the recognition of equal dignity is present alongside utility-based approaches, where language is perceived as a resource, an asset, a strategic device in the individual empowerment of people. This latter argument, intensively promoted and largely interiorized by public employees, including those in the education, reduces the value of linguistic diversity to the economic, pecuniary criterion. The author remarks that the Polish Language Council, as an epistemological community and an important actor in crafting the public debate on linguistic diversity, does not address the problem in sufficient depth. As a result, although they are not necessarily irreconcilable, the preservation of linguistic diversity and the utility-based approaches do often conflict and the recognition of equal dignity might be put at risk by a marketing of diversity (Kraus & Kazlauskaitė-Gürbüz, 2014, p. 519), and efficiency might be prioritized over fairness (Grin & Civico, 2018, p. 6). The dominance of economic imperatives lies also behind the argument that migration processes "do not pose any threat to the Polish language, but on the contrary—prove its power and attractiveness, highlighting the fact that Polish is becoming an international language in Central Europe" (as cited in Hordecki & Wallas, 2021, p. 70)—an explicit reference to the legitimacy of international competition between languages. Tactical schemes built on reciprocity also show up in these arguments, i.e., teaching the language of immigrants in schools is a rewarding investment for the Polish government, as it increases the chances of the Polish diaspora gaining similar language rights in the Western countries that they emigrated to.

The prevalence of utility-based perspectives is perhaps the most eloquent in education policy. In Kanaki's (2021) article on Scotland, this problem is embodied in the dilemma of ligatures and options introduced by Kraus and Kazlauskaitė-Gürbüz (2014). The author argues that despite a more balanced and nuanced public discourse on language issues in Scotland, language skills offer 'options' rather than 'ligatures' for students to become "confident individuals, effective contributors and responsible citizens" (Kanaki, 2021, p. 21). As 'clients' of the education system they are required to make wise linguistic decisions for their personal careers. Meanwhile, the effective linguistic supply is quite hierarchical: In Scotland, as in Poland, international languages which offer greater employability and have higher market value are primarily offered for study even in the "1 + 2" Language Approach scheme, to the detriment of regional/community languages. The name of the project

“The Trinity of Languages” speaks for itself when it is about giving purposeful priorities to the global and regional lingua francas in Kazakhstan’s education policies (i.e., English and Russian; see Zhumay et al., 2021).

Expectations about the entrepreneurial self are also pronounced when it comes to getting a job, but even in the context of super-diversity, the linguistic choices remain rather limited. An illustrative example in this respect is offered by Scheibelhofer, Holzinger, and Draxl (2021). In the offices of the Austrian Public Employment Service, knowledge of German language remains a tacit institutional expectation from the clients (mostly jobseekers), and in everyday interactions, multilingual communication is used only as an emergency solution. In addition, as a result of neoliberal management logic, the scope of the interventions is limited to the (re)integration of clients in the labor market. Meanwhile the facilitation of access to resources—regardless of their linguistic conditionality—remains secondary. This is also explained by the chronic underfunding and understaffing of these institutions, and by the consequent workplace pressures and alienation among employees. It is not a coincidence that most of the officials interviewed were surprisingly enthusiastic to take part in the study, being happy to have someone listen to them.

Some of these problems also appear in the Scottish public institutions examined by McKelvey (2021), many services reported similar practical challenges, such as difficulties in engaging sufficient numbers of interpreters and concerns about ensuring high-quality language support. Overall, the changes induced by neoliberal governance, due to the withdrawal of resources along with the internalization of client-based narratives on efficiency by the officials, create and maintain ad-hoc and inconsistent linguistic solutions in the public service.

Furthermore, the cases presented in this issue come from countries which have ratified the conventions created for the protection of minority languages, resulting in language policies and practices that are more likely to take the principles of dignity and fairness seriously. Even in this context, the situation is likely to become complicated in those places where a significant number of ‘historical’ minorities lives and actions of arbitrage should also take place along with the those targeting the protection and promotion of languages (Grin & Civico, 2018). In such cases, the preservation of diversity is an even greater challenge; multiculturalism and multilingualism risk remaining empty phraseologies as long as (linguistic) differences are transformed into social and economic inequalities on the ground of utilitarian efficiency.

3. Lingua Franca Solutions

Globalization increases the frequency of contact with linguistic diversity, making multilingual and transnational communication strategies ever more relevant. One of these transnational communication strategies involves lingua franca communication. A lingua franca

is a non-native bridge language used by interlocutors for communicative purposes, i.e., L1. Many commentators observe that English is the global lingua franca, although from a linguistic and sociolinguistic perspective the global spread of English raises significant problems. These problems arise in two different forms, depending on how this process is interpreted. If we view it as the spread of a standard variant of English, we may be facing a case of linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 2006) with detrimental effects on linguistic justice. If, on the contrary, we view this process as the dissemination of something radically different from English, something often referred to, by its proponents, as English as a lingua franca (ELF). In the literature, ELF is indeed sometimes used to refer to English as spoken by non-native speakers, with morphological and lexical features that depart from those of standard English (for an extensive discussion of ELF see Gobbo & Marácz, 2021). ELF advocates claim that these non-standard characteristics should be accepted. This would, so the argument goes, democratize international communication and strip English of its potentially imperialistic character. Such a view, unfortunately, suffers from serious limitations. However, Gobbo and Marácz (2021) argue that the vehicle of lingua franca communication between interlocutors involved should be rather a neutral language, which, like Esperanto, would guarantee maximal social inclusion.

For others, the issue of a global lingua franca is more than English-only and involves other lingua francas alongside global English. A number of languages of wider communication are already competing with global English for the status of (regional) lingua franca. In former parts of the Soviet Union, Russian is still being used as a regional lingua franca. Kazakhstan, a country within the former Soviet and the contemporary Russian orbit has even adopted an official trilingual policy, including an equally prominent status for native Kazakh, Russian, and English. Akkaliyeva, Abdykhanova, Meirambekova, Jambaeyva, and Tussupbekova (2021) convincingly argue in their contribution that Russian functions as a pivot between Kazakh and English in the translation of literary texts. Bayekeyeva, Tazhibayeva, Beisenova, Shaheen, and Bayekeyeva (2021) make a similar point in connection with multilingual thesauri for Kazakh industry-specific terms where Russian mediates between the Kazakh and English languages.

Acknowledgments

The research leading to these results has received funding from the National Research, Development and Innovation Office of Hungary, under grant agreement no. FK 125276.

Conflict of Interests

The authors declare no conflict of interests.

References

- Akkaliyeva, A., Abdykhanova, B., Meirambekova, L., Jambaeyva, Z., & Tussupbekova, G. (2021). Translation as a communication strategy in representing national culture. *Social Inclusion*, 9(1), 5–13.
- Bayekeyeva, A. T., Tazhibayeva, S. Z., Beisenova, Z. S., Shaheen, A. A., & Bayekeyeva, A. T. (2021). Controlled multilingual thesauri for Kazakh industry-specific terms. *Social Inclusion*, 9(1), 35–44.
- Commission of the European Communities. (2003). *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, 2003: Promoting language learning and linguistic diversity: An action plan 2004–2006*. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities. Retrieved from <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2003:0449:FIN:en:PDF>
- Gazzola, M., Wickström, B. A., & Templin, T. (2018). Can the free market manage language diversity? In F. Grin, M. C. Conceição, P. A. Kraus, L. Marác, Ž. Ozoliņa, N. Pokorn, A. Pym (Eds.), *The MIME vademecum: Mobility and inclusion in multilingual Europe* (pp. 34–35). Grandson: Artgraphic Cavin SA.
- Gobbo, F., & Marác, L. K. (2021). Two linguas francas? Social inclusion through English and Esperanto. *Social Inclusion*, 9(1), 75–84.
- Grin, F., & Civico, M. (2018). Why can't language questions just be left to themselves? In F. Grin, M. C. Conceição, P. A. Kraus, L. Marác, Ž. Ozoliņa, N. Pokorn, A. Pym (Eds.), *The MIME vademecum: Mobility and inclusion in multilingual Europe* (pp. 30–31). Grandson: Artgraphic Cavin SA.
- Hordecki, B., & Wallas, T. (2021). Members of the Polish Language Council on the problems of linguistic diversity and linguistic inclusion in Poland. *Social Inclusion*, 9(1), 63–74.
- Jørgensen, J. N. (Ed.). (2011). *A toolkit for transnational communication in Europe*. Copenhagen: Faculty of Humanities, University of Copenhagen.
- Kanaki, A. (2021). Multilingualism and social inclusion in Scotland: Language options and ligatures of the “1+2 language approach.” *Social Inclusion*, 9(1), 14–23.
- Kraus, P. A., & Kazlauskaitė-Gürbüz, R. (2014). Addressing linguistic diversity in the European Union: Strategies and dilemmas. *Ethnicities*, 14(4), 517–538.
- Marác, L. K. (2018). Why should we combine different communication strategies? F. Grin, M. C. Conceição, P. A. Kraus, L. Marác, Ž. Ozoliņa, N. Pokorn, A. Pym (Eds.), *The MIME vademecum: Mobility and inclusion in multilingual Europe* (pp. 102–103). Grandson: Artgraphic Cavin SA.
- McKelvey, R. (2021). Language provision in the Scottish public sector: Recommendations to promote inclusive practice. *Social Inclusion*, 9(1), 45–55.
- Phillipson, R. (2006). *English-only Europe? Challenging language policy*. London: Routledge.
- Scheibelhofer, E., Holzinger, C., & Draxl, A.-K. (2021). Linguistic diversity as a challenge for street-level bureaucrats in a monolingually-oriented organisation. *Social Inclusion*, 9(1), 24–34.
- Zhumay, N., Tazhibayeva, S., Shaldarbekova, A. Jabaheva, B., Naimanbay, A., & Sandybayeva, A. (2021). Multilingual education in the republic of Kazakhstan: Problems and prospects. *Social Inclusion*, 9(1), 56–62.

About the Authors



Zsombor Csata is an Economic Sociologist, a Research Fellow at the Centre for Social Sciences in Budapest, Hungary, and an Associate Professor at the Faculty of Sociology and Social Work, Babeş-Bolyai University, Romania. He has conducted several research projects on ethnicity, entrepreneurship, and regional development in Central and Eastern Europe. Lately, his research has been focused on the economic aspects of multiculturalism and the socioeconomics of language. He holds a PhD in Sociology at BBU and was a Fulbright Scholar at the University of Texas at Austin and a Julius Rezler Scholar at Indiana University in Bloomington.



László Marác has defended his PhD dissertation in General Linguistics at the University of Groningen in 1989. Since 1992, he has been affiliated as a Senior Lecturer to the Department of European Studies at the University of Amsterdam. In 2015, László Marác was awarded the title of Honorary Professor at the L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University in Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan. He was Vice-Coordinator of the MIME consortium that won the European FP7-tender in 2013 on the “Multilingual Challenge for the European Citizen.”

Article

Translation as a Communication Strategy in Representing National Culture

Aizhan Akkaliyeva^{1,*}, Baktigul Abdykhanova², Lyazat Meirambekova³, Zhanar Jambaeyva⁴
and Galiya Tussupbekova⁵

¹ Department of Translation Studies, L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, 010000 Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan;
E-Mail: akkaliyeva.aizhan@mail.ru

² Department of Foreign and Russian Philology, Shakarim State University of Semey, 070000 Semey, Kazakhstan;
E-Mail: abdychanovab@mail.ru

³ Department of Foreign Languages, Faculty of International Relations, L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University,
010000 Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan; E-Mail: Imeyrambekova@mail.ru

⁴ Department of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, 010000 Nur-Sultan,
Kazakhstan; E-Mail: sgpi@mail.ru

⁵ Department of Kazakh Language and Literature, Shakarim State University of Semey, 070000 Semey, Kazakhstan;
E-Mail: autovna67@mail.ru

* Corresponding author

Submitted: 31 July 2020 | Accepted: 15 September 2020 | Published: 14 January 2021

Abstract

The linguistic trinity policy, which has been implemented in Kazakhstan since its independence in the 1990s, is aimed at integrating translation into global processes. Kazakh-Russian bilingualism, caused by the historical and geopolitical proximity of the two countries, is now turning into trilingualism, joining up with English as the dominant language for international communication. Literary translation as a part of cross-cultural communication is also involved in social inclusion processes, contributing to the exchange of cultural values and a better understanding of modern multilingual Kazakhstani society. This article focuses on the issue of presenting Kazakh literature in translation through a mediating language and the research involves an analysis of culture-related lexemes as representations of a nomadic lifestyle in the mirror of intercultural communication. The authors highlight cultural and linguistic aspects of Kazakh transmitted from the mediatory Russian into the target English. Based on a review of previous findings on indirect literary translation, this article discusses whether a mediating language affects the inclusion of Kazakh culture in the globalization process.

Keywords

bilingualism; culture-related realia; intercultural communication; literary translation; national literature; translation

Issue

This article is part of the issue “Social Inclusion and Multilingualism: The Impact of Linguistic Justice, Economy of Language and Language Policy” edited by László Marác (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands / L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Kazakhstan) and Zsombor Csata (Babeş-Bolyai University, Romania / Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Hungary).

© 2021 by the authors; licensee Cogitatio (Lisbon, Portugal). This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY).

1. Introduction

Literature and translation are two connected spheres, the former being able to migrate into other cultures via translation. Even though literary translations have often been considered inferior compared to their sources, new literary forms and ideas, borrowed from a foreign lan-

guage culture through translation, have contributed to the development of a national literature moving in new directions (Woodsworth, 2013, p. 72).

In the context of globalization, literary translation can serve as an indicator of the relationships of “minor-dominant” cultures, when the translation is carried out through an intermediary language. In this regard, the

role of the indirect translation expands as it becomes a connecting tie between an original text and a target reader. Besides, translation either direct or indirect is a factor leading to greater diversity and thus a contributor to the internal differentiation of national literature (Levy, 1974).

In the modern science of translation, there is still no definite concept characterizing indirect translation. On the one hand, there is a clear negative attitude to this type of translation, reflected in UNESCO's request that translation be made from the original language (Pieta, 2014). On the other hand, it is necessary that, as a means of communication between peripheral and dominant cultures, the issue of indirect translation be kept sharp and twofold (Pieta, 2017; Ringmar, 2007). Indirect translation makes possible the dissemination of minor literatures worldwide. In this case, indirect translation is a more efficient means for the inclusion of cultural products from peripheral cultures (Witt, 2017). Furthermore, there is a need to study not only translated texts but also cultures as, within the process of literary translation, the phenomenon of cultural asymmetry is observed. To detect these asymmetries, an analysis of the economic and political processes in the source and target society could increasingly reveal the constraints in the production and reproduction of texts (Lambert, 2006).

The literature of the former Soviet republics attracts little attention among western scholars, admits Chernetsky (2011) when considering Ukrainian literature in translation. Kazakh literature has shared the same fate and the history of its development and translation asks for rigorous study.

Generally, Kazakh literature is considered to be peripheral and its translation exemplifies an interesting model of a mediating relationship between national and world literatures through the Russian language. The striking point in these relations is that Kazakh-Russian bilingualism has become part and feature of the national literature and culture, conditioned by historical and geopolitical events. One of the manifestations of bilingualism in fiction is the mixture of multilingual elements.

The change of cultural and civilization paradigms at the turn of the last two centuries, the structuring of a new geopolitical and cultural-spiritual space, has led to a new stream of studies that contributed to the disclosure of the phenomenon of creative bilingualism (Bakhtikireeva, 2005), that is, a perception of the world by bilingual writers as a "linguistic" world (Tumanova, 2012). It has been argued that the linguistic situation in modern Kazakhstan differs significantly from that of the Soviet period concerning everyday interaction and in literature. It is bilingualism that supports intercultural dialogue and contributes to the formation of ethnic, social, ideological, and communicative tolerance in modern Kazakhstani community (Tuksaitova, 2007).

François, Marácz, Pokorn, and Kraus (2018, p. 103) state that translation, like other communication strate-

gies, can be used to favor mobility and inclusion in global communication. In this regard translation of literary works via mediating language can be accepted as a creative transnational interaction and contribute to the policy of linguistic diversity and linguistic justice.

As has been established, for a long time, in all of the republics of the former Soviet Union, the study of Russian as a state-forming language attracted more attention, while other national languages were relegated to the background due to their limited use in various spheres of society.

Authors from the indigenous Kazakh nation used more Russian in their work, and this linguistic situation has suffered significant changes since the emergence of newly independent states due to new understandings of the role of native languages and changes in the linguistic consciousness of authors. Kazakhstani writers more actively use the potential of their native language and culture, or the titular language of the ethnic group, when describing their surrounding reality. As a result, the use of Kazakh-Russian bilingualism—with the predominance of the Kazakh language—and Russian-Kazakh bilingualism—with the predominance of the Russian language—has become widespread in Kazakhstan. This has regularly been an object of interest for Kazakh linguists (Amalbekova, 2010).

So, the problem of literary translation from and into Kazakh should be approached from the point of view of multilingualism or, to be more precise, bilingualism as, in the system of translation in Kazakhstan and Central Asia, the Russian language acts as a polyfunctional means of communication, serving as a source, mediating, and intra-national language (Khasanov, 1987).

The history of Kazakh translation is closely connected and intertwined with the Soviet science of translation. The process of formation of the canons of Russian-Kazakh literary translation stretches back to tsarist times, when trade, political and diplomatic relations were established. At the time of the Soviet regime, translation of Kazakh literature was completely under the control of censorship. This process is a characteristic of the national literature of all post-Soviet republics. As Witt (2017) argues, literary translation in the Soviet Union, where a totalitarian regime ruled, attracts little academic attention, though the practices that existed in that period might 'highlight the question of translation and power' and be a brilliant example of 'interlinear translation in the Soviet context.' Literary translation in the former republics of the Soviet Union was implemented with the help of *trots* or *podstochniki* (indirect translation) and more often implied culture planning, according to G. Toury (Witt, 2011).

Russian scholars considered indirect translation as a factor contributing to the development of the Soviet school of poetic translation, in spite of the fact that the mass character of translations from national languages into Russian lowered the quality of "the product" (Nikonova, 2008).

With regard to the Kazakh history of translation, by the end of the 1990s, a cohort of bilingual native speaker translators who had fully mastered two languages had formed in Kazakhstan. Kazakhstan's literary translation was already moving to a new level of quality at that moment: This became an era of conceptual translation and translation-interpretation (Bakhtikireeva, 2009).

In this article, we examine the issue of indirect translation in the context of the equivalence of cultural and linguistic realias representing the Kazakh culture. We emphasize the fact that, in spite of the presence of the mediating language, modern standards of literary translation allow the transposition of both artistic and national specifics of a work of fiction. Moreover, the phenomenon of Kazakh-Russian or Russian-Kazakh bilingualism has contributed to lessening semantic losses during the process of indirect translation as a great range of vocabulary in Kazakh and Russian is based on notions that embrace bilingualism.

2. Methods and Materials

Russian and English variants of the translation of the novel *Aq Boz Yui* by the well-known Kazakh writer Smagul Yelubay (2008) were used as empirical material for our research. The novel was translated into Russian by Kazakh translator L. Kosmukhamedova and the English translation was performed by American translator K. Fitzpatric, known for her translations of Soviet authors.

The main material, including cultural and linguistic realias, was subjected to linguistic and statistical analysis using comparative and statistical methods. In total, we collected 500 lexical units, referred to as culture-specific terms, but for this article only a minor part of the lexemes have been considered, constituting about 100 lexical units.

The method of linguistic analysis makes it possible to reveal different methods of transposing realias into the target language through the interlinear language and to evaluate the losses and gains in the process of interlingual interaction. The use of statistical analysis allows us to establish the level of linguistic loss and, thus, assess the role of the interlinear language in the process.

3. Discussion

Aq Boz Yui is composed of three parts depicting the most sorrowful events in the history of Kazakhstan in the 1930s, the Holodomor. Conquest (1986) claims that the Holodomor, the disastrous famine, was caused by the failed policies of the Soviet government on the territories of Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and other soviet republics. Human losses in Kazakhstan were staggering, with nearly seven million people dying in the horrific famine. Historians argue that it might have been ethnic genocide (Kotkin, 2014). The novel arouses interest not only through its linguistic content but also through the

descriptions of the social and cultural events which took place during this historical period.

The author opened up the world in which Kazakhs lived at that time, with its everyday lifestyles, language, and unique system of tribal order having been destroyed by the new political formation (Zhaksylykov, 2013). It is essential to reconsider historic events and recover our ethnic roots to preserve our national identity and to interact with other cultures. It should be noted that in the 1980s, when Yelubay was creating this work, the topic of the Holodomor in former soviets was banned.

As far as the linguistic features of the novel are concerned, the range of specific vocabulary used by the author is worth mentioning. As Nida (1964) asserts, different languages display different concentrations of vocabulary; this depends on the cultural focus of the given ethnos in the matter under consideration. The ethnos of the Nuers of the Sudan is known for having a great number of terms relating to cattle, the Arabs have an intensive vocabulary for camels, and the same trend is found in the Kazakh language. In this article we will discuss the problem of translatability and ways of finding equivalents to these cultural realias in the context of indirect translation.

Any time the issue of equivalence is considered, either structural or dynamic, we should keep in mind three types of relatedness, 'as determined by the linguistic and cultural distance between codes used to convey the messages' (Nida, 1964, p. 160).

In the case of Kazakh-English translations, we have two different languages and cultures, though the existence of the intermediary language, Russian, plays a significant role in making intercommunication more accessible. Regarding this, it is agreed that, according to some authors (Catford, 1965; Fawcett, 1997) the semi-otic approach to solving the problem of cultural losses or untranslatability is evidently favorable. It allows the translator not only to search for equivalence of meaning but to go deeper into semantic content and the pragmatic context.

The lexical system of the Kazakh language is characterized by the presence of different synonymous notions related to a general one, e.g.: There are more than 13 notions to indicate male representatives of various ages, more than 20 words to denote dairy products, and up to 25 synonyms for the term "species" (Belger, 2009). The existence of hyponymic structures in the source language can cause difficulties for translators, and we provide linguistic comments on the use of these specific terms.

The bulk of cultural terms from the novel have been subdivided into four groups:

1. Cattle nomination
2. Russian and Kazakh borrowings
3. Religion-related notions
4. Culture-specific terms for items of clothing

The terms related to livestock were few in the novel but, as they were more specific in structure and semantics, they were thought to present interest in terms of translation.

3.1. Cattle Nomination

In general, Kazakhs employ about one hundred notions for denoting camel but in the framework of our research, we have analyzed the use of twenty notions. These include *nar* (single-horned), *bura* (two-humped sire), *ulek* (purebred camel), *kaspak* (half-bred from single-horned sire and two-humped female), *zhalbaya* (camel stallion), *zhalbay* (with humps in different directions), *aruana* (single-horned female camel), *ingen* (milking cow), *atan* (emasculated), *arvan* (a pack camel breed), *kaiyma* (primiparous camel), *buyrshyn* (young stallion), *bota* (calf), *tailak* (over one year old), *tumsa* (young female), *zhampoz* (a kind of zhalbay), *maya* (aruana offspring), amongst others. In the winter, all the camels are called “thick-woolen,” but in summer they are *kara kaiys tuie*, which means “black as rawhide.” In autumn they are referred to as *bozdakty tuie*, where *bozdak* means “undercoat left after the spring wool cutting.” This list can be enlarged with the following lexemes: *lek* (single-horned sire), *narsha* (three year old), *kunazhyn* (a species between three and four years old), *eki tysty* (a four year-old, literally meaning “two-teethed”), and *tort-tisti* (a full-grown adult, literally “four-teethed”). The lexeme *aruana* can be widened to describe not just a one-humped camel, but a purebred female, with thick wool on the nape and a lush long tail.

Having such a variety of lexemes in Kazakh produces many obstacles for translators (Belger, 2009). But in both stages of translation, camel-related terms preserve their main semantic meaning by the use of explanatory translation.

Cattle-nominating specific terms represent the Kazakh nomadic lifestyle they followed before the establishment of the Soviet regime in the Kazakh steppes. Camels and horses comprised a significant part of the workforce in the nomadic household, so the fact that Kazakh authors address the images of animals in their works is logically assumed.

In Yelubay’s novel, the camel is not the central figure, but the author often assigns a significant role to its image. The camel for the Kazakhs, who led a nomadic lifestyle up until the 1920s, was an important part of everyday life and served as a means of transportation during their migration from their winter to their summer settlements. So, there are many detailed descriptions of camels’ behavior in works of fiction, even their individual traits of character are depicted colorfully.

In the novel, we deal mostly with generic names. When translating into Russian, the use of the lexemes *verblyud*, *nar*, and *dromader* prevail in the translation of Kazakh hyponyms. There are some cases when the meaning of specific words denoting “camels” has been trans-

formed through transliteration or by adding explanatory notes. Here are some examples of this:

Kazakh: *Shoiynqara* túksiip sidaan-sidaan jelgen shi *borbai aruana, ingen, maia, qunanshalarǵa* suzile qaraidy. Bul Shoiynqaranyń úiri edi (Yelubay, 2008, p. 35, emphasis by the authors)

Russian: *Shoiynkara*, obrosshi klochmi shersti tak, chto ona svysala i s mordy, totchas oshshetinihsia, pristalno, v upor razgliadyvaia zamelkavshih pered ego glazami, *tonkonogih verbliýdic s oblezlymi lia-jkami, odnogorbyh i dvýgorbyh, molodyh i ne sovsem molodyh*. Eto bylo ego stado, kotorogo vse leto on byl polnovlastnym vojakom. (Yelubay, 2009, p. 26, emphasis by the authors)

English: *Shoiynqara* with overgrown clumps of fur even hanging from his mouth, bristled, stared fast at the *slender-legged female camel with bare thighs, one-humped and two-humped, young and not so young, flashing before his eyes*. (Yelubay, 2016, p. 46, emphasis by the authors)

In the English translation, the most common method of translation used is explanatory, whereby a term describing a specific kind or breed of a camel is transposed through attributive or nominative word structures: slender-legged female camel with bare thighs; one-humped and two-humped; young and not so young.

Here is an example of an excerpt describing a huge black camel, which serves as a character in the plot of the novel. The camel was named Shoiynqara; the name of the camel carries a semantic load in a pragmatic sense and, therefore, requires clarification. If translated literally, it means “as black, as coal and mighty.” The camel symbolizes the “black” power inherent in the common working people. Besides this, in Asian cultures, the camel symbolizes obedience as it easily kneels before being loaded (Skrobonja et al., 2001). The death of the camel on the grave of one of the respected and honored citizens among the Kazakhs symbolizes the fall of the old nomadic style under the ruthless and heavy burden of the socialist system.

The camel in the life of the Kazakhs was not only a means of transportation but also a form of exchange or currency. In the years of famine, people went to neighboring countries in search of work and food and for their work, they got camels. It should be acknowledged that the presence of a camel in the economy of nomads meant a secure and comfortable life. In one episode depicted in the novel, we meet with various names of camels, denoting the breed and age of the animals:

Kazakh: Pirimkúl jylyna *bir túie* alasyń deidi erbek aqyńa. Sonda, bai bularǵa keleniń ishindegi er jaman *qotyrtailaq* pen *qatpa marany* beredi. (Yelubay, 2008, p. 74, emphasis by the authors)

Here, the words *qotyr* and *qatpa* express negative meaning, and *tailaq* denotes a young camel over one year old, and *maya* denotes a camel of high breed.

Russian: Obeshshal on Daý-ape za raboty po *verbliýdy* v god. Dva goda mat s synom pasli baskih verbliýdov, a potom reshili vernýtsia na rodiný i poprosili u baa raschet. Tot vybral im v tabýne *parshivogo godovalogo verbliýjonka* i *starýy oblezlýy verbliýdicu* (Yelubay, 2009, p. 55).

English: The bay was called Pirmkul. He promised Dau-apa a camel per year for her work. For two years, the mother and son pastured the bay's camels and then decided to return to their homeland and asked for the bay to settle up. He selected a *lousy yearling camel* and an *old mangy female camel* out of the herd (Yelubay, 2016, p. 97, emphasis by the authors)

In our opinion, in the Russian text the adjectives *parshivyi* and *staraya oblezlaya* (Ozhegov, 2012) were being used to express some negative characteristics of camels and to successfully cover the cultural loss of the specific terms.

As for the English text, the expressive attributes *lousy yearling* and *old mangy female camel* also serve to represent the dramatic effect of the situation, though in the source language the term *maya* particularly implies a high-quality camel.

In one of the excerpts from the novel, people drive the camels using the word *Oisylqara*. It was translated into Russian and English literally and for the target readers, it may sound only like an authentic name or exclamation; however, it has an implicit meaning denoting the patron saint of camels in Kazakh mythology. An explanation is given a text footnote in the Russian translation, and in the English text, it is introduced in the ethnographic glossary for readers at the end of the novel.

This short name can refer readers to the pre-Islamic period in the history of the nomads when they were thought to have followed a cult of ancestors and animals (Nurgaliyeva, Tastaeva, Baibulsinova, & Serikova, 2017, p. 151).

Kazakh: Káni, turǵyzshy endi! Shý, *Oisyl-qara!* (Yelubay, 2008, p. 33, emphasis by the authors)

Russian: Nu-ka, podymi ego teper! Chý, *Oisylkara!* (Yelubay, 2009, p. 25, emphasis by the authors)

English: Go on now, raise it up now! Chu, *Oisylkara!* (Yelubay, 2016, p. 45, emphasis by the authors)

Thus, all 25 lexemes used in the context of the novel to refer to livestock were mostly transposed with the help of an explanatory translation meaning the specific notions and hyponyms were lost in translation.

4. Russian and Kazakh Borrowings

One of the features of novels representing historical bilingualism in the works of Kazakh writers is a wide range of Russian borrowings; some of them are still used in Kazakh while others have become archaic. There are some notions that refer to Soviet nomenclature. This stock of words is a valuable source of information about the linguistic interaction between cultures under the influence of political and social processes. We have analyzed 50 Russian borrowed words in the original text and 120 Kazakh borrowings in the Russian translation. Almost all of the borrowings were found in indirect translation in transliterated form.

Most of the Russian borrowings in the original text are used in a distorted way: *Kampeske* is a distorted version of a Russian word for “confiscation,” introduced at the time of the Soviets and turning out to be a tragedy for nomads. *Arystabay* is how Kazakhs pronounce the Russian word *arestovannyi*, which means arrested. It refers to people who were arrested by the Soviet authorities following denunciation by some neighbors or those who were from prosperous clans.

Kallektip is a distorted word form of “collective,” a political term used to describe the form of social management introduced by the Soviets. *Tabarysh*—tovarisch—means comrade and is a widely used form of address in the former Soviet Union. *Milisakhan* is how Kazakh people pronounce militia or police. *Atkashevka* is a distorted form of the historic term “otkochevka,” which denotes the process when local nomads, being afraid of the harsh policies of the Stalinist government, tried to escape to neighboring countries. *Komones* is a distorted form of the word “communist.” Some of these words are still found in their distorted forms in the speech of, mostly elderly, Kazakhs.

The borrowings from Kazakh are also widely used in the Russian language and successfully exploited by bilingual writers in their work to achieve expressiveness.

The lexemes like *jigits*, *koshma*, *chapan*, *aksakal*, *aul*, *saksaul*, *baibishe*, *tokal*, *yurt*, have been successfully transposed into the English translation of the novel. These lexemes from the original work, as culture-relating words in English translation, are presented in their initial forms, so they are translated through calque or transliteration, and a footnote explanation is provided, for example:

Kazakh: Auldyn' bas kotergen *aqsaqal*, *qarasaqaldary* Shariptin' yuinde eken (Yelubay, 2008, p. 26, emphasis by the authors)

Russian: Solidnyie muzhi aula, aksakaly, vossedali v yurte Sharipa (Yelubay, 2009, p. 18, emphasis by the authors)

English: The prominent men of the aul, *the aksakals*, sat solemnly in Sharip's yurt (Yelubay, 2016, p. 3, emphasis by the authors)

The translation of the two identical in structure words is different: the nouns *aqsaqal* and *qarasaqal*, used to indicate age (literally, *aqsaqal* is “white-bearded” and means “old man,” *qarasaqal* is “black-bearded” and indicates a young, not aged, man). A black beard is recognized in Kazakh culture as a sign of a real man. *Qarasaqals* participated in the solution of difficult issues in nomadic settlements and were treated as “followers” of the elders (Kaliev, 2014, p. 339). In Russian, the lexeme *aksakal* has become a common borrowing, but the lexeme *qarasaqal*, due to the lack of such a concept in the Russian language, has been transposed through an explanation into the attributive construction “prominent men.”

5. Religion-Related Notions

Religious terms are not numerous, but they perform an expressive role in the original work, portraying the main characters, and also providing additional information about the life of nomads. The total number of religious terms considered in the article is 30. Many of the presented realias referring to religious traditions and rituals are outdated, and it requires a more careful approach when translating them in order to preserve the style of the historical time, for example:

Kazakh: Qaiyp *molda* bir kese sýğa duğa oqyp *dem salyp*, bólek eki úide otyrǵan kúieý men qalyndyqqa rızashylyǵyn bildirip, álgi kesedegi dýaly sýdan bir urtam ishýge jiberdi. (Yelubay, 2008, p. 47, emphasis by the authors)

Russian: Veчерom byl proveden obrád *neke kiy*. Kaiyp *mýla* osvátíl molitvoi vodý v chashe, kotorýú jenih i nevesta doljny byli ispit, vyrajaia tem samym soglasie na brak. (Yelubay, 2009 p. 44, emphasis by the authors)

English: In the evening, the religious ritual known as *neke-kiyu* was performed. The *kaysh—mullah—* blessed the water in the chalice with a prayer. (Yelubay, 2016 p. 78, emphasis by the authors)

The first lexeme *molda* in the source text denotes “a Muslim religious teacher or leader” and so it is transposed correspondingly as *mulla* in Russian and *mullah* in English. The next highlighted notion *dem salu* is ethnographic and literally means “to put breath” or “to cast a spell.” It is a kind of ritual when a mullah says a prayer over a cup of water as if to sanctify an action or anything else. In the Russian text of the translation, the given extract was presented as an interpretation and a new Kazakh realia was introduced in the translation *neke-kiyu*, which denotes a religious wedding ceremony. The term in its initial form was transposed into the target text.

A large number of religion-related terms are not considered to be culturally specific as there are adequate equivalents in the target language.

Thus, all religion-related notions keep their original forms in both translated texts and in most cases were followed by explanatory notes in the form of footnotes.

6. Culture-Specific Terms for Items of Clothing

The novel under consideration is a historical drama and most of the realia are archaisms. There may be reference to items of clothing worn by nomads. These culture-specific terms may be interesting from the aspect of translating non-equivalent vocabulary. We have analyzed more than 25 units of lexemes for clothing, for example:

Kazakh: Basynda úkisi bulǵaqtaǵan kámshát *bórik*, ústinde qyrmyzy *kámzol*. Ash belin túrmemen qynai bailaǵan. (Yelubay, 2008 p. 9, emphasis by the authors)

Russian: Ona v krýgloi bobrovoi shapochke, puh filina klonitsá iz storony v storoný na veterke, krasny shelkovyi *kamzol* v talii týgo perehvachen izáshnoi zastejkoí. (Yelubay, 2009 p. 8, emphasis by the authors)

English: She was wearing a round beaver cap, and the owl sewn onto its crown waved in the breeze. Her red silk *camisole* was held snugly to her slender waist with a fine clasp. (Yelubay, 2016, p.10, emphasis by the authors)

Non-equivalent vocabulary representing items of women’s clothing—*kamshat boryk*, *kyrmyzy kamzol*—are translated through explanation with the addition of attributive lexemes indicating the material and style of the clothing. For example, the image of a *boryk* is revealed as ‘a round beaver cap.’ But the Kazakh lexeme *kamsole* does not coincide in meaning with the English equivalent “camisole.” In Kazakh, *kamsole* is ‘a plush or velvet item of women’s clothing without a collar and sleeves, worn over a dress’ (Syzdykova & Khusain, 2001, p. 488), while “camisole” in English, according to the Cambridge dictionary, is a ‘short garment worn underneath a sheer bodice to conceal the underwear’ or a ‘woman’s negligee jacket’ (Camisole, n.d.).

With other examples of items of clothing, the strategy of transliteration prevails, with added explanatory notes.

Other than the culture-specific terms discussed above, there are more than 50 examples of lexical units in the form of phonetic inclusions or vocatives (*jeneshe*, *apatai*, *koke*), interjections expressing emotions (*oibay*, *kotek*), belonging to the most effective speech means of expressing emotions based on non-normativity and which are common in Kazakh-Russian literary texts. Such words are justified in the text and can be considered elements of internationalization, or special inter-language expressiveness techniques (Kopylenko & Akhmetzhanova,

1990, p. 162). None of the presented vocabulary was lost while being translated into the target language, being transposed adequately through transliteration, explanatory translation or word-for-word translation.

7. Conclusion

The problem of indirect translation has not been adequately covered in local research and requires further study. The linguistic situation, represented by bilingualism in Kazakhstan and Soviet censorship in the past, has determined the indirectness of literary translation. In this regard, the issue of adequacy and equivalence of semantics has been highlighted in the context of correlation and linguistic compliance in this study.

A long historical interrelationship between Kazakh and Russian cultures and languages has brought about unique linguistic phenomena in the form of some culture-related lexemes being equally found in both languages.

A comparative study of two translations of the original literary work in the Kazakh language has revealed a variety of culture-specific terms relating to different spheres of nomadic life presented in the novel as a historical reality.

The Kazakh language is characterized by a wide range of specific vocabulary, which produces linguistic obstacles for translators when searching for counterparts. However, the interposition of the mediating Russian language allows for the transposition of the specific realia without semantic losses.

So, the historical interaction of the Russian and Kazakh languages has provided a high level of literary translation and shown a low degree of semantic loss in the translation of culture-specific terms. Besides this, the close interrelationship of the two neighboring cultures and languages has fostered a special linguistic phenomenon of bilingual creativity, whereby domestic authors—bilinguals—successfully use the linguistic means of both languages in their work.

To conclude, eighty percent of all lexical units considered in the analysis were transposed adequately in both translations needing only some alterations. The type or degree of alteration depended on the specific nature of the lexeme in question. Transliteration with explanatory footnotes was the prevailing method of translation both into Russian and English.

Thus, in modern terms of global interaction, we consider that the presence of the interlinear language in literary translation is the most beneficial way of displaying national culture and literature to the wider world.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our sincere gratitude to Dr. László Marác and Professor M. Amalbekova for their valuable suggestions during planning and development of this research.

Conflict of Interests

The authors declare no conflict of interests.

References

- Amalbekova, M. B. (2010). *Fenomen bilingval'noy lichnosti publitsista (lingvokulturnyi i sopostavitel'nyi aspekt)* [The phenomenon of the bilingual personality of a publicist (linguo-cognitive and comparative aspects)] (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan.
- Bakhtikireeva, U. M. (2005). *Tvorcheskaya lichnost': Natsional'nyi russkoyazychnyi pisatel' i osobennosti ego russkogo khudozhestvennogo teksta* [A creative bilingual personality: National Russian-speaking writer and features of his Russian literary text]. Moscow: Triada.
- Bakhtikireeva, U. M. (2009). *Perevodovedenie v Kazakhstane, Chast' 1* [Translation studies in Kazakhstan, Part 1]. Moscow: Tezaurus.
- Belger, G. (2009). *Kazakhskoye slovo. Izbrannoye: Esse, romany* [The Kazakh word. Selected: Essays, novels]. Almaty: Vox Populi.
- Camisole. (n.d.). In *Cambridge online dictionary*. Retrieved from <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/camisole?s=t>
- Catford, J. C. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Chernetsky, V. (2011). Nation and translation: Literal translation and the shaping of the modern Ukrainian culture In B. J. Baer (Ed.), *Contexts, subtexts and pretexts: Literary translation in Eastern Europe and Russia* (Vol. 89, pp. 33–55). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Conquest, R. (1986). *The harvest of sorrow: Soviet collectivization and the terror-famine*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fawcett, P. (1997). *Translation and language: Linguistic theories explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Kaliev, B. (2014). Qarasaqal [Blackbeard]. In *Tolkoviy slovar' kazakhskogo yazyka* [The explanatory dictionary of the Kazakh language]. Almaty: Almaty Institute of State Language Development.
- Khasanov, B. N. (1987). *Kazakhsko-russkoye dvuyazychie* [Kazakh–Russian bilingualism]. Alma-Ata: Nauka.
- Kopylenko, M. M., & Akhmetzhanova, Z. K. (1990). *Kazakhskoye slovo v russkom literaturnom tekste* [Kazakh word in Russian literary text]. Alma-Ata: Galym.
- Kotkin, S. (2014). *Stalin: Paradoxes of power, 1878–1928* (Vol. 1). New York, NY: Penguin Press.
- Lambert, J. (2006). Literatures, translation and de(colonization). In D. Delabastita, L. D'Hulst, & R. Meylaerts (Eds.), *Functional approaches to culture and translation: Selected papers by J. Lambert*

- (Vol. 89, pp. 87–104). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Levy, J. (1974). *Iskusstvo perevoda* [The art of translation]. Moscow: Publishing Progress.
- François, G., Marácz, L., Pokorn, N. K., & Kraus, P. A. (2018). *Why should we combine different communication strategies?* Paper presented at the MIME Kick-Off Conference, Geneva, Switzerland.
- Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a science of translating*. Leiden: Brill Publishers.
- Nikonova, N. E. (2008). *Podstrochyi perevod: Tipologiya, funktsii i rol' v mezhkulturnoy kommunikatsii* [Interlinear translation: Typology, functions and role in intercultural communication]. Tomsk: Tomsk State University.
- Nurgaliyeva, A., Tastaeva, Z., Baibulsinova, A., & Serikova, I. (2017). The Firecult and Islam in the Kazakh system of belief. *Trames*, 21(2), 151–160.
- Ozhegov, S. I. (2012). Parshyvaya [Lousy]. *Explanatory Dictionary of Russian Language*. Retrieved from <https://slovarozhegova.ru>
- Pieta, H. (2014). What do we (think) know about indirectness in literary translation? A tentative review of the state-of-the-art and possible research avenues. *Punctum*, 2014(199). Retrieved from <https://repositorio.ul.pt/handle/10451/27791>
- Pieta, H. (2017). Theoretical, methodological and terminological issues in researching indirect translation: A critical annotated bibliography. *Translation Studies*, 10(2), 198–216.
- Ringmar, M. (2007). “Roundabout routes”: Some remarks on indirect translation. In F. Mus (Ed.), *Selected papers of the CETRA research seminar in translation studies*. Leuven: KU Leuven. Retrieved from <https://arts.kuleuven.be/cetra/papers>
- Skrobonja, A., Kontosic, I., Basic, J., Vučević-Bajt, V., Muzur, A., & Golibovic, V. (2001). Domestic animals as symbols and attributes in Christian iconography: Some examples from Croatian sacral art. *Veterinarni Medicina*, 46(4), 101–107.
- Syzdykova, R. G., & Khusain, K. S. (2001). Kamsol [Camisole]. In *Kazakhsko-russkiyi slovar* [Kazakh–Russian dictionary]. Almaty: Daik-Press.
- Tuksaitova, R. O. (2007). *Rechevaya tolerantnost' v bilingval'nom tekste (na material russkoyazychnoy kazakhskoy khudozhestvennoy prozy i publitsistiki)* [Speech tolerance in a bilingual text (based on the material of Russian-language Kazakh fictional prose and journalism)] (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). Ural State University, Yekaterinburg, Russia.
- Tumanova, A. B. (2012). *Spetsifika yazykovoy kartiny mira v khudozhestvennom diskurse pisatelya-bilingva* [The linguistic image of the world in the artistic discourse of a bilingual writer]. *Vestnik RUDN*, 2012(2), 38–44. Retrieved from <http://journals.rudn.ru/semiotics-semantics/issue/view/456>
- Witt, S. (2011). Between the lines: Totalitarianism and translation in the USSR. In B. J. Baer (Ed.), *Contexts, subtexts and pretexts: Literary translation in Eastern Europe and Russia* (Vol. 89, pp. 149–170). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Witt, S. (2017). Institutionalized intermediaries: Conceptualizing Soviet practices of indirect literary translation. *Translation Studies*, 10(2), 162–182.
- Woodsworth, J. (2013). Impact of translation. In Y. Gambier (Ed.), *Handbook of translation studies* (pp. 70–72). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Yelubay, S. (2008). *Aq boz yui* [White yurt]. Almaty: Atamura.
- Yelubay, S. (2009). *Odinokaya yurta* [Lonely yurt]. Almaty: Izdatelstvo Audarma.
- Yelubay, S. (2016). *Lonely yurt*. New York, NY: Metropolitan Classics.
- Zhaksylykov, A. (2013). *Adebi shygarmashylyq jane korkem audarma teoriyasy: Darister jinagy* [Theory of literary creativity and literary translation: Collection of lectures]. Almaty: Kazakh University Press.

About the Authors



Aizhan Akkaliyeva is a Senior Teacher at Shakarim State University of Semey. She is a PhD candidate in Translation Studies at L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University and her research involves comparative analysis of translations of literary texts from Kazakh into Russian and English. She is also interested in cultural linguistics.



Baktigul Abdykhanova is an Associate Professor in the Department of Russian and Foreign Philology at Shakarim State University of Semey. Her areas of scientific interest include cognitive linguistics, pragmalinguistics, cultural linguistics, ethnolinguistics, intertextuality and translation issues. Her recent research involves precedent names in the Kazakh literary texts and the problems of their translation into foreign languages.



Lyazat Meirambekova is an Associate Professor at L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University and holds the Chair of Foreign Languages at the Faculty of International Relations in this institution. Her research interests lie in the realm of Turkish Studies. Her PhD dissertation specifically focuses on monosyllabic base of Kazakh and the Kipchak group languages.



Zhanar Jambaeyva is a Professor of Philology in the Department of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, at L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University. She has numerous publications on comparative and axiological linguistics, text linguistics and translation issues.



Galiya Tussupbekova is an Associate Professor in the Department of Kazakh Language and Literature, Philological Faculty, at the Shakarim State University of Semey. Her recent research publications cover the issues of axiological and cognitive linguistics, semantics of the Kazakh language.

Article

Multilingualism and Social Inclusion in Scotland: Language Options and Ligatures of the “1+2 Language Approach”

Argyro Kanaki

School of Education and Social Work, University of Dundee, Dundee, DD1 4HN, UK; E-Mail: a.kanaki@dundee.ac.uk

Submitted: 17 July 2020 | Accepted: 20 October 2020 | Published: 14 January 2021

Abstract

Recent global trends in migration, trade and overall mobility have continued to transform our objective realities and subjective experiences around linguistic diversity. More broadly, in many countries, the politics of multilingualism seem to have changed the old links between language and nation-state. In this context, Scotland is studied in this article as a case study as it acts to dispel the myth of a ‘monolingual country.’ Its recent language policy, the “1+2 Language Approach” (Scottish Government, 2012b), including regional languages, modern foreign languages and heritage languages of migrants have created opportunities as well as imbalances and issues of equity in the Scottish language habitus. Drawing on Kraus’s work (2018), this article demonstrates how the policy creates language as ‘options’ and as ‘ligatures.’ However, these ‘options’ and ‘ligatures’ are not salient and straightforward. The policy is explored on three different levels: (1) on its potential for allowing the development of multilingual communication strategies such as intercomprehension, code-switching and mixing, (2) on its commitment to linguistic justice avoiding language hierarchies and (3) on its links with dominating, neoliberal approaches to education and the economy. The article finally concludes that options and ligatures visible in language policy impose some semantic order on the confusion of layered co-occurrences of various hegemonies, or the general strain between macro and micro distinction.

Keywords

1+2 language approach; language policy; multilingualism; options and ligatures; Scotland; social inclusion

Issue

This article is part of the issue “Social Inclusion and Multilingualism: The Impact of Linguistic Justice, Economy of Language and Language Policy” edited by László Marác (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands / L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Kazakhstan) and Zsombor Csata (Babeş-Bolyai University, Romania / Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Hungary).

© 2021 by the author; licensee Cogitatio (Lisbon, Portugal). This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY).

1. Introduction

Recent global trends in migration, trade and overall mobility have continued to transform our realities and subjective experiences around linguistic diversity. More broadly, in many countries, the politics of multilingualism seem to have changed the old links between language and the nation-state. In this context, this article takes Scotland as a case study, and reports while it acts to dispel the myth that it is a ‘monolingual country.’ Its recent language policy, the “1+2 Language Approach” (Scottish Government, 2012b) included regional languages, modern foreign languages (MFL), the heritage languages of migrants, and sign language. It created opportunities, as well as imbalances and issues of equi-

ty in the Scottish language habitus. Drawn in part from Kraus’s (2018) work, the article demonstrates how the policy reified language as a range of ‘options’ and, often directly opposing, ‘ligatures.’ In other words, ‘options’ can be considered as opportunities that might offer professional and personal benefits, and ‘ligatures’ can be considered as ties that hold one back.

This article also uses perspectives from different academic fields and disciplines such as applied linguistics, sociolinguistics, language planning, and political science, to explore the Scottish language policy. Although the author is an applied linguist, the interdisciplinary approach to examining a language policy is necessary, simply because language is such a complex phenomenon. The author agrees that maintenance of disci-

plinary boundaries and orthodoxies goes against interdisciplinary engagement (May, 2019). Therefore, this article tries to adopt an interdisciplinary character. It references a variety of academic work, and variously sourced policy texts, which provide examples from the Scottish language habitus describing the multiply levelled layers of a language policy (Johnson, 2018). It uses the framework of options and ligatures to do this, together with three levels of analysis. On each level, a similar frame is used to demonstrate, and offer similar evidence, that options and ligatures are interwoven at each level of analysis for the Scottish language policy.

The policy is explored on a straightforward, and possibly minimal, number of different levels. First, we examine the policy's potential for allowing the development of multilingual communication strategies, such as intercomprehension, code-switching and mixing. Secondly, the article explores the policy in terms of its commitment to linguistic justice and avoiding damaging language hierarchies. Thirdly, we examine the policy's links with dominant, neoliberal, approaches to both education and the economy. The article finally concludes that 'options' and 'ligatures,' visible at all three levels in language policy, impose some semantic order on the confusion of layered co-occurrences of various hegemonies, as well as upon the general strain between macro and micro distinctions in *soi-disant* less partisan theorisations. What might be considered as an option/opportunity for one could be seen as a ligature/tie for somebody else. Language policies can easily be seen as ambivalent. The article finally takes the position that further examination on language policies is needed, using a multilingual mindset to allow for opportunities to employ an alternative discourse in language planning debates.

This article first presents the context, and then moves on to the theory, analysis and critique. It starts with information about the "1+2 Language Approach" in Scotland and presents its theoretical underpinnings. It continues with the exploration of three different levels of the policy: the development of multilingual communication strategies, linguistic justice and neoliberal approaches to education. It finishes with some concluding remarks.

2. The "1+2 Language Approach": A Language Policy

This section starts with a small clarification regarding referencing around the policy. The policy itself entails two documents: *Language Learning in Scotland: A 1+2 Approach, Scottish Government Languages Working Group Report and Recommendations* (Scottish Government, 2012a) and *Language Learning in Scotland: A 1+2 Approach, the Scottish Government's Response to the Report of the Languages Working Group* (Scottish Government, 2012b). The first document groups its recommendations under various broad headings and the latter sets out the government's responses, roughly by recommendation, suggesting some of the key actions they might need to take. The latter text thus appears to

be a repetition of the first document with the addition of key actions. This is a clarification notice since, in citation, both those documents often appear to be called Scottish language policy. This 'antiphonal' approach to policy publication and statute is simply a statement, generally, of aims followed by an account, aim by aim, of government reaction. It is a feature of contemporary civil structure, usually at a federal level.

We now move on to explore how the "1+2 Language Approach" has emerged in Scotland.

The Scottish Government currently has decision-making powers and responsibility for its educational policy, in its own Parliament, Holyrood in Edinburgh, devolved from Westminster and the UK Government. In 2012, Scotland commissioned the Languages Working Group. Constituted by policymakers, practitioners, local authorities, teacher educators, parents and business representatives, this body was tasked with producing a 'language report.' The report centred on language learning, with 35 recommendations (Scottish Government, 2012a). Although it was, in its own frame of reference, concerned with education, it turned out to have a wider focus, dealing with language matters on a broad social level, rather than a simply school-based one.

Consequentially, the Scottish government published a language manifesto, adopting in this way the European 1+2 language policy for Scotland, with the aim of completing its implementation by 2020 (Scottish Government, 2012b). This non-statutory initiative was called the "1+2 Language Approach" (Scottish Government, 2012b). As a language manifesto, the Scottish Government (2012b) addressed language in Scottish society and took notice of languages in Scotland. It thereby became a language policy rather than simply a policy about teaching and learning in MFL. The policy was based on the 1+2 language model adopted by the European Union and ratified at the European Council of Barcelona in 2002. This brought Scotland, theoretically at least, in line with many other European countries. According to the 1+2 language model, all EU citizens would learn two foreign languages in addition to their mother tongue, and their language education would start from their early years and be a matter of lifelong relevance and availability. The Scottish Government adopted this initiative in 2012, almost 10 years after the 1+2 language model had been ratified by the rest of the EU in Barcelona in 2002, and its implementation, notionally, started immediately.

From the 35 recommendations, in the first document (Scottish Government, 2012a), 31 recommendations were fully accepted whilst four were partially accepted by the answering 'antiphonal' document (Scottish Government, 2012b). Most recommendations concerned early language learning; however, there were also recommendations about language teaching and learning in secondary schools and teacher education. The first of the partially accepted recommendations is the matter of Content and Language Integrated Learning

(Scottish Government, 2012b, p. 20). Partial acceptance in the response document (Scottish Government, 2012b) allowed schools to decide the best approach to implementing Content and Language Integrated Learning in secondary schools. The broad statement here appears to condone school-level decision-making about all language-teaching approaches. The second partial acceptance (Scottish Government, 2012b, p. 21) concerned qualifications for teachers as the 1+2 language model was implemented. It deferred the process of deciding on the level and appropriateness of language qualifications for licensed teachers, either beginning or ending their qualifying courses, to one arbitrated by the General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS). Today, in 2020, GTCS has not changed any of its teacher requirements regarding languages. The third partial acceptance of the policy document (Scottish Government, 2012b, p. 22) alters the policy's view of what universities should do about the "1+2 Language Approach." It replaces recommendation with broad statements about the relations between schools and universities on the matter of language learning, creating an open arena entirely for the judgement of universities. The fourth partial acceptance is of the original policy requirement for the ablest of young people, with requisite qualifications, to be recruited for language education in secondary and primary schools. The government's response to this was a statement (Scottish Government, 2012b, pp. 22–23) that it would invest in the current workforce, and its Career Professional Development. It would also consider the specific recruitment of linguists as part of a national recruitment strategy, a step which broke the policy's link between primary schools and secondary language teaching departments and sectionalised interests in the teaching of MFL.

3. Theoretical Underpinnings

The context of this case study has already been set. Now, the theoretical underpinnings of this article are enumerated and examined, with brief but necessary accounts of their implications for aspects of policy.

Nowadays, migration, new forms of mobility and general demands for effective communication preoccupy language policy and political theory discourses (May, 2014). Often discussed and explored as globalisation, matters of multilingualism and social inclusion are being described and resolved through linguistic research.

According to May (2014), maintenance and support of minority languages, bilingual and/or multilingual education, acquisition of a global lingua franca and endorsement of national languages are all included in language policy documents that foreground language status and use. At the same time, language policy uses political formations and their theoretical debates to create and strengthen links between language and citizenship; these debates, from political theory, explore arguments about social inclusion, either through the exist-

tence and use of a shared and almost always dominant language, or through individual and public multilingualism (Ricento, 2006). In either case, linguistic diversity and social inclusion emerge here as facets of political and social praxis across a spectrum between monolingual and multilingual policy approaches, with complex and rather multi-layered relations between them (Marácz & Adamo, 2017).

According to Grin and Civico (2018), the engagement of states in language policy formation, and its theorisation, is essential. States might have small languages that need to be protected as they are in danger of disappearing; in urban settings, several languages cohabit and people experience multilingual daily lives. Language policy has to deal with linguistic diversity, which always has such apparent paradoxes associated with it (Grin & Civico, 2018). A first paradox here is, of course, that linguistic diversity pushes to increase and decrease, at the same time (Grin & Civico, 2018). The increase happens when people subjectively experience multilingualism and its effects in urban settings. The decrease occurs in linguistic diversity when small languages lose their speakers and disappear as individuals, public spaces and collectivities move towards one language, and away from others. A second paradox takes place where linguistic diversity can be considered, simultaneously, as threatened and threatening (Grin & Civico, 2018). For example, states often take measures for the forced revitalisation of minority languages, while they arbitrate between languages as they compete over material and symbolic resources, instituting policies which promote some languages at the expense of others. Grin and Civico (2018, p. 30) talk about protection and promotion, as well as arbitration and demarcation, in their examination of language policies concerning linguistic diversity and, therefore, social inclusion.

We also consider the distinction from Grin and Civico (2018) while we draw on Kraus's (2018) work to examine the parallel notions of 'option' and 'ligature' in the creation of linguistic identity. Kraus had, in turn, conceptually relied on Dahrendorf's (1979) earlier distinction between options and ligatures in modern societies. For Dahrendorf, options are related to the future, whilst ligatures look to the past, in the building of a social reality. Kraus (2018) works on this distinction in discussing linguistic diversity. On one hand, language communities whose language is disappearing are bound to lose both culturally and historically mediated ligatures, active ties with and from the past. On the other hand, learning new languages, and being open to multilingual dimensions in modern literate societies constitute options and allow people to acquire new, worldwide viewpoints that permeate and overrule national identities (Kraus, 2018). According to Kraus (2018), our linguistic identities are related to the ligatures and options that our linguistic repertoires offer us. For example, maintaining Gaelic through Gaelic Medium Education could be seen as an effort to maintain Scottish linguistic and cul-

tural identities, a ligature to history and culture; however, this ligature can impede the dissemination of knowledge, because one can only use English to communicate beyond the local community, an option which opens new professional opportunities. Kraus (2018) continues this argument by exploring the formation of options and ligatures stemming from the juxtaposition and intertwining of minority, immigrant, national and traditional languages as well as of aspirant or already-dominant *linguae francae*. As Kraus and Kazlauskaitė-Gürbüz (2014) believe, multilingualism could offer a kind of balance between different languages; the balance, however, is disturbed because options and ligatures in the domain of language change all the time and are very context-dependent. This article agrees with the position taken by Kraus and Kazlauskaitė-Gürbüz (2014). Furthermore, the theoretical clarity of some aspects of linguistic ethnography, distinctions between discourse and conversation, the macro and the micro, have been subject to important programmatic critiques (for a fuller account see Blommaert, 2015). In this article, the primacy of these aspects in ethnographic linguistic accounts of social inclusion, via the distinction between ‘options’ and ‘ligatures,’ helps explore and understand how language policy creates options, in the sense of possibilities of choices, while simultaneously generating ligatures, historical and culturally mediated ties, in the area of education. In this case, of course, I limit the examination to the “1+2 Language Approach” (Scottish Government, 2012b) in Scotland, and therefore occlude, and exclude, the urgent appeals for notice of similar processes and trends in other geographies and histories such as the case of Catalan or the traces of similar process and structure in Euskara.

Importantly, also, “language policy should be conceptualised and studied as multiply levelled or layered” (Johnson, 2018, p. 465). A multiply layered understanding of a policy context includes micro-macro distinctions in the policy’s world, as well as the distinctions the policy itself might make. Blommaert (2013) memorably describes the intertwining of layers, ideologies and hegemonies on a macro, meso and micro level and their co-occurrences, layered across time and space. The concepts of ‘options’ and ‘ligatures,’ the binary ends of a single parameter, visible in language policy, impose some semantic order on these layered co-occurrences from various hegemonic origins. As one can see, particularly later on in this article, general strains between macro and micro distinctions still continue, while macro and micro discourses/conversations can both emerge to shape a single policy. Options and ligatures can appear together, within the same discourse, for the same structure and/or agent. So, most things, and all policy points, can be seen as ‘options’ or as ‘ligatures,’ depending on evaluative perspectives. That, of course, makes language policies ambivalent, if not ambiguous. Social inclusion, particularly in the sense of linguistic justice, cannot be based on ambivalence; a major rational point

of justice, in philosophical terms, is to banish ambiguity. Examination of individual ambiguities and the, often repetitive, exposure of such evaluative contradictions indicates that our analysis fits with a recognisable theoretical frame. ‘Ligatures’ and ‘options,’ and their theoretical equivalents, or patterns of process, should be considered, together, as necessities for the evaluation of any language policy.

4. The “1+2 Language Approach” and the Development of Multilingual Communication Strategies

Here, the policy’s potential for allowing the development of multilingual communication strategies is explored. These are mainly approaches such as intercomprehension, code-switching, and mixing, in language use. As we will see, the policy does not develop a clear potential for promoting and nourishing multilingual communication strategies.

According to Meulleman and Fiorentino (2018), students and adults should be trained to acquire and use receptive or intercomprehensive language skills. That means that:

People can learn how to understand what is said or written in a foreign language without necessarily being able to speak or write that language, provided it is closely related to at least one language they are already familiar with. (Meulleman & Fiorentino, 2018, p. 138)

For example, word resemblance between romance languages (derived from Latin) becomes apparent quickly, especially if one sees the words in writing, but also when one hears them spoken. Maiden, Cappellaro, and Lahiri (2020) provide plenty of examples of similarities and differences between languages and how these could be used as a way to overcome our language anxiety, and perhaps improve rates of language acquisition. Exploiting similarities and differences between related languages has also been explored as a simple learning framework for languages in education (Castagne, 2007).

Furthermore, code-switching and language mixing are also considered to be innovative pedagogical approaches with immense pedagogical value promoting multilingualism (García, 2007, 2009). Under the term ‘translanguaging,’ these pedagogical methodologies, intercomprehension, code-switching and mixing, are promoted as multilingual communication strategies, even though the term ‘translanguaging’ appears to be conceptually and terminologically difficult to define, however popular it becomes (Cenoz & Gorter, 2017).

The main point, here, is that “creating bridges of understanding across languages” (Maiden et al., 2020, p. 69) is simply as important as the development of multilingual communication strategies, intercomprehension and translanguaging, etc. These are all ‘options’ that open new doors to us. Those communication strategies

could give us the confidence to understand other languages, to understand other people and to be more open to multiple ways of thinking. Of course, they are also possibly conceived as ‘ligatures.’ Exposure to multilingualism can be perceived as menacing; monolingual people can often feel isolated and hesitant towards speakers of other languages. For them, exposure to other languages might trigger unknown and unexpected feelings of uneasiness and awkwardness; they do not know how to deal with foreigners, what they are saying and what to expect from them. The only way to erase these feelings is through education. As Maiden et al. (2020, p. 70) argue:

Feelings of alienation can be alleviated if societies are aware that ‘foreign’ languages are not inaccessible barriers to comprehension, that many doors into other languages are already open, and that what seems alien may be much more familiar than might at first appear.

Their argument continues by claiming that it is our “right” to be given access to language education, and education systems have a “duty” to allow people to gain access to languages (Maiden et al., 2020, p. 71). In other words, the feelings of ligure should be replaced by feelings of confidence and options that bring optimism rather than alienation and exclusion.

Introductions to other languages and the use of multilingual pedagogical approaches, appropriate to demonstrations of those bridges between languages, could, first, reduce alienation and exclusion by bringing people closer in society, allowing them to develop similar ligatures of social identity, openly and in a way which allows discussion; secondly, they allow liberal education systems to create for their members/students access to languages that could be ‘options,’ making students more “free” and more “powerful” as they have the command of other languages (Maiden et al., 2020, p. 71).

The “1+2 Language Approach” (Scottish Government, 2012a) does not refer explicitly to any multilingual communication strategies in its policy. This language policy simply refers to effective teaching methods and recommends them for language learning, for example in primary school settings. The use of songs and rhymes, games, direct teaching, paired and group activities are all mentioned by name alongside more general, but still teaching-specific, recommendations, such as a whole school approach to language learning, encouraging skills to develop and helping children to learn better (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 15). According to the policy, pupils also need contact with native speakers, for example with the employment of language assistants, and the widespread use of technology. “Pupils must have a real sense of what the language sounds like when spoken by a native speaker, and how to engage in conversation with a native speaker” (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 32). “Short blocks of language learning” embedded into the daily school routine were recommended, as well

as the use of target languages (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 17).

As we see, the language policy suggests pedagogical approaches, in its effort to develop a language educational policy, that could offer development of pupil language skills and improvement of their learning, both of these could be considered as advantages/options for pupils. The policy tries to convince us of its holistic language approach, promoting language to the centre of whole-school teaching and learning approaches, to the extent that language constitutes a conscious basic element of the daily school routine. However, Phipps and Fassetta (2015, p. 16) argue that

[Scotland] does not have statutory time allocation for foreign languages. While primary schools are encouraged to offer a foreign language, in practice the teaching is left very much to an individual school’s priorities and to the human and financial resources they have access to.

Language learning in Scottish primary schools does not have an established curriculum time, nor it is considered as an established curriculum subject, and insufficient time is allocated to satisfy any language proficiency goals (Phipps & Fassetta, 2015). Furthermore, the policy does not encourage the implementation of any other specific pedagogical approaches, nor any multilingual communicative strategies. Rather, it fails to demonstrate that embracing the co-existence of multiple languages is a necessary part of the implementation and creation of pedagogical approaches in a school setting (Oliva, Donato, & Ricciardelli, 2019). In the context of modern language lessons, monolingual learners are discouraged from using their L1 prior knowledge in order to develop translanguaging skills between their L1 and L2 (Oliva et al., 2019). Its persistent and pervasive preference for ‘target language,’ as well as for ‘native speakers,’ forces us to regard its efforts simply as a method to produce a series of parallel monolingualisms, as described by Grosjean (2010). Considering languages as separate language entities first suppresses our ability to credit literacy anywhere except in our L1, and it inevitably fits nationalistic ideas about languages (Piller, 2001). It also converts educational options to educational ligatures by tying them to specific national languages and educational systems.

5. The “1+2 Language Approach” and Linguistic Justice

The concept of linguistic justice has provoked many debates because of its complex and recondite nature and definition (Gobbo, 2018). This article does not explore linguistic justice as a matter of how efficient and fair the linguistic Scottish language regime is, taking into account, for instance, specific approaches towards linguistic justice in the literature (for example, Gazzola & Grin, 2013). It is often acknowledged that sociolinguistic

perspectives, as well as perspectives from other fields, i.e., applied linguistics, are missing in all debates on linguistic justice, whilst research data from those fields are also lacking (Gobbo, 2018). Key terms in such debates are often misunderstood, as different meanings emerge depending on the field and the academic background of authors (Gazzola, 2014).

Linguistic justice has evolved as a term of increasing importance in scientific debates (for a full review see Alcalde, 2018). This article uses interdisciplinary lenses, and references scholars from different academic fields. Linguistic justice is considered, here, in a more general sense, as the avoidance of damaging language hierarchies in education and society. These language hierarchies constitute linguistic inequality, domination and exclusion promoted by different layers of technologies of power, i.e., policy, law, parents' opinions, etc. (Martín Rojo, 2015). The next section of the article is written from an applied linguistic perspective but uses other academic fields and their strands to explore, inform and interpret the case from an applied linguist's position. As we will see, linguistic justice is not served as a clear and straightforward purpose from the policy itself. Indeed, the policy endorses, hides and promulgates the same language hierarchies and inequalities which already exist in Scottish society.

The "1+2 Language Approach" (Scottish Government, 2012a) also emphasises the diversity of Scotland by including Scotland's own languages, Gaelic and Scots, together with what it calls "community languages," and British Sign Language (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 6). It follows international trends in language education systems which introduce language learning in the early stages of primary school or even pre-school. Yet it simultaneously emphasises the early introduction of languages related to powerful economies, such as Chinese, and Portuguese (Brazil), among others (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 12). It characterises Scotland as a leading competitive nation, citing this as the reason why Scotland cannot refuse its young people opportunities to learn an additional language (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 12). The policy is clear about offering options, those future opportunities that languages can provide for young people. It encompasses all the languages of Scottish society, addressing in this way the linguistic diversity of Scotland (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 6), and creating and confirming hierarchical and ideological bonds between languages and their speakers (Kraus, 2018), together with rehearsing, often imaginary, ties to a specific society and educational system.

Scottish policy also refers to Gaelic and encourages the learning of Gaelic through Gaelic medium education (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 13). Gaelic was recognised as an official language of the United Kingdom in 2003 and has been protected and promoted by the Scottish Government through the development of statutory language authority, Bòrd na Gàidhlig, a Gaelic broadcasting authority, as well as a Gaelic medium education

(for more information see Dunmore, 2019). All the above efforts have envisaged establishing culturally and historically mediated ligatures to promote and revitalise Gaelic. The Gaelic Language (Scotland) Act of 2005 was also passed to secure status for Gaelic as "an official language of Scotland commanding equal respect with the English language" (Walsh & McLeod, 2008, p. 35). However, as Dunmore (2019) highlights, the status of 'equal respect' is not clear, in terms of its derivation, what it means in practice, or how it could support Gaelic against English. This last is probably the classic example of the ambiguity and contradiction of linguistic policy productions.

One could wonder how culturally- and historically-mediated ligatures could be sustained. In education, issues of teacher shortages and problematic recruitment of teachers for Gaelic medium education, as well as the scarcity of books and literacy resources in Gaelic, could be seen as obstacles in the revitalisation of Gaelic (Kanaki, 2020), destroying the future opportunities/options of, and for, Gaelic speakers. At the same time, those obstacles also destroy attempts to establish cultural and historical ligatures with Scottish Gaelic, and particularly with the cognate Goidelic Gaelic languages in Eire, the Isle of Man and Cornwall. Contrasts might be drawn particularly between Eirise (Irish Gaelic), which is recognised as the official language of Ireland by the EU and is spoken by some 30% of the population (see Ó Ceallaigh & Ni Dhonnabháin, 2015) and the other Goidelic languages.

Scottish policy also refers to Scots recognising the Scots language as part of Scotland's historic language diversity (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 13) and promoting language and cultural ligatures. However, Scots does not exist without controversy. Sebba (2019) highlights that Scots provides a classic example of the difficulty of distinguishing between a 'dialect,' and especially a 'dialect' of English, and a 'language' referring to all the associations with inferiority that language matters usually encounter. Political tendencies and social forces who wanted an independent Scotland considered Scots as a cultural marker, therefore they included language questions in the census; the findings were controversial, demonstrating and revealing language ideologies. As Sebba (2019, p. 339) notes, "according to some, the census provided no useful information, while according to others it demonstrated that there was a robust Scots-speaking population, and a clear public understanding of what it meant to be a speaker of Scots."

Furthermore, hostilities between languages are also present and these can also be viewed as an 'option' or 'ligature' for one language or another. Public views sometimes oppose Gaelic revitalisation because of the tension between Gaelic and Scots, in Scots speakers identified by Dunmore (2017, p. 737):

An ideology framing the Scots language as a ballast to pro-Gaelic policy—or, possibly as a rival linguistic identity—often emerge....Gaelic tended not to be

viewed as a national language for Scotland because of perceived opposition to its revitalisation, particularly among speakers of Scots.

Apart from the minority languages, Scotland also has community languages. The 2017 Pupil Census shows that children and young people come from a variety of heritages with 157 different languages spoken in the home compared to 136 different languages in 2010 (Scottish Government, 2018). The Scottish policy, report and recommendations (Scottish Government, 2012a) also includes 'community languages.' According to the policy (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 13), all the languages of pupils should be celebrated in their community, and pupils should maintain and develop their own mother tongue. However, it was up to local authorities to design a language strategy that would encourage the continuation of mother tongue learning and provide and ensure possible resources to do so. Ligatures with mother tongue are encouraged.

But, in reality, as Hancock and Hancock (2018) observe, only Urdu and Chinese are taught in some Scottish schools and there are almost no other opportunities in mainstream schools to learn other heritage languages. Polish should be mentioned here as one example of the lack of consideration of heritage languages of migrants (Kanaki, 2020). Polish is the largest community language in Scotland according to the 2011 Census (NRS, 2013), spoken as their main language by 61,000 speakers, i.e., 1.2% of the population. Poland was the third most popular location of birth for adult responders to the 2011 census in Scotland. Unfortunately, there is no Scottish provision of any form of formal language teaching, or any offer of school language qualification in Polish. The Scottish Qualification Authority does not offer any qualifications in Polish, and there is no opportunity for teacher training under GTCs for heritage languages such as Polish (Hancock & Hancock, 2018; Kanaki, 2020).

Situations where formal education hampers the creation of ligatures with a mother tongue have contributed to the expansion of complementary schools in Scotland (Hancock & Hancock, 2018). According to Li Wei (2006, as cited in Hancock & Hancock, 2018, p. 10), monolingual and assimilationist school policies that constitute a sort of linguistic apartheid, promote the establishment and expansion of the complementary school sector in the United Kingdom. In Scotland, although the language policy (Scottish Government, 2012b) tries to encourage links, even with a simple statement, with cultural and complementary schools, there needs to be a greater, active collaboration between mainstream schools and complementary schools—such as informal Polish Saturday schools—to support heritage language learning (Hancock & Hancock, 2018) and, therefore, to encourage greater linguistic justice for all the languages of the community in Scottish society.

As mentioned before, ligatures with mother tongues are often problematic. Familiar problems also surface as

the policy promotes English while recognising that for some pupils, while their mother tongue is not English, their first additional language (L2) should be English (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 13). It is clear that this aspect of policy questions the legitimacy of other languages, as it supports a specific ideology: the view that the use and prevalence of a single language bring national cohesion, and all citizens can have easy access to all social services and goods using the same language (Martín Rojo, 2015). English, here, is an 'option' and a 'ligature'; it opens opportunities to all citizens, whilst creating exclusive, cultural and political bonds within a specific society. This role of 'option and ligature' for English is accepted by many immigrant parents, for example in Edinburgh and Glasgow, who do not claim low English proficiency themselves, for fear that their children would not be enrolled in, or able to attend, mainstream schools (McKelvey, 2017).

English as an Additional Language (EAL) is fully recognised as part of the policy (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 13) and EAL work and delivery should be incorporated within a policy of 1+2 delivery in schools and should be protected and developed as part of the roll-out of that policy (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 34). Nevertheless, Christie, Robertson, Stodter, and O'Hanlon (2016) argue that there is little evidence of consideration for EAL or English as a second language in Scotland. McKelvey (2017) also states the need for further work on improving EAL teaching practices and understanding of the benefits of linguistic diversity.

In these circumstances, multilingualism within language provision in education in Scotland seems to be a challenging task that does not serve linguistic justice. The Scottish "1+2 Language Approach," following the EU model, is based on the monolingual assumption that people have one mother tongue, study in a monolingual school setting, and should learn two further languages, overlooking all their multilingual, contemporary school environments (Kraus, Garcia, Frank, & Climent-Ferrando, 2018).

6. Neoliberal Understandings in Language Education

In this section, the links between the Scottish language policy and neoliberal strands are demonstrated.

The 1+2 language policy follows international trends in language education systems which introduce language learning in the early stages of primary school or even pre-school (Scottish Government, 2012a). Yet it also encourages the early introduction of languages related to powerful economies, such as Chinese, Portuguese (Brazil), etc. (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 12). It characterises Scotland as a leading competitive nation (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 12), citing this as the reason why Scotland cannot refuse its young people opportunities to learn an additional language. The language used by the policy itself demonstrates a strong ideological position about language, and not simply in its plethora of econom-

ic or financial allusions. The policy considers, for example, that learning languages is a value-added object, offering opportunities to work and travel abroad (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 6).

Languages have been commodified in the policy (Kanaki, 2020); they have been considered as objects “rendered available for conventional exchange in the market” (Heller, Pujolar, & Duchêne, 2014, p. 545). Speaking ‘languages’ offers justified and justifiable employability. The 1+2 policy encouraged the introduction in schools and teaching institutions of languages that were related to powerful economies such as Portuguese and Arabic, as well as ‘the Slavonic languages,’ which also gained a mention in its list of consumable objects that might assist Scotland’s economic ambitions. Language is construed as an “object invested with market value” (Urciuoli, 2016, p. 31). Not only are languages commodified, but students can accumulate language and communication skills as personal assets (Martín Rojo & Del Percio, 2020). Languages can be viewed solely as personal assets for work, travelling abroad, performance and pleasure.

One could simply claim that the “1+2 Language Approach” (Scottish Government, 2012b) creates a neoliberal disciplinary framework in which students are trained to speak following a template such as the native speaker model. According to Education Scotland (n.d., p. 5), “children should be exposed increasingly to real-life examples of ‘fluent language in action’ through various media, songs, podcasts, or input from native speakers.” Within neoliberal logic, the Scottish language policy (Scottish Government, 2012b) emphasises the importance of international languages, associated with particular and shifting economic powers. The policy itself creates language hierarchies as it promotes specific languages. Moreover, within the neoliberal approach, this language policy (Scottish Government, 2012b) also shapes the conduct of professionals/teachers by creating guidelines according to which they need to treat language. A policy document states, for example, that:

Primary teachers do not have to be fluent in the modern language(s) they teach. However, they do need to have enough language, and sufficient expertise in using and accessing appropriate resources, so that they can include modern language teaching readily in lessons. (Education Scotland, n.d., p. 2)

The 1+2 language policy clearly prescribes that primary school teachers should have knowledge of language pedagogy, and that they need to maintain their language skills throughout their teaching career (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 27) and the policy prescribes teacher engagement with the languages they teach, that is engagement with spoken and written language, the use of media and IT, and engagement with native speakers (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 31).

As Martín Rojo (2020, p. 162) mentions:

It is the individual (encouraged by educational institutions) who assumes most of the responsibility, by consenting or resisting the perceived need to accumulate language competencies, in the understanding that this creates economic value for the person concerned, for employers and for the community.

Here, I would add that it is the same language policy (Scottish Government, 2012b) that imposes this neoliberal concept on professionals, creating options/opportunities for learning languages simply so that students can become successful learners, confident individuals, effective contributors and responsible citizens, a clear and emphasised reference to the *Curriculum for Excellence* (Scottish Government, 2008), the major preceding piece of education-related policy in Scotland.

Furthermore, according to the policy, report and recommendations (Scottish Government, 2012a), local authorities have to design a language strategy that would encourage the continuation of mother tongue learning and ensure possible resources to do so, as well as ensuring that local authorities develop a language strategy and framework to implement policy regarding any language learning (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 13). Schools in each area should make informed decisions regarding language choice (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 13). In a neoliberal language discourse, ‘choice’ is the neoliberal keyword (Holborow, 2007) and these ‘informed decisions’ on language planning and management follow the attitude of *laissez faire* (Phipps & Fassetta, 2015). As Martín Rojo and Del Percio (2020, p. 1) note, “we are viewed as ‘clients’ of services that are funded by our taxes, but which at the same time are obliged to profit from our patronage,” a foundational contradiction. This policy (Scottish Government, 2012b) delegates local authorities and schools as promoters of our options, opportunities for our future associated with the maintenance of mother tongue, as well as learning other languages. At the same time, these options become our ligatures, the ones that tie us to particular market conditions and disciplinary frameworks.

7. Concluding Remarks

The juxtaposition and intertwining of minority, immigrant, national languages, and *linguae francae* in a society can usefully be viewed from a perspective of ‘options’ and ‘ligatures’ (Kraus, 2018). Language policies become ambivalent as they present options and ligatures simultaneously. This raises questions of particular complexity, especially in the light of social inclusion. This article has used the case of the Scottish language policy (Scottish Government, 2012b) to show some of these complexities in language planning. It hopes to contribute to the debate on social justice. It encourages further research and exploration of the phenomenon of multilingualism and its politics in a context of complex diversity, and in the light of language planning and man-

agement. Further examination of policies is needed where these are explored using a non-binary multilingual framework of theorising both of ‘options’ and ‘ligatures,’ and exploring their ambiguities. As Ester de Jong (2016, p. 378) remarks, “much of our formal language-in-education policies that address linguistic diversity are firmly grounded in a monolingual mindset.” It is time to look at language policies with a multilingual mind.

Acknowledgments

I thank the editors and reviewers for their careful reading of my manuscript and their insightful comments and suggestions.

Conflict of Interests

The author declares no conflict of interests.

References

- 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 economic, philosophical and sociolinguistic approaches* (pp. 65–149). Berlin: Springer.
- Blommaert, J. (2013). Policy, policing and the ecology of social norms: Ethnographic monitoring revisited. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 219, 123–140.
- Blommaert, J. (2015). Dialogues with ethnography notes on classics and how I read them. *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies*, 138, 1–145.
- Castagne, E. (2007). Transparences lexicales entre langues voisines [Vocabulary equivalence between neighbouring languages]. In E. Castagne (Ed.), *Les enjeux de l’intercompréhension* [The stakes for intercomprehension] (pp. 155–166). Reims: Epure.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2017). Translanguaging as a pedagogical tool in multilingual education. In J. Cenoz, D. Gorter, & S. May (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Language awareness and multilingualism* (pp. 309–321). Berlin: Springer.
- Christie, J., Robertson, B., Stodter, J., & O’Hanlon, F. (2016). *A review of progress in implementing the 1+2 languages policy*. Edinburgh: Association of Directors of Education in Scotland.
- Dahrendorf, R. (1979). *Life chances: Approaches to social and political theory*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- de Jong, E. (2016). Toward pluralist policies, practices, and research. *Language and Education*, 30(4), 378–382.
- Dunmore, S. S. (2017). Immersion education outcomes and the Gaelic community: Identities and language ideologies among Gaelic medium-educated adults in Scotland. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38(8), 726–741.
- Dunmore, S. S. (2019). *Language revitalisation in Gaelic Scotland linguistic practice and ideology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Education Scotland. (n.d.). *1+2 approach to language learning from P1 onwards*. Livingston: Education Scotland. Retrieved from <https://education.gov.scot/improvement/documents/modlang12-1plus2approachmar17.pdf>
- García, O. (2007). Foreword. In S. Makoni & A. Pennycook (Eds.), *Disinventing and reconstituting languages* (pp. xi–xv). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Oxford: Basil and Blackwell.
- Gazzola, M. (2014). Partecipazione, esclusione linguistica e traduzione: Una valutazione del regime linguistico dell’Unione europea [Participation, linguistic exclusion and translation: An evaluation of the language regime of the EU]. *Studi Italiani di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata*, 43(2), 227–264.
- Gazzola, M., & Grin, F. (2013). Is ELF more effective and fair than translations? An evaluation of the EU’s multilingual regime. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 23(1), 93–107.
- Gobbo, F. (2018). How to measure linguistic justice? Theoretical considerations and the South Tyrol case study of the Calvet Language Barometer. In P. A. Kraus & F. Grin (Eds.), *The politics of multilingualism europeanisation, globalisation and linguistic governance*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin’s.
- Grin, F., & Civico, M. (2018). Why can’t language questions just be left to themselves? In F. Grin (Ed.), *The MIME VADEMECUM: Mobility and inclusion in multilingual Europe* (pp. 30–31). Geneva: MIME Project.
- Grosjean, F. (2010). *Bilingual: Life and reality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hancock, A., & Hancock, J. (2018). *Extending the 1+2 language strategy: Complementary schools and their role in heritage language learning in Scotland*. Edinburgh: Centre for Education for Racial Equality in Scotland.
- Heller, M., Pujolar, J., & Duchêne, A. (2014). Linguistic commodification in tourism. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 18(4), 539–566.
- Holborow, M. (2007). Language ideology and neoliberalism. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 6(1), 51–73.
- Johnson, D. C. (2018). Teachers’ language policy engagement: European perspectives and challenges. *Language and Education*, 32(5), 462–469.
- Kanaki, A. (2020). Multilingualism from a monolingual habitus: The view from Scotland. In K. Strani (Ed.) *Multilingualism and politics: Revisiting multilingual citizenship* (pp. 309–332). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kraus, P. A. (2018). From glossophagic hegemony to multilingual pluralism? Re-assessing the politics of linguistic identity in Europe. In P. A. Kraus & F. Grin (Eds.), *The politics of multilingualism europeanisation, globalisation and linguistic governance*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin’s.

- Kraus, P. A., Garcia, N., Frank, M., & Climent-Ferrando, V. (2018). Which principles should we use to tailor language policies? In F. Grin (Ed.), *The MIME VADEMECUM: Mobility and inclusion in multilingual Europe* (pp. 88–89). Geneva: MIME Project.
- Kraus, P. A., & Kazlauskaitė-Gürbüz, R. (2014). Addressing linguistic diversity in the European Union: Strategies and dilemmas. *Ethnicities*, 14(4), 517–538.
- Maiden, M., Cappellaro, C., & Lahiri, A. (2020). Not as ‘foreign’ as you think creating bridges of understanding across languages. In K. Kohl, R. Dudrah, A. Gosler, S. Graham, M. Maiden, W. C. Ouyang, & M. Reynolds (Eds.), *Creative multilingualism: A manifesto* (pp. 69–85). Cambridge: Open Book Publishers.
- Marác, L., & Adamo, S. (2017). Multilingualism and social inclusion. *Social Inclusion*, 5(4), 1–4.
- Martín Rojo, L. (2015). *Five Foucauldian postulates for rethinking language and power* (Working Paper in Urban Language and Literacies No. 76). London: King’s College London.
- Martín Rojo, L., & Del Percio, A. (Eds.). (2020). *Language and neoliberal governmentality*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Martín Rojo, L. (2020). The “self-made speaker”: The neoliberal governance of speakers. In L. Martín Rojo & A. Del Percio (Eds.), *Language and neoliberal governmentality* (pp. 162–189). New York, NY: Routledge.
- May, S. (2014). Contesting public monolingualism and diglossia: Rethinking political theory and language policy for a multilingual world. *Language Policy*, 13, 371–393.
- May, S. (2019). Negotiating the multilingual turn in SLA. *The Modern Language Journal*, 103, 122–129.
- McKelvey, R. (2017). Language provision in education: A view from Scotland. *Social Inclusion*, 5(4), 78–86.
- Meulleman, M., & Fiorentino, A. (2018). Who can benefit from training in receptive language skills? In F. Grin (Ed.), *The MIME VADEMECUM: Mobility and inclusion in multilingual Europe* (pp. 138–139). Geneva: MIME Project.
- NRS. (2013). Statistical bulletin: 2011 census—Key results on population, ethnicity, identity, language, religion, health, housing and accommodation in Scotland. *National Records of Scotland*. Retrieved from <https://www.nrscotland.gov.uk/news/2013/census-2011-release-2a>
- Ó Ceallaigh, T. J., & Ní Dhonnabháin, A. (2015). Reawakening the Irish language through the Irish education system: Challenges and priorities. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 8(2), 179–198.
- Oliva, C. J., Donato, C., & Ricciardelli, F. (2019). Translation and translanguaging pedagogies in intercomprehension and multilingual teaching. In N. Slavkov & J. Séror (Eds.), *Translanguaging: Opportunities and challenges in a global world* (Vol. 10, pp. 157–182). Ottawa: Official Languages and Bilingualism Institution, University of Ottawa.
- Phipps, A., & Fassetta, G. (2015). A critical analysis of language policy in Scotland. *European Journal of Language Policy*, 7(1), 5–27.
- Piller, I. (2001). Naturalization language testing and its basis in ideologies of national identity and citizenship. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5(3), 259–277.
- Ricento, T. (Ed.). (2006). *An introduction to language policy*. New York, NY: Blackwell.
- Scottish Government. (2008). *Building the curriculum 3: A framework for learning and teaching*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- Scottish Government. (2012a). *Language learning in Scotland: A 1+2 approach, Scottish Government Languages Working Group report and recommendations*. Scottish Government. Retrieved from <http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2012/05/3670/downloads>
- Scottish Government. (2012b). Government’s response to the report of the Languages Working Group. *Scottish Government*. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.scot/binaries/content/documents/govscot/publications/corporate-report/2012/11/1-2-language-learning-policy-scottish-gov-response/documents/edb4494e-7c33-48cf-abd6-5abe76dfcefc/edb4494e-7c33-48cf-abd6-5abe76dfcefc/govscot%3Adocument>
- Scottish Government. (2018). Summary of statistics for schools in Scotland: Pupil census supplementary data. *Scottish Government*. Retrieved from <http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Statistics/Browse/School-Education/dspupcensus>
- Sebba, M. (2019). Named into being? Language questions and the politics of Scots in the 2011 census in Scotland. *Language Policy*, 18, 339–362.
- Urciuoli, B. (2016). The compromised pragmatics of diversity. *Language and Communication*, 51, 30–39.
- Walsh, J., & McLeod, W. (2008). An overcoat wrapped around an invisible man? Language legislation and language revitalisation in Ireland and Scotland. *Language Policy*, 7(1), 21–46.

About the Author



Argyro Kanaki is a Lecturer in Education at the University of Dundee, Scotland. She holds a PhD in language education. Her current teaching focuses on the pedagogy of modern foreign languages, TESOL, issues around culture, and debates in international education. Argyro currently researches metalinguistic awareness and its relations with language policy and language practices.

Article

Linguistic Diversity as a Challenge for Street-Level Bureaucrats in a Monolingually-Oriented Organisation

Elisabeth Scheibelhofer *, Clara Holzinger and Anna-Katharina Draxl

Department of Sociology, University of Vienna, 1010 Vienna, Austria; E-Mails: elisabeth.scheibelhofer@univie.ac.at (E.S.), clara.holzinger@univie.ac.at (C.H.), anna-katharina.draxl@univie.ac.at (A.-K.D.)

* Corresponding author

Submitted: 30 July 2020 | Accepted: 28 September 2020 | Published: 14 January 2021

Abstract

Migration-induced diversity has led to the global emergence of multilingual life worlds in which language regimes are particularly intertwined with labour markets. Thus, state institutions such as national unemployment services must fulfil a special role in society. In a qualitative research project (2019–2021), we interviewed employees at the Austrian Public Employment Service (AMS) at multiple organisational levels. The results demonstrate diverging and (apparently) contradicting approaches and strategies throughout the organisation concerning the appropriateness of using German exclusively during interactions with clients. This is illustrated along a continuum, ranging from a reflective, critical approach towards linguistic diversity that is at least partly based on ideas promoting the value of multilingualism to frequently encountered notions of the need for monolingualism. Such a framework must be understood by considering the coexistence of diverging ideas and ideologies surrounding multilingualism, as well as a neoliberal working context characterised by new public management and activation policy.

Keywords

communication; labour-market integration; language regimes; language-based discrimination; linguistic diversity; migration; social security; street-level bureaucracy; public employment service

Issue

This article is part of the issue “Social Inclusion and Multilingualism: The Impact of Linguistic Justice, Economy of Language and Language Policy” edited by László Marác (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands / L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Kazakhstan) and Zsombor Csata (Babeş-Bolyai University, Romania / Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Hungary).

© 2021 by the authors; licensee Cogitatio (Lisbon, Portugal). This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY).

1. Introduction

Because participation in society is contingent upon labour market access, public employment services are central institutions regarding social equity, particularly in the context of migration-related diversity. When researching the Austrian Public Employment Service (AMS) and how it addresses linguistic diversity, we observed both the absence of a coherent institutional strategy and an ensuing shift of language management-related responsibilities onto individuals (see also Holzinger, 2020).

Globalisation and its ensuing superdiversity (Vertovec, 2007) require a reassessment of the articulation between language, migration, and institutions

(Duchêne, Moyer, & Roberts, 2013). Despite its relative lack of attention in social science and migration studies (Canagarajah, 2017), the role of language has become more prominent in recent decades because of migration, new forms of mobility and transnationalism (Duchêne et al., 2013; Park & Wee, 2017). Scholars have criticised superficial celebrations of neoliberal multiculturalism and multilingualism (Canagarajah, 2017; Flores, 2019), thus highlighting the need for more concentrated research into the specific political, economic, cultural and social processes through which (linguistic) difference is transformed into inequality (Brubaker, 2014).

In an increasingly mobile world, the organisation of social security faces new challenges (Sabates-

Wheeler, Koettl, & Avato, 2011). Additionally, migrants within the EU—where a unique transnational social security system has been established—face substantial barriers when accessing welfare-related services and resources (Scheibelhofer & Holzinger, 2018; Scheibelhofer, Holzinger, & Regös, 2020; Seeleib-Kaiser & Pennings, 2018). For example, studies from Germany and Austria have shown that the enforcement of German as the language of administration and communication is the main informal barrier in this regard (Holzinger, 2020; Ratzmann, 2018). As Sabaté Dalmau, Garrido Sardà, and Codó (2017, p. 558) argue, migrants' access to key services for transnational survival "hinges upon the mobilization of 'appropriate' linguistic and communicative resources." Thus, language is at the core of migrants' unequal opportunities in how they organise their transnational lives (Sabaté Dalmau et al., 2017, p. 560).

Rather than merely being a neutral means of communication, language also serves to reproduce social inequalities on a symbolic level (Bourdieu, 1982). This social function of language is particularly relevant in the context of multilingual migration societies, where the phenomenon of transnationalism (Szanton-Blanc, Basch, & Glick Schiller, 1995) characterises both the lives of those who are actively in the process of migrating and adjusting to a new place, and those who are native to or have lived there for a long time. Within the context of globalisation and the new economy, the link between language and national identity has been weakened by the promotion of global languages and the commodification of language (Duchêne & Heller, 2012; Heller, 2010). At the same time, essentialist ties between language and national identity still serve as an influential model in the context of transnationalism (Park & Wee, 2017). This complex relationship between language, the nation-state and transnationalism is of particular relevance in an EU context, where pro-linguistic diversity discourses contrast with the territorial organisation of linguistic difference and where *de facto* multilingual nation-states still perceive themselves as essentially monolingual (Busch, 2009; Gal, 2006; Stevenson, Mar-Molinero, & Hogan-Brun, 2009).

Street-level bureaucracies, which occupy a frontline position in the mediation between government policy and the public (Lipsky, 1980), face unique communication challenges related to migration-induced linguistic diversity. As they function as both sites of migrant group categorisation and the administration of access to resources and services, a focus on public institutions provides insights into how social inequalities are (re)produced. Although contradictory ideologies and practices concerning language can arise in street-level bureaucracies, traditional ideologies that connect a national language with institutional identity are still influential in public institutions (Duchêne et al., 2013).

Drawing theoretically on Foucault, scholars working on the nexus of migration and language have shown

that through everyday institutional practices, neoliberal governmentality affects how language is seen, used and governed (Martín Rojo & Del Percio, 2019). Monolingualism—as a norm in institutional settings, rather than resulting from top-down policies—is often imposed by 'self-governing' strategies and monoglossic language ideologies, which have become embedded within institutions (Flores, 2019). Workfare (or activation), which emerged in the 1990s, can also be considered a form of governmentality (Flubacher, Coray, & Duchêne, 2016). The internalisation of dominant discourses promoting the ideal of an 'entrepreneurial self' leads neoliberal subjects to regard social risks such as unemployment as their own responsibility (Soysal, 1994).

Discourses unfold in particular discursive spaces or fields, where they are institutionalised and operationalised by social actors (Allan, 2018). As street-level bureaucrats (Lipsky, 1980), AMS employees must handle diversity-related issues when interacting with clients and are responsible for implementing migration- and integration-related policies on a local scale. Research has shown that preconceived notions held by street-level bureaucrats about migrants can affect the services they receive (Schütze, 2019).

2. Research Methodology

The analysis in this article is based on findings from the ongoing qualitative research project AMIGS—Employment Services in the Context of Migration-Induced Linguistic Diversity. Using the AMS, the project investigates public institutions in the context of linguistic diversity. Commissioned by the Federal Ministry of Labour, the AMS—which is organised as an enterprise under public law—is tasked primarily with delivering labour market-related services for both companies and jobseekers. Most of our interviewees were advisors responsible for assisting job seekers with accessing information and training opportunities, as well as accessing financial support.

Vienna (Austria) was chosen because of how the AMS is structured federally, as well as the city's significantly higher share of migrants and migration-related linguistic diversity compared to the rest of the country (Statistik Austria, 2020).

Our previous research (Holzinger, 2020; Regös, Holzinger, & Scheibelhofer, 2020; Scheibelhofer & Holzinger, 2018; Scheibelhofer et al., 2020) identified difficulties in handling linguistic diversity—both among AMS clients and within the institution itself—which are evident in the language barriers and pressure experienced by street-level bureaucrats (Lipsky, 1980). In a previous study (Holzinger, 2020) we included input from the AMS' migrant clients and will additionally focus on their perspective in a future research project (the FWF Austrian Science Fund-financed project "Investigating the Social Construction of Deskilling Among 'New' EU

Migrants in Vienna”). The ongoing project, however, is concerned with the internal perspective found within the institution; it investigates how AMS staff perceive handling linguistic diversity in their daily work routines as well as the associated problems and (both institutional and individual) solution strategies they describe. Thus, in order to focus on the latent structures, meaning-making processes and individual (coping) strategies at the AMS, our research employed a qualitative-interpretative approach. By drawing on the methodological principles of constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006, 2014) we collected data from problem-centred qualitative interviews (Scheibelhofer, 2008; Witzel & Reiter, 2012) and ethnographic observations (Spradley, 2009). To grasp the diversity of views within the AMS, we are continuing to interview employees at different organisational levels and consulting units in Vienna. The data analysis is geared towards initial and focused coding techniques, as proposed by Charmaz (2006, 2014).

At the time of this article’s completion, the project’s first research cycle has concluded and 15 qualitative interviews have been conducted. Additionally, the following research draws on nine interviews with AMS employees from our previous studies. In total, our analysis is thus based on a heterogeneous sample of 24 interviews with AMS employees, of which ten were conducted at the management level (federal office, regional office of Vienna, regional branch offices and department managers), and fourteen with street-level bureaucrats from seven different regional branch offices (basically corresponding to Vienna’s districts) as well as two specialised departments (counselling young clients, counselling convention refugees and people granted subsidiary protection). They ranged from 50 minutes to two hours, with an average length of 75 minutes. Almost half of the interviewees were ‘lifeworld multilingual’ (Gogolin, 1988) in languages such as Albanian, Dari, Farsi, French, Hungarian, Italian, Pashtu, Polish, Portuguese, Serbian, Spanish and Swedish, due to the participants’ personal or family history of immigration. All interviewees learned English at school, as is common in Austria, while some learned additional languages such as French or Spanish.

The following results demonstrate the divergent approaches to multilingualism, as expressed by the interviewees through the argumentations and problematisations they raised when discussing their work. This range of perspectives can be understood by the simultaneous presence of various ideas about public institutions and language policies. These ideas, in turn, influence the practices of street-level bureaucrats in their meetings with clients, and should be interpreted within a context marked by both underfunding and neoliberal logic.

3. A Monolingual Institution in a Multilingual Social Context?

Before proceeding to the interview results, the following passage contains a brief observation we made about the

AMS website, which exemplifies the institution’s stance on languages:

From *www.ams.at* (last accessed July 23rd, 2020): Here you can find German-language information about the first steps to take in the case of unemployment, further training opportunities, as well as working in Austria and the EU. At the top of the website, there are easy-to-understand options that demonstrate how to enlarge the font size for better accessibility. One looks in vain for one or more little symbols (e.g., flags or other signs) indicating the option to switch languages. However, only after scrolling down to the bottom of the page, below the Impressum (legal notice), do the two words “English version” appear. They can be found in the very last line, next to the privacy settings, and in an inconspicuously small font size. Our expectations for accessing the English version of the homepage by clicking on this option are immediately disappointed: Embedded in the German version of the webpage, there are only two sections translated into English, that give a very basic overview of the AMS and the services it offers (which make no mention about its responsibility for delivery of unemployment benefits). Overall, this is very scarce information. While further browsing through the German version of the homepage, we stumbled upon a handful of downloadable leaflets in other languages. We are puzzled: How can anyone lacking fluency in German access information on what to do in the case of unemployment?

Just like this brief evidence from the field, much of our empirical data clearly shows a contradictory relationship between the AMS and the realities of Vienna when it comes to how different languages are used within the city. Why would an unemployment agency in a highly diverse capital not offer this crucial information in other languages? How can we describe the deeper logics behind such evidence?

With approximately two million inhabitants, Vienna is a relatively small city compared to other European or international capitals, yet it is highly diverse: In 2019, more than 45% of the city’s population had a migration background, most of whom spoke a first language other than German. Of the Austrian population with a migration background, more than two thirds had a first language other than German in 2014, and 17% had no or only very limited knowledge of German (Fuchs et al., 2019; Statistik Austria, 2020). Increasing diversity can also be noted in the labour market, where the share of non-nationals in the workforce grew significantly over the past decade (Auer, Grieger, & Wach, 2019). To illustrate the linguistic diversity amongst those needing support from the AMS in Vienna, the employment rate for immigrants in Vienna who obtained their education in non-EU states was 56% in 2016. This employment rate has been declining considerably since 2011. By con-

trast, the rate of employment in Vienna for non-Austrian, EU/EFTA-born citizens who obtained an Austrian education is 78% (König et al., 2017). Furthermore, a positive correlation between German language skills and employment prospects has been observed (Gächter, 2016).

When approaching AMS employees at different hierarchical levels, we were astonished throughout our empirical work at how openly welcome our research interest in languages and everyday language use at the AMS was. We found a highly reflective environment in terms of diversity and language usage and were successful in securing interviewees in a short period of time. In fact, after word got around about our research topic, we were contacted by the interviewees in higher numbers than we had expected. Therefore, we were not surprised with how the interviewees usually started the interviews by describing how language and linguistic diversity was one of the most salient topics characterising everyday work at the AMS.

The participants' enthusiasm to participate in the interviews and their first-hand experiences, thus, sharply contrasted with what the AMS website projects. On the one hand, advisors highlighted the importance of using different languages as part of their work routines and were eager to share their experiences with linguistic diversity. On the other hand, the website almost completely ignored the multilingual reality of the Viennese labour market and thus failed to provide information that would be helpful to unemployed persons with limited knowledge of German language. In the following, we will use results from the still-ongoing analyses of our research materials to try to make sense of these observed divergences.

3.1. Language-Related Difficulties for Street-Level Bureaucrats Amplified by Underfunding and New Public Management

Institutional and political arrangements within the AMS help explain how languages manifest as everyday work issues, and how they are approached. Our findings differentiate between the following issues, which are sometimes directly addressed by the interviewed AMS employees. At the beginning of the interview, AMS officers would generally acknowledge that "customers"—the term the AMS uses to address unemployed persons—frequently do not speak German as their first language. Thus, dealing with language-related issues is a common experience for the organisation's employees. Consequently, many AMS advisors expressed doubts about whether their clients would be able to understand what they told them, and the resulting misunderstandings might have implications for their eligibility for unemployment benefits. One interviewee expressed this concern as:

The question is always whether you've understood one another. I'm often not sure whether my cus-

tomers understand me correctly. [Laughs] And if you then have somebody sitting in front of you who only speaks broken German, then naturally it's even more difficult. (Cornelia Nowack, advisor—all interviewee names have been anonymized)

After establishing the presence of language-related difficulties at their work, the clerks focused on coping strategies concerning how to manage situations where clients had very limited knowledge of the German language. For example, they would use simple expressions, while avoiding technical legal terms and elaborate German. When encountering their clients, the interviewees also found it helpful to create drawings or highlight written documents in different colours. Overall, we identified a wide and often disjointed variety of strategies, ranging from communicating with gestures to using technologies (e.g., pilot testing online interpretation via video).

A key issue for AMS officers was how to make themselves clear in terms of legally binding restrictions, which has many implications. It is ultimately the AMS officer's duty to provide legally flawless information to the unemployed. Therefore, trying to greatly simplify often-complex issues may interfere with their work duty. To avoid legal complications, AMS officers sometimes used additional coping strategies. At some local offices, interviewees who did not share a room with other colleagues described leaving their office door open. This ensured that their next-door colleague could listen in and serve as a witness if legal troubles later arose.

However, this issue of liability must be seen in a broader context. In addition to needing to communicate complex issues in simpler language, officers also must do so under specific circumstances that exacerbate language barriers. Our empirical work indicates that the specific institutional work context at the AMS is characterised by bureaucratic reform processes under the heading of new public management (see, e.g., Lessenich, 2015; Soysal, 2012) as well as chronic underfunding and understaffing arising from a combination of rising unemployment rates and cutbacks. The interviewees perceived high pressure concerning temporal, financial and personnel resources, in addition to considerable legal complexity and bureaucratisation. As noted by Penz, Sauer, Gaitsch, Hofbauer, and Glinsner (2017) in their comparative study, Austrian AMS advisors must juggle more legal fields than those in similar positions in Germany and Switzerland. Furthermore, they have a significantly higher caseload and thus only very short and standardised appointment timeslots. High and increased work requirements are accompanied by high levels of discretion and are regulated by constant performance evaluations for individual AMS employees and regional branch offices (Penz et al., 2017). Thus, explaining complex legal matters in an intelligible and accessible way to those with poor German skills requires time that employees rarely can provide.

During our interviews, we noted how AMS clerks at different organisational levels had internalised the problem of limited resources. Such limitations induce street-level bureaucrats to carefully estimate the costs and benefits of each training measure for job seekers. For example, while following institutional guidelines, AMS employees had to quickly evaluate whether or not someone's employment prospects would benefit from German courses, which meant that typically only highly educated jobseekers with good employment outlooks were placed in higher-level courses. In the following quote, an advisor expresses regret about not being able to offer to all interested clients a higher-level German course due to limited resources and the AMS' focus on (re)integrating clients into the labour market as quickly as possible:

I also don't think it's a disadvantage if customers want to be trained above the B1 level. I wish they would also get it. But of course, all that costs money and the AMS is assigned to connect people and work and to do so as quickly as possible. And the fact is that with B1, which is approximately the level of compulsory education—having completed compulsory education—you can absolutely take up work in the auxiliary sector or to do an apprenticeship. (Lisa Gruber, advisor)

Additionally, the notion of self-responsibilization plays a role, including estimations about whether a client is sufficiently 'active' (i.e., self-motivated) in seeking a new job (Soysal, 2012). As one advisor explained:

So, these are the things where we...when we think about further support measures, whether we should really support the customer or...or not. Even if he meets the requirements, but his personal attributes wouldn't fit...then this support measure was in vain....And communication from the other side is also very important for us. How does the customer talk to me? Does he come and go or...does he have a certain amount of initiative, is seeking employment, has made an application, has submitted everything in writing. And...he needs assistance and then I have to act. (Farid Ahmadi, advisor)

This quote illustrates how some advisors internalized dominant discourses promoting 'self-responsibility' and how, therefore, the activation paradigm within European labour market politics (van Berkel, de Graaf, & Sirovátka, 2012) functions as a form of governmentality. In such an environment, it is ultimately the AMS officers who make decisions that determine the future work biography of the unemployed. Thus, AMS officials have considerable leeway in their decision-making, which is characteristic of street-level bureaucrats (Lipsky, 1980). On one hand, this discretion is necessary for the advisors to cope with their complex and highly diverse caseload. On the

other hand, this discretion may lead to additional strain for street-level bureaucrats, while being an additional source of unequal treatment and (linguistic) discrimination for clients, as admitted inter alia in the following quote from an AMS advisor:

It certainly is rather different from advisor to advisor, so to speak...assessing is one thing and partly—we may have our guidelines—but partly we also have some leeway. So...it is then a bit of a coincidence, so to say, which advisor you end up with and whether this advisor is a bit understanding and says, "ok, then let's do another German course," or eventually says, "well...yet another...a fourth German course, that doesn't make sense anymore, we are now only looking for jobs on construction sites," to put it in extreme terms. (Michael Tomek, advisor)

3.2. Using Languages Other than German: An 'Emergency Solution' Only?

Returning to the matter of which coping strategies AMS officers apply, interviewees also mentioned using one's own language repertoire beyond German. This was usually described as an 'emergency solution' used only when there was no other way to communicate. It was clear that switching to another language is not an everyday habit of AMS employees. However, interviewees explained that in exceedingly rare cases, when deemed necessary, they would speak in another language—usually English. However, this raises the question of what constitutes a 'necessity' to use another language in this context.

First, there were groups that the interviewees consistently referred to as vulnerable groups, thus legitimising their distinct treatment (which included language practices) that is inconsistent with the above-described discourse on self-responsibilization. By contrasting them with unemployed migrants from the EU (who were described as independent, self-sufficient, and consequently not in need of institutional help), refugees were described as vulnerable and in need. As one regional branch director illustrated: "It's also evident that these people can't come here and function like well-situated Central Europeans" (Karl Metzler). In 2017, this recurrent pattern of reasoning justified using multilingual material and the creation of a special service point for refugees in Vienna, in which the AMS began to offer appointments in the first-languages of certain refugee populations. Specific material, trainings, or appointments in languages other than German were also offered to other groups. For example, women (mainly Muslim) were positioned as vulnerable and thus in need of 'special' treatment, including linguistic accommodations.

A further differentiation in how foreign languages were used at the AMS arose between officials who drew on languages they learned after childhood, mainly standard school languages, and native speakers of common migrant languages (such as Turkish or Bosnian-

Croatian-Serbian). Implicitly, a special and simultaneously ambiguous status was afforded to the latter (in detail see Holzinger, 2020): Although non-German counselling is not legally prohibited by the AMS, it was presented as undesirable. Interviewees described how this viewpoint was transmitted verbally by department managers and colleagues as well as through daily institutional routines. However, the interviewees also reported occasionally relying on multilingual officials to provide unofficially valuable (and necessary) services concerning language-related problems. In this regard, interviewed executives explicitly addressed the problem of exploited native speakers (De Jong, 2019). For example, an interviewed director from a regional branch referred to native speakers of common migrant languages as “colleagues we somehow can exploit a bit if we need information” (Karl Metzler).

However, we also identified differences among interviewees who were themselves native speakers of languages other than German. While they all explained that they do most of their work in German, there was significant discrepancy regarding how they evaluated speaking another language and their reported practices—another paradigmatic example of the street-level bureaucrat’s leeway in decision making. Some enjoyed using other languages in their line of work: “Well...so, my advantage is that I can switch. If Poles would come, I could absolutely see to it that I could help them along” (Lucjan Wisniewski, advisor). On the other hand, others were concerned about problems that could arise from communicating with clients in other languages. As one young female advisor expressed:

And I happen to have Serbian as my mother tongue; I actually don’t use it at work—I avoid it. It’s not really desirable, because first—because the customers—we see to it that the customers, if possible, learn to speak German. And second, simply, just for my self-protection. (Dunja Ivanovic, advisor)

A recurrent theme in the interviews, as illustrated above, was the patronizing idea (in contrast to the notion of autonomous clients, according to the activation paradigm) that clients must be compelled to learn German and that communication in any other language will impede this goal. Advisors also frequently emphasized the need to be protected or protect themselves from potential ‘fraternisation’ among co-ethnics or clients’ attempts to ensure favourable treatment based on an assumedly shared cultural identity. Besides the ensuing need to establish linguistic boundaries with clients to deter such illicit requests, (self-)protection was also mentioned regarding issues of hierarchy, power relations, and their intersection with languages. Communication in an institutional setting like the AMS entails establishing a certain power relation, to ensure that the street-level bureaucrats’ role is respected in the subsequent interactions. As Bourdieu (1982)

asserts, language is a fundamental means of negotiating social power positions. In that sense, using languages other than German at the AMS was perceived by most interviewees as a potential threat to maintaining a dominant speaker position—both for native speakers of non-German languages and, as the following passage shows, for those advisors reverting to languages acquired later in life, most notably English:

Of course, it’s also that I have colleagues who don’t speak foreign languages; now, they could not at all hold, uhm, a conversation in another language. Like I said, I myself also find it difficult, in English, because I often, need to use technical terms, so, I often find it awkward when I’m sitting there, in front of me....So, I was really embarrassed last time around, a young Syrian was sitting in front of me speaking perfect English and I was trying to explain something to him, and I couldn’t express what I meant, so...that’s, that’s really, so....Perhaps you also don’t do it so that you....Because I prefer to do it with an interpreter—the counselling interviews—because I myself am embarrassed that I often can’t explain it. (Cornelia Nowack, advisor)

Interestingly, we identified some differences among AMS employees in their attitudes to multilingual communication and could partly link them to status positions. First, there were differences regarding the language in question: Speakers of more prestigious languages (such as English or Italian) were more inclined to use them than speakers of common migrant minority languages that enjoy less prestige in the Austrian context, such as Serbian or Hungarian. However, we also found decisive differences among speakers of these minority languages (see, for example, the above-mentioned Polish-speaking advisor). Second, our data indicates that interviewees’ choice of which language to use during appointments is a resource that helps street-level bureaucrats gain legitimacy in their professional role as well as their client’s compliance: For example, the above-mentioned young female Serbian-speaking advisor described how she often found it difficult to establish a professional relationship with her clients because they would not accept her position due to her age and gender—especially if they shared the same native language. Thus, insisting on using German helped her demand respect and maintain a professional distance.

In general, setting boundaries with clients seems to be important to AMS employees, especially under the challenging working conditions that are typical to the neoliberal restructuring of the welfare state. Nevertheless, it is essential for street-level bureaucrats to ensure a certain level of trust and cooperation with the unemployed (regardless of their first language). In order to reach the new public management goals in terms of management by objectives (Weishaupt, 2010), employees must perform affective work (Penz et al.,

2017). This emotional work is even more complex if additional languages are incorporated into the situation. In the following passage, an AMS officer described the difficulties that arose in her work arising from the (assumed) intersection of deficient German language skills and the lack of willingness to cooperate:

To generally understand the preconditions, ‘what do I actually have to fulfil?’ For a start, in order to receive a benefit, that’s actually the most difficult barrier; then it’s most often that the customers don’t want—not that they don’t know it—but rather that they don’t want. But at the beginning, it’s just really hard, it’s hard to rate. Does she get me now and simply doesn’t want to have it that way? Or does she not get me and is just defending herself, so to speak, because she can’t do it otherwise, can’t express it another way? (Dunja Ivanovic, advisor)

The AMS officers described their tasks not only in terms of emotional work in order to ensure cooperation on the side of the unemployed. As with previous examples, this quotation also shows how power relations are negotiated through language use. In this case, we can see how advisors perceive resistance from some clients who they suspect to ‘hide’ behind (ostensible) incomprehension.

3.3. Speaking German as the Dominant Strategy

As described in the preceding sections, all interviewees acknowledged a multiplicity of languages present in their everyday work. However, our analyses show that the AMS as an organisation is predominantly perceived as a monolingual institution. This is maintained by the assumption that the Viennese labour market is German-speaking, meaning the unemployed must speak German to find work. Therefore, the AMS may ask its clients to communicate in German. The interviewees also argued that they did not want to send false signals and pointed to an assumed unwillingness to learn German on the part of their clients, thereby drawing on widespread public and political discourses concerning language and integration (Cederberg, 2014; Cillia & Dorostkar, 2013; Flubacher, 2018; Flubacher et al., 2016; Plutzar, 2010). Another common overtone that highlights the AMS being perceived as monolingual is the normative role of German in everyday work: In 14 of the 24 interviews, the interviewees stated (without being prompted) that the ‘official’ or ‘administrative language’ (*Amtssprache*) of the AMS is German. *Amtssprache* has a clearly normative connotation, and its emphasis from the interviewees indicates the influence of a traditional ideology that connects a national language with institutional identity.

Nevertheless, it should be emphasised that the interviewees also reflected upon the monolingual (self-)image of the organisation, by mostly applying a temporal lens to the meaning of the German language within the AMS. The following interviewee stressed that

younger, more diverse colleagues would put their first languages to use as well:

The first thing you’d learn is: German is the *Amtssprache* in Austria. That was in me, as well. OK? Simply, if you hear it all around, then that’s the way it is. OK? And I still hear myself frequently saying, I’m certainly not going to speak English, German is the official language in Austria. So....And that’s changed though. Thank God that’s changed. I believe it’s a, a question of generations. We’ve really got a lot of young colleagues...who just don’t see it that way. Who use their Turkish, who use their Serbian, whatever we’ve got as to languages. (Theresa Lenz, department head)

Thus, we could identify ideas and ideologies which contested the traditional idea of German as the only legitimate institutional language by recognizing the multilingual reality of Vienna and valuing multilingualism. However, although interviewees acknowledged (increasing) diversity—including diversity of language use—within the AMS, we see that monolingualism remains dominant. This becomes most obvious in one of the few documents addressing language usage at the AMS: In the event that unemployed persons who at their first appointments seem to speak German insufficiently, they are handed a double-sided, printed information sheet stating in 20 languages to take someone who can interpret for them along to their next appointment. As a justification for the necessity of monolingualism, the interviewees repeatedly told us that they needed to make sure that they could flawlessly provide legally binding information, as described earlier. Thus, by asking the unemployed to bring interpreters to the appointments, street-level bureaucrats can avoid being blamed for misunderstandings, while the need for (language-related) problem-solving is delegated to the unemployed person seeking assistance from the AMS (see also Holzinger, 2020). Nevertheless, this organisational strategy does not guarantee that the correct information reaches the clients, since those interpreting may speak German only slightly better than the clients themselves. Additionally, the concept of self-responsibility is once again invoked here to relieve the AMS of its responsibility to ensure mutual understanding:

Yes, because the responsibility always lies with the customer and they have to make sure that they understand it. It’s like when you go abroad, then you have to find out for yourself what the rules are like abroad. Yes, the legal requirements, for example....Yes, it is the self-responsibility of the customer to understand what we are saying here; we cannot speak all the languages of the world. (Lisa Gruber, advisor)

The observed top-down instructions, official guidelines and regulations thus point to monolingualism as the main strategy used to cope with diversity at this institution.

4. Conclusion

Returning to our vignette of the AMS website above, we now can provide more clarity about the context surrounding a website directed at *all* unemployed persons living in Austria that is clearly not equipped to provide information in any language besides German. We could not discern a coherent AMS-wide institutional strategy regarding linguistic diversity. Instead, street-level bureaucrats have considerable leeway in decision-making regarding language use. While we identified monolingualism as the main strategy, multiple multilingual practices can be identified in the everyday work of AMS employees, yet they reflect a disorganised mix of side strategies rather than a coherent institutional strategy. We explained this apparent incongruity in the co-presence of various (occasionally conflicting) ideologies and ideas about languages and language use. These, in turn, influence the practices of street-level bureaucrats in a context marked by scarce resources and new public management reforms.

We therefore argue that diverging strategies, ranging from monolingual to multilingual, can be readily combined with each other. Both ends of this linguistic continuum must be recognised as existing within a changing political and public discourse as well as based on neoliberal activation policy. While we encountered contradictory ideologies and practices concerning language when researching the AMS, we also observed that traditional ideologies, connecting a national language with institutional identity, are still influential in this public institution (Duchêne et al., 2013).

We conclude that more interpretative qualitative research is necessary to provide a more detailed account of the complex, interwoven issues as well as simultaneous monolingual and multilingual practices within a single institution. In the context of de facto multilingual nation states, which paradoxically still perceive themselves as essentially monolingual (Busch, 2009; Gal, 2006; Stevenson et al., 2009), we advocate for contemplating about these issues in more general terms: Looking at street-level bureaucracies in general, such as unemployment services, in addition to hospitals, schools or universities, may reveal a greater phenomenon of neglecting linguistic diversity as an issue for the respective organisation, which requires a coherent institutional answer. In other words, dealing with language barriers and communication problems is still too often delegated to the individual street-level bureaucrats. In turn, their primary focus—especially in a context of neoliberal management strategies and underfunding—is rather on delivering what they are trained to, whether it involves reintegrating people into employment, helping them improve their health, or learning necessary skills, rather than on ensuring equal access to resources for all clients regardless of their linguistic resources.

As highly diverse societies, we will need to further develop approaches to overcome language-based dis-

crimination and power struggles that lead to associated social inequalities. Achieving this requires much more interdisciplinary and internationally comparative work to move beyond unchallenged traditional ideas about language usage that reflect social inequalities not only within the researched organisation but within society in general.

Acknowledgments

The two-year research project AMIGS (2019–2021) was funded by the Anniversary Fund of the Central Bank of the Republic of Austria (OeNB, Project Number 18078). Open access funding was provided by the University of Vienna. We thank the three anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on earlier drafts of the manuscript.

Conflict of Interests

The authors declare no conflict of interests.

References

- Allan, K. (2018). Critical political economic approaches to the study of language and neoliberalism. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 22(4), 454–469. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12313>
- Auer, E., Grieger, N., & Wach, I. (2019). *Erstmals mehr als 4 Millionen Menschen: Wie sich das Arbeitskräftepotenzial zusammensetzt und wie sehr es sich in den letzten 10 Jahren verändert hat* [For the first time: More than four million people. What the labour force potential is composed of and how strongly it has changed over the past 10 years]. Vienna: Public Employment Service Austria, Department of Labour Market Research and Career Information.
- Bourdieu, P. (1982). *Ce que parler veut dire: L'économie des échanges linguistiques* [Language and symbolic power]. Paris: Fayard.
- Brubaker, R. (2014). Linguistic and religious pluralism: Between difference and inequality. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 41(1), 3–32.
- Busch, B. (2009). Local actors in promoting multilingualism. In G. Hogan-Brun, C. Mar-Molinero, & P. Stevenson (Eds.), *Discourses on language and integration: Critical perspectives on language testing regimes in Europe* (pp. 129–152). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Canagarajah, S. (2017). The nexus of migration and language. The emergence of a disciplinary space. In C. Suresh (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of migration and language* (1st ed., pp. 1–28). London: Routledge.
- Cederberg, M. (2014). Public discourses and migrant stories of integration and inequality: Language and power in biographical narratives. *Sociology*, 48(1), 133–149.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Thou-

- sand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). London: SAGE.
- Cillia, R. d., & Dorostkar, N. (2013). Integration und/durch Sprache [Integration and/through language]. In J. Dahlvik, C. Reinprecht, & W. Sievers (Eds.), *Migration und Integration—Wissenschaftliche Perspektiven aus Österreich* [Migration and integration—Scientific perspectives from Austria] (pp. 143–162). Göttingen: V&R Unipress.
- De Jong, S. (2019). A window of opportunity? Refugee staff's employment in migrant support and advocacy organizations. *Identities*, 26(3), 321–338.
- Duchêne, A., & Heller, M. (Eds.). (2012). *Language in late capitalism: Pride and profit*. London: Routledge.
- Duchêne, A., Moyer, M., & Roberts, C. (2013). Introduction: Recasting institutions and work in multilingual and transnational spaces. In A. Duchêne, M. Moyer, & C. Roberts (Eds.), *Language, migration and social inequalities: A critical sociolinguistic perspective on institutions and work* (pp. 1–21). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Flores, N. (2019). Producing national and neoliberal subjects. Bilingual education and governmentality in the United States. In L. Martín Rojo & A. Del Percio (Eds.), *Language and neoliberal governmentality* (pp. 49–68). London and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Flubacher, M.-C. (2018). "Sprache," Integration und Arbeit. Eine soziologische Annäherung ["Language," integration and work. A sociological approach]. In S. Engelage (Ed.), *Migration und Berufsbildung in der Schweiz* [Migration and vocational training in Switzerland] (pp. 53–76). Zurich: Seismo.
- Flubacher, M.-C., Coray, R., & Duchêne, A. (2016). Language, integration, and investment: The regulation of diversity in the context of unemployment. *Multilingua: Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 35(6), 675–696.
- Fuchs, R., Klimont, J., Knittler, K., Kytir, J., Marik-Lebeck, S., Wisbauer, A., & Biffl, G. (2019). *Migration und Integration 2019* [Migration and integration 2019]. Vienna: Statistik Austria.
- Gächter, A. (2016). *Die Attraktivität von Arbeitskräften aus den EU-Mitgliedsstaaten 2004 und 2007* [The attractiveness of labour from the EU member states in 2004 and 2007] (Working Paper No. 31). Vienna: Zentrum für Soziale Innovation.
- Gal, S. (2006). Migration, minorities and multilingualism. Language ideologies in Europe. In C. Mar-Molinero & P. Stevenson (Eds.), *Language ideologies, policies and practices: Language and the future of Europe* (pp. 13–27). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gogolin, I. (1988). *Erziehungsziel Zweisprachigkeit: Konturen eines sprachpädagogischen Konzepts für die multikulturelle Schule* [Bilingualism as an educational goal: Outlines of a language education concept for multicultural schools]. Hamburg: Bergmann + Helbig.
- Heller, M. (2010). The commodification of language. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 39, 101–114.
- Holzinger, C. (2020). 'We don't worry that much about language': Street-level bureaucracy in the context of linguistic diversity. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 46(9), 1792–1808. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2019.1610365>
- König, K., Manolacos, T., Luger, K., Ganal, U., Häberlin, U., Akagündüz-Binder, B., . . . Fröschl, D. (2017). 4 *Wiener Integrations & Diversitätsmonitor 2013–2016* [Fourth Viennese integration and diversity monitor, 2013–2016]. Vienna: City of Vienna, Integration and Diversity (Municipal Department 17).
- Lessenich, S. (2015). *Die Neuerfindung des Sozialen: Der Sozialstaat im flexiblen Kapitalismus* [Reinventing the social: The welfare state in flexible capitalism]. Bielefeld: transcript.
- Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-level bureaucracy*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Martín Rojo, L., & Del Percio, A. (2019). Neoliberalism, language, and governmentality. In L. Martín Rojo & A. Del Percio (Eds.), *Language and neoliberal governmentality* (pp. 1–25). London and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Park, J. S.-Y., & Wee, L. (2017). Nation-state, transnationalism and language. In C. Suresh (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of migration and language* (1st ed., pp. 47–62). London: Routledge.
- Penz, O., Sauer, B., Gaitsch, M., Hofbauer, J., & Glinzner, B. (2017). Post-bureaucratic encounters: Affective labour in public employment services. *Critical Social Policy*, 37(4), 540–561. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261018316681286>
- Plutzar, V. (2010). Sprache als "Schlüssel" zur Integration? Eine kritische Annäherung an die österreichische Sprachenpolitik im Kontext von Migration [Language as a "key" to integration? A critical approach to Austrian linguistic policies in the context of migration]. In H. Langthaler (Ed.), *Integration in Österreich. Sozialwissenschaftliche Befunde* [Integration in Austria. Social science findings]. Innsbruck: Studien Verlag.
- Ratzmann, N. (2018). Gleichberechtigt—und diskriminiert. Für EU-Bürger gibt es Zugangsbarrieren zur deutschen Grundsicherung [Equitable—and discriminated. There are barriers to entering basic German security benefits]. *WZ Mitteilungen*, 159, 41–43.
- Regös, E. N., Holzinger, C., & Scheibelhofer, E. (2020). When vicinity divides: Transnational social security in the cross-border region of Hungary and Austria. In A. Amelina, E. Carmel, A. Runfors, & E. Scheibelhofer (Eds.), *Boundaries of European social citizenship. EU citizens' transnational social security in regulations, discourses and experiences* (pp. 113–132). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Sabaté Dalmau, M., Garrido Sardà, M. R., & Codó, E. (2017). Language-mediated services for migrants. Monolingualist institutional regimes and translinguistic user practices. In C. Suresh (Ed.), *The Routledge*

- handbook of migration and language* (1st ed., pp. 558–576). London: Routledge.
- Sabates-Wheeler, R., Koettl, J., & Avato, J. (2011). Social security for migrants: A global overview of portability arrangements. In R. Sabates-Wheeler & R. Feldmann (Eds.), *Migration and social protection. Claiming social rights beyond borders* (pp. 91–116). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Scheibelhofer, E. (2008). Combining narration-based interviews with topical interviews: Methodological reflections on research practices. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 11(5), 403–416. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13645570701401370>
- Scheibelhofer, E., & Holzinger, C. (2018). ‘Damn it, I am a miserable Eastern European in the eyes of the administrator’: EU migrants’ experiences with (transnational) social security. *Social Inclusion*, 6(3), 201–209. <https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v6i3.1477>
- Scheibelhofer, E., Holzinger, C., & Regös, E. N. (2020). Navigating the labyrinths of transnational social security: Experiences and meaning-making processes of EU migrants when accessing and porting social benefits. In A. Amelina, E. Carmel, A. Runfors, & E. Scheibelhofer (Eds.), *Boundaries of European citizenship: Regulations, discourses and experiences of transnational social security* (pp. 91–112). London: Routledge.
- Schütze, C. (2019). Attitudes matter—Welfare work and migration in Sweden. *Migration Studies*, 8(3). <https://doi.org/10.1093/mny/mny048>
- Seeleib-Kaiser, M., & Pennings, F. (2018). Intra-EU migration and social rights: An introduction. In M. Seeleib-Kaiser & F. Pennings (Eds.), *EU citizenship and social rights. Entitlements and impediments to accessing welfare* (pp. 1–7). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Soysal, Y. N. (1994). *Limits of citizenship: Migrants and postnational membership in Europe*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Soysal, Y. N. (2012). Citizenship, immigration, and the European social project: Rights and obligations of individuality. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 63(1), 1–21.
- Spradley, J. P. (2009). *Participant observation* (31st ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Statistik Austria. (2020). *Bevölkerung mit Migrationshintergrund nach Bundesländern* (Jahresdurchschnitt 2019) [Population with migrant backgrounds according to federal states (2019 annual average); Press release]. Retrieved from http://www.statistik.at/web_de/statistiken/menschen_und_gesellschaft/bevoelkerung/bevoelkerungsstruktur/bevoelkerung_nach_migrationshintergrund/index.html
- Stevenson, P., Mar-Molinero, C., & Hogan-Brun, G. (2009). *Discourses on language and integration: Critical perspectives on language testing regimes in Europe*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Szanton-Blanc, C., Basch, L., & Glick Schiller, N. (1995). Transnationalism, nation-states, and culture. *Current Anthropology*, 36, 683–686. <https://doi.org/10.1086/204418>
- van Berkel, R., de Graaf, W., & Sirovátka, T. (2012). Governance of the activation policies in Europe: Introduction. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 32(5/6), 260–272. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01443331211236943>
- Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 1024–1054. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870701599465>
- Weishaupt, J. T. (2010). A silent revolution? New management ideas and the reinvention of European public employment services. *Socio-Economic Review*, 8(3), 461–486.
- Witzel, A., & Reiter, H. (2012). *The problem-centred interview*. London: SAGE.

About the Authors



Elisabeth Scheibelhofer is an Associate Professor of Sociology (University of Vienna) working on migration, mobility and qualitative methods. She is currently leading the research project AMIGS (2019–2021) which is looking at labour-market institutions in multilingual societies. This is a follow-up project of a broader international collaboration (transwel.org; 2015–2018) covering EU migrants’ transnational access to social security rights. She has published extensively on a range of issues within migration research and qualitative methodologies.



Clara Holzinger works as a Research Assistant and Lecturer at the Department of Sociology, University of Vienna, Austria. She is currently working on the AMIGS project (2019–2021). She has a disciplinary background in Sociology, Applied Linguistics and History. Her research interests focus on qualitative empirical methods, migration, welfare, linguistic diversity and language policy. Recent publications include the article “‘We Don’t Worry That Much About Language’: Street-Level Bureaucracy in the Context of Linguistic Diversity” (2020; *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 46(9), 1792–1808).



Anna-Katharina Draxl works as a Research Assistant at the Department of Sociology, University of Vienna, Austria. Having a background in Social and Cultural Anthropology and Applied Linguistics, she has experience in interdisciplinary research teams in Educational Studies and Sociology. Her research interests focus on migration and language in the fields of education, work and language policy.

Article

Controlled Multilingual Thesauri for Kazakh Industry-Specific Terms

Ainur Bayekeyeva ^{1,*}, Saule Tazhibayeva ², Zhainagul Beisenova ², Aigul Shaheen ² and Aisaule Bayekeyeva ³

¹ Department of Translation Theory and Practice, L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, 010000 Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan; E-Mail: a_baekeyeva@mail.ru

² Faculty of Philology, L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, 010000 Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan; E-Mails: sauletazhibayeva@mail.ru (S.T.), zhaina_b@mail.ru (Z.B.), akingan@mail.ru (A.S.)

³ State Material Reserve Committee of the Ministry of National Economy of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 010000 Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan; E-Mail: aisaule68@mail.ru

* Corresponding author

Submitted: 31 July 2020 | Accepted: 15 October 2020 | Published: 14 January 2021

Abstract

This article discusses the practical issues of compiling controlled multilingual thesauri for the purposes of industry-specific translation (IST). In the multilingual, transnational and globally connected Kazakhstan, IST is a much-needed translation service. IST is an interdisciplinary field between terminology, computational linguistics, translation theory and practice. Most of the professional guides, dictionaries and glossaries are systemized in alphabetical order and contain multiple variants for the terms searched. Therefore, there is an urgent need to create a systemized controlled multilingual thesaurus of industry-specific Kazakh, English and Russian terms in order to provide multilingual users with an interoperable and relevant term base. Controlled multilingual thesauri for industry-specific terms are the most effective tools for describing individual subject areas. They are designed to promote communication and interaction among professionals, translators and all Automated Information System users of specific fields irrespective of their location and health conditions. Unlike traditional dictionaries, controlled thesauri allow users to identify the meaning with the help of definitions and translations, relations of terms with other concepts, and broader and narrower terms. The purpose of this research is to unify and systematize industry-specific terms in Kazakh, to provide Russian and English equivalents, and to classify the terms into essential rubrics and subjects. Based on the Zthes data scheme to create a controlled multilingual thesaurus of industry-specific terms, the major rubrics have been formulated, and about 10,000 Kazakh mining and metal terms approved by the Terminological Committee of Kazakhstan have been structured.

Keywords

controlled thesaurus; controlled vocabulary; industry-specific terms; interoperable thesaurus; Kazakhstan; multilingualism; multilingual thesaurus; terminology; thesaurus

Issue

This article is part of the issue “Social Inclusion and Multilingualism: The Impact of Linguistic Justice, Economy of Language and Language Policy” edited by László Marác (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands / L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Kazakhstan) and Zsombor Csata (Babeş-Bolyai University, Romania / Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Hungary).

© 2021 by the authors; licensee Cogitatio (Lisbon, Portugal). This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY).

1. Introduction

1.1. Language Situation in Kazakhstan

Kazakhstan is a multiethnic, multilingual and multicultural country. During the twentieth century, 126 eth-

nic groups found residence in Kazakhstan. These ethnicities migrated to Kazakhstan from different regions of the Soviet Union for various reasons: (1) deportation during the collectivization period in the USSR in the 1920s; (2) deportation during the period of the Second World War; (3) industrialization during the Second World War;

and (4) the Virgin Land Campaign in the 1950s and 1960s (Nevskaya & Tazhibayeva, 2015a).

Many people from various populations came to Kazakhstan's cities to work in the factories, in state and municipal administrations, in organs of the Communist Party and other fields. Such migration volume strongly influenced the ethnic-demographic, social and language situation in Kazakhstan. From a monolingual country in the early 1920s, it turned into a bilingual one, with a strong Russian language dominance.

As a result, the Kazakh language was the language of rural areas, where the majority of Kazakh population lived. The language situation in Kazakhstan changed after the collapse of the USSR. The subsequent years of Kazakhstani independence have had a positive impact on the state language by broadening the usage of Kazakh in education, mass media, and culture. The promotion and full functioning of Kazakh as well as the policy of multilingual education was announced in the State Program on Education Development for 2011–2020. A new generation of young Kazakhs carries out their activities in Kazakh, Russian and English. However, code shifting into Russian is very frequent even now and Russian serves as an intermediate language when providing Kazakh–English translation.

1.2. New Challenges to Kazakh Industry-Specific Terminology

Scientific and technological progress in the 1960–1980s, globalization since the 1990s, and the world pandemic situation in 2019–2020 have created new challenges and opportunities in information exchange for the emerging new field of industry-specific translation (IST). Globalization in a multilingual world, the 4th Industrial Revolution and the recent world pandemic have impacted Kazakhstan's economy, industry and other related fields such as translation services. Seventy percent of Kazakhstan's state bodies and ministries, 80 percent of educational establishments, schools and universities, and 100 percent of disabled employees and other vulnerable communities have been changed over to home offices (Republic of Kazakhstan, 2020).

The prevalence of linguistically diverse and multilingual societies are increasing due to globalization and Europeanization (Marácz & Adamo, 2017; Nevskaya & Tazhibayeva, 2015b). English often is considered to be the lingua franca in international communication, business and technology. Therefore, translation from/to English still remains an imperative in most non-English-speaking countries of the world, and trilingual Kazakhstan is no exception (Yeskeldiyeva & Tazhibayeva, 2015). Multilingual IST is a cross subject and multidimensional field involving terminology, computational linguistics, translation theory and practice.

As a branch of terminology, bilingual industry-specific terms in Kazakh and Russian were first unified in the 1950s by the initiative of Kazakh scholars

Kanysh Satpayev and Alimkhan Yermekov (Kydyralina, 2014). The role of the Kazakh language in texts of science and technology remains in the shade leaving Russian to be the dominant language. In IST Russian serves as an intermediate language. The lack of English–Kazakh and Kazakh–English dictionaries in subject areas is a serious problem for the professionals and translators. Furthermore, when searching for the necessary terms in online dictionaries, the absence of trilingual online dictionaries creates difficulties especially for vulnerable communities. Rapidly growing economic cooperation in Kazakhstan make it necessary to enrich the term base with various new terms denoting technology and equipment. Direct English–Kazakh translation occurs very rarely. Creating a new generation of dictionaries will enhance opportunities for Kazakhstan's translation services and strengthen the Kazakh language status as a state language.

The aim of our controlled multilingual thesaurus is to offer a way for all AIS users to find the relevant data related to the industry-specific terms without having to search several dictionaries for the relevant information and accurate terminology, and thus avoiding misunderstandings and mistranslations.

1.3. Kazakh Industry-Specific Dictionaries

Automated Information System (AIS) users and industry-specific translators in Kazakhstan's ministries and other state bodies use a variety of online dictionaries and language tools, particularly *ABBYY Lingvo*, *FreeDict*, the *Free On-line Dictionary of Computing*, *WordNet*, among others. The most widely used online dictionaries and language tools in the multilingual Kazakhstan are *Sozdik*, *Termincom* and *Multitran*, which meet the requirements of bilingual dictionaries. In order to provide translations in three languages, the AIS users and translators have to consult two bilingual dictionaries as *Sozdik* and *Termincom* for Kazakh and Russian, then *Multitran* and *ABBYY Lingvo* for Russian and English. When searching for the necessary terms in online dictionaries, the absence of trilingual online dictionaries creates difficulties especially for vulnerable communities.

Many trilingual industry-specific dictionaries are available only in hard copies and in the current pandemic situation, our controlled multilingual thesaurus gives equal opportunity to all AIS users to access these dictionaries irrespective of their location and health conditions. Another issue in terminological dictionaries is multiple variants of a certain term. Industry-specific terms have widely a used synonymic range of terms and the problem of choosing the relevant term between the ranges of synonyms often arises. For example, terms such as 'beneficiation,' 'concentration,' 'dressing,' 'enrichment,' 'refinement,' 'separation,' 'treatment' and 'washing' for the Kazakh *кен байыту* and Russian *обогащение*.

In this article, the selected mining and metal terms, approved by the Terminological Committee

of Kazakhstan have been analyzed by an expert of Kazakhstan's Ministry of National Economy with special attention for use by the disabled, translators and terminologists. Moreover, a unified search tool on Zthes data scheme has been demonstrated to provide relevant information with the examples of industry-specific terms in trilingual context. The article has been written by a group of authors with the support of the State Material Reserve Committee of the Ministry of National Economy of the Republic of Kazakhstan to support developing industry-specific terminology with the involvement of experts from vulnerable communities.

2. Controlled Multilingual Thesaurus in Digital Library

2.1. Thesaurus: General Information

The thesaurus or ideographic dictionary in general (in Greek *Θησαυρός*, in English 'treasure') is a collection of information, a corpus of concepts, definitions and terms of special fields of knowledge or industries, with examples of their use in a context. Today, one of the most well-known thesauri was compiled by the British lexicographer Peter Marc Roger and published in 1852. The original name of this thesaurus was the *Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases*.

In the field of machine translation, Masterman (1961) was the first to utilize a thesaurus in 1961. Masterman's thesaurus contained 15,000 concepts defined as the basic vocabulary. With the help of thesauri, correspondence was established between the language of user requests and documents in the information system. Shreider (1965) proposed to consider the thesaurus as a system of knowledge reflected in the language, in which case the thesaurus itself becomes interesting and not just an auxiliary tool. Other controlled thesauri are the *WORDNET* thesaurus for English, developed at Princeton University, its analogue *RussNet* thesaurus for Russian, developed by the Mathematic Linguistics Department at St Petersburg State University, the multilingual *UNESCO Thesaurus*, *NISO* and *LOGOS* (see ANSI/NISO, 2003, 2005; IFLA, 2009).

According to the definition of the International Organization for Standardization (ISO), a thesaurus is a dictionary of managed indexing language, formally organized in order to establish explicit a priori relationships between concepts (ISO, 1985, 1986). This definition establishes lexical units and semantic relationships between these units as elements that constitute the thesaurus. Thesaurus relations such as genus-species, part-whole, etc., are imposed on the taxonomy structure, i.e., they identify the main taxonomy of the subject area.

Legislative Indexing Vocabulary designers of the Library of Congress Linked Data Service (id.loc.gov) recommend the following rules: (1) Terms of thesaurus should represent the concepts that are actually mentioned in the source documents and should be selected from considerations of their use efficiencies in search-

ing for documents; (2) an important factor in including the term is the frequency of its mention in the texts that must be checked periodically; (3) including new terms in the thesaurus should take into account already included thesaurus terms (Library of Congress, n.d.).

Thus, the candidate terms should be checked for consistency with respect to their generality and specific use with other terms of the thesaurus. It also should be checked as to whether or not the candidate term represents a separate concept that does not have correspondences among the existing terms in the thesaurus. It is necessary to avoid including terms whose values overlap with the values of already existing terms in the thesaurus because it might be difficult for indexers, users and translators to differentiate between these terms.

2.2. Controlled Multilingual Thesaurus of Industry-Specific Terms in Kazakh

The goal of developing the controlled multilingual thesaurus is to unify and systematize industry-specific Kazakh terms in conformity with the requirements of modern interoperable thesauri to be easily integrated with other thesauri, to describe and provide Russian and English equivalents, and to classify the terms into relevant topics using related rubrics and associated relations in a hierarchical order. The controlled thesauri provide a special type of vocabulary with general and specialized terminology, in which relations such as broader and narrower terms, synonyms, antonyms, paronyms, hyponyms, hypernyms etc. are indicated with their equivalents in other languages.

Based on the study of standards and various approaches to controlled thesauri, the Zthes data scheme was chosen to create a controlled multilingual thesaurus for industry-specific terms. Within the framework of this research, major rubrics have been created for about 10,000 Kazakh terms on mining and metal industry. These are 'mining and metals,' 'minerals,' 'exploration,' 'production,' 'equipment' and 'technology.' The use of multilingual thesauri in digital libraries is effective because of their interoperable characteristics, so this multilingual thesaurus can be easily integrated into international databases such as the UNESCO, NISO and LOGOS thesauri.

The proposed thesaurus model was implemented by IRIS, an integrated resource information system developed by the Institute of Computational Technology of the Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences (SB RAS; Shokin, Fedotov, Zhizhimov, & Fedotova, 2015; Tussupov, Sambetbayeva, Fedotov, Fedotova, et al., 2016). The Zthes data scheme was chosen to compile the multilingual thesaurus for industry-specific Kazakh, Russian and English terms.

To date, the most effective way to solve the lexicographic problems in IST was to organize the relevant information into information systems provided by digital libraries. Digital libraries offer specialized technol-

ogy to work with digital information, forming a new class of information systems designed to manage information resources (Tussupov, Sambetbayeva, Fedotov, Sagnayeva, et al., 2016). The standard approach to systemize the data is by classifying documents using taxonomies. Taxonomy is a subject classification that groups terms into a controlled thesaurus and organizes the dictionaries into hierarchical structures. To describe a subject area, usually a certain set of key terms is used, each of them denotes or describes a concept from a given subject area (Salton, 1979).

During the classification process, the relevant concepts and key terms are determined, and ‘parent-child’ type relations are established. The problem in providing scientific and educational information systems for industry-specific terms is that the technologies for classifying and systematizing information developed by libraries and archives do not effectively work now because of the thematic proximity of the classified documents. The efficiency in information retrieval systems to support scientific and educational activities directly depends on the use of specific thesauri.

2.3. Structure of Multilingual Controlled Thesaurus for Industry-Specific Terms

Our multilingual controlled thesaurus for industry-specific terms has been developed as a joint project between L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Kazakhstan, and the Institute of Computational Technology of the SB RAS (see Figure 1).

The aim of our controlled multilingual thesaurus is to offer a way for all AIS users to find the relevant data related to the industry-specific terms without having to search several dictionaries for the relevant information and accurate terminology, and thus avoiding misunderstandings and mistranslations. For example, the Kazakh term *ұңғыма* and Russian *скважина* has several linguistic equivalents in English such as ‘bore,’ ‘borehole,’ ‘hole’ and ‘well.’

According to the dictionary of the Well Drillers Association (n.d.): “Typically a borehole is drilled by machine and is relatively small in diameter. A well is usually sunk by hand and is relatively large in diameter.” The term ‘well’ is used only in the oil and gas industry because of the liquid nature of oil, while ‘borehole’ is used for mining and the metallurgical industry because of the solid nature of the ore. However, in Kazakh and Russian, this word is used with respect to only one meaning since *ұңғыма* and *скважина* that have no specific synonyms.

This controlled multilingual thesaurus consists of a variety of dictionaries, including a reference dictionary, multilingual dictionary, a dictionary of synonyms, a dictionary of antonyms, a dictionary of homonyms, a glossary, etc. The terms are clearly defined semantically and functionally, their linguistic equivalents are established and they are classified hierarchically.

This multilingual, controlled and interoperable thesaurus is composed of the following elements (see Figure 2):

1. A list of terms.
2. The relations between the terms, indicated by their hierarchical relative position. BT (broader term) is a connection with the parent term, e.g.: ‘alloy’—term; ‘metal’—broader term.
3. NT (narrower term) is a connection with a child term. BT ↔ NT communication is mutual and reciprocal, e.g.: ‘brass’—narrower term.
4. UF (used to mean) is reciprocal feedback of USE, USE ↔ UF.
5. RT (related term) is a link defining a related term.
6. LE (linguistic equivalent) is a connection between linguistically equivalent terms in Kazakh, English and Russian, e.g.: *сплав* and *қорытпа*—terms in Kazakh and Russian.
7. TT (term type) is a top-level term, i.e., a term that has no related terms of a wider class (terms with the type of BT connections).



Figure 1. Homepage of the website *Control System for Digital Libraries* of the Institute of Computational Technology of the SB RAS.




Figure 2. Hierarchical relative position of our controlled multilingual thesaurus.

8. NT (relation type) is not a top-level term, a descriptor that has BT type connections.

Most controlled interoperable thesauri are usually monolingual. The multilingual thesaurus based on a digital library is a system for managing structured catalogued collections of dissimilar digital resources, i.e., industry-specific terms and their associated relations, links and parallel texts. It provides not only a comprehensive search and navigation function through catalogues, but also shows all the users the relevant resources such as publications, documents, pictures, fact descriptions, etc.

Our multilingual thesaurus gives comprehensive and relevant information related to the terms. Some examples are: ‘concentration,’ used for concentrating the chemicals in laboratory; ‘refinement,’ used only for gold and silver refining in mining and metallurgy (but oil can also be refined); ‘separation,’ the exact process of separating the different metals in the ores; ‘washing,’ the initial process of separating the ores; ‘dressing,’ used for treating the ore in the special equipment; ‘treatment,’ which is the general name for processing the ores of any type. Only ‘enrichment’ and ‘beneficiation’ can be used synonymously for the Kazakh *кен байыту* and Russian *обогащение*.

The multilingual thesaurus based on Zthes data scheme allows all AIS users to search for the relevant information related to the specific term in a multilingual way. In the case of searching for information related to the Kazakh term *жез*, one may use *Sozdik* for the Kazakh–Russian translation, and *Multitran* or other dictionaries to translate the term into English, in addition to other dictionaries to get more information about the specific term.

2.4. Advantages of Multilingual Thesaurus

The main advantage of the multilingual thesaurus in the Digital Library is the targeted or relevant search of terms in semantic and functional aspects. The industry-specific terms in a particular field are clearly defined and linguistic equivalents in Kazakh, Russian and English are established and hierarchically classified. Thus, one can find the relevant information about the Kazakh term *жез*: Its linguistic equivalent in Russian is *латунь* and in English ‘brass.’ This term (*жез*) directly associates with the broader term *қорытпа* and its English equivalent ‘alloy’—and subsequently with other types of ‘alloys,’ ‘metals’ and ‘ores.’ Every term has relevant descriptions with associative relations that allow the user to search for more information related to the industry-specific terms (see Figure 3).




Figure 3. Example of searching for industry-specific terms.

Consequently, the controlled multilingual thesaurus in the Digital Library is an effective tool not only for professionals of specific industries, but it is useful for all AIS users regardless of their location and health conditions. This also lays the groundwork for the future development of a Kazakh language corpus, and for unifying and systemizing the industry-specific Kazakh terms in a multilingual way.

3. Controlled Multilingual Thesaurus for Information Retrieval

The information retrieval thesaurus is a normative and controlled dictionary of key terms in natural language with explicitly indicated semantic relations between terms. It was designed to describe the content of documents and search queries (ISO, 2011, 2013). The thesaurus is intended to describe a specific subject area, each term of which denotes or describes a concept from a given subject area.

This thesaurus is constructed to describe the vocabulary of descriptive Information Retrieval language, the lexical units of which are descriptors. The terms, descriptors, keywords and associative relations are the notions used in compiling multilingual thesaurus aimed at information retrieval. The selected terms in a controlled multilingual thesaurus serve as descriptors that denote certain concepts of a specific subject area and satisfy the principles of common usage, prevalence, brevity and terminological accuracy proposed by domestic and foreign terminologists (Aitbaiuly, 2013; Beisenova, 2011, 2014; Cabré, 1998; Kaidarov, 1993; Kurmanbaiuly, 2014).

Keywords, as a separate terms, words or phrases, extracted from the text of the subject area data and document reflect the main content when indexing. The group of conditionally equivalent keywords unites not only the terms that are recognized as synonyms in the multilingual term base, but also those that can be considered conditionally equivalent in terms of information retrieval within the framework of the multilingual scope, i.e., in Kazakh, Russian and English. The associative relations express the class-type, whole-part relations between the terms of information retrieval language. These terms are stable for each subject area and indexed in the multilingual thesaurus. This can be illustrated by the industry-specific terms such as ‘trammeling,’ ‘crushing,’ ‘grinding,’ ‘flotation,’ ‘filtration’ and ‘magnetic separation,’ which are indexed in the rubric Enrichment of the subject field Mining and Metals (see Table 1).

In the information retrieval thesaurus, the following relations are indexed and applied: (1) class-type relation; (2) equivalence or synonymic relation; (3) associative relation. Source: Bayekeyeva (2018) and Bayekeyeva, Tazhibayeva, Shaheen, Beisenova, and Mamayeva (2020).

The class-type relation links two descriptors if the scope of the concept corresponding to one of the descriptors includes the scope of the concept of another descriptor, e.g.: crushing department—crushing workshop; crushing unit—crushing machine; crushing type—medium crushing, fine crushing, etc. (see Table 2).

The equivalence or synonymic relation occurs when searching for one of the conditional or true synonyms that allows finding in the AIS database the documents to

Table 1. The examples of multilingual descriptors.

Descriptor in English	Descriptor in Kazakh	Descriptor in Russian
Trammeling	Тас уату	Грохочение
Crushing	Ұсату	Дробление
Grinding	Ұнтау	Измельчение
Flotation	Флотация	Флотация
Filtration	Фильтрация	Фильтрация
Magnetic separation	Магнитті сепарациялау	Магнитная сепарация

Notes: The equivalents of Kazakh and Russian terms such as *флотация* or *фильтрация* correspond in form, but they are indexed in different languages.

Table 2. The class-type relation links with multilingual descriptors.

Descriptor in Kazakh	Descriptor in English	Descriptor in Russian
Ұсату цехы	Crushing department	Дробильный цех
Ұсату бөлімшесі	Crushing workshop	Дробильная
Ұсату техникасы	Crushing unit	Дробильная техника
Ұсату машинасы	Crushing machine	Дробилка
Ұсату типі	Crushing Type	Тип дробления
Орташа ұсату	Medium crushing	Среднее дробление
Ұсақ ұсату	Fine crushing	Мелкое дробление

Notes: All the concepts concerning the term ‘crushing’ will be displayed with the equivalents in Kazakh, English, and Russian.

which the others are assigned as keywords, e.g., ‘enrichment’ = ‘beneficiation.’ Both terms have the same hierarchical category and meaning as in the Kazakh *кен байыту* and in the Russian *обогащение*.

Associative relations are established between the keywords that belong to the same or different semantic categories and arbitrary levels of the hierarchy, e.g., when searching for the descriptor ‘metal production,’ the AIS user and/or translator is offered to conduct additional searches for other descriptors (see Table 3).

Ontology in compiling multilingual thesaurus offers developed formalized means of describing the terms of the subject area that are used in modern intelligent information systems. Ontology consists of a set of concepts and statements, such as the classification of concepts, the relations between concepts, the hierarchy of concepts with respect to general-part and part-whole relations.

Thesauri in the modern interdisciplinary applied sciences such as computational linguistics and translation theory are considered to be linguistic resources, describing the relationships between lexical meanings of words in natural languages as a hierarchical system of synonymic groups, i.e., synsets (Fedotov et al., 2016). A synset, or synonymic set is a group of data elements that are considered semantically equivalent for the purposes of information retrieval. According to *WordNet*, a synset is a set of one or more synonyms that are interchangeable in some context. Each synset offers a definition and examples of the use of the word in a context. A term, word or phrase can appear in more than one synset and can have more than one category or part of speech. Each synset contains a list of synonyms or synonymic phrases and pointers describing the relations between other synsets. Various semantic relations interconnect these synsets:

1. Hyperonym: metal product → metal production; metal product → metallurgy
2. Hyponym: metal production → metal product; metallurgy → metal product
3. Has-member: metallurgy → metallurgist
4. Member-of: metallurgist → staff
5. Meronym: has-part: enrichment → flotation; enrichment → filtration

6. Antonym: magnetic separation → non-magnetic separation

In accordance with the definition of international standards, the Information Retrieval thesaurus is a normative dictionary that accurately indicates the relationship between terms and is intended to describe the content of documents (ISO, 1985, 1986, 2011, 2013). The controlled multilingual thesaurus is used for search queries to provide the translation of documents and user requests. Thus, the industry-specific terms of the multilingual thesaurus allow the AIS users and/or translators to find the optimal term, to use it as a search tool when searching for relevant information regardless of their location and health conditions.

When creating a controlled multilingual thesaurus, the first task is to select terms for thesaurus. There are several possible sources for terms when forming a multilingual thesaurus. Candidate terms for the controlled thesaurus are usually offered or checked by experts in the given field. Such experts who are responsible for language policy and representatives of state bodies, ministries and national departments have expertise on terminology. In addition, terms for thesauri may be derived from domain-specific texts using automated methods or manual processing of documents. When manually processing documents, indexers annotate the documents with the most relevant keywords, which are then reduced to a single list that may serve as the basis for the thesaurus. After the list of candidate terms is obtained, low-frequency terms are excluded from the list, since it is assumed that they are not informative enough to differentiate the separate documents. Relatively low-frequency terms can be removed from the list or presented as ascriptors of more general or frequent concepts.

As a result, our multilingual, controlled and interoperable thesaurus is composed of the following essential elements:

1. A list of terms systemized and classified according to subject areas and rubrics.
2. Term relations indicated by their hierarchical relative positions.
3. Equivalent terms of Kazakh terms in Russian and English.

Table 3. The associative relations with multilingual descriptors.

Descriptor in English	Descriptor in Kazakh	Descriptor in Russian
Metallurgy	Металлургия	Металлургия
Industry	Өндіріс	Промышленность
Raw materials	Шикізат	Сырье
Deposit	Кен орны	Месторождение
Metals	Металдар	Металлы
Processing methods	Өңдеу тәсілдері	Способы обработки
Equipment	Құрылғы	Оборудование
Transport	Көлік	Транспорт

Notes: All the concepts associated with the term ‘metal production’ will be displayed with the equivalents in Kazakh, English, and Russian.

Thus, in order to compile the up-to-date controlled multilingual thesaurus for industry-specific terms, it is necessary to provide the above-mentioned basic criteria.

4. Conclusion

Since Kazakhstan gained its sovereignty and independence in 1991, the elevation of the status of the Kazakh language has impacted the nation's education, economy, and industry. New generations of Kazakhstan's professionals in various subject areas must be fluent in Kazakh, Russian and English, and be mobile and effective in information retrieval. Right now, industry-specific translators have to make Kazakh–English translations through Russian as an intermediate language. Direct English–Kazakh translation occurs very rarely. Creating a new generation of dictionaries will enhance opportunities for Kazakhstan's translation services and strengthen the Kazakh language status as a state language.

Currently, IST is in demand for many areas of social and economic life of Kazakhstan. In accordance with the National Program of Industrial and Innovative Development of the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2015–2019 and spurred by the pandemic situation in 2019–2020, the controlled multilingual thesaurus, especially in covering terminology in the mining sector, gives equal opportunity to all AIS users and becomes the urgently necessary information retrieval tool. Such a thesaurus is needed because mining and metallurgical industry in Kazakhstan has a crucial role in providing sustainable development and ensuring the effective operation of subsoil use in areas such as exploration, development, production, processing and selling of solid minerals, as well as in improving the mineral resources potential of Kazakhstan with commercial and non-commercial reserves deposits.

Accordingly, the controlled multilingual and interoperable thesaurus of industry-specific terms is one of the effective tools for describing individual subject areas and is designed to promote communication and interaction between professionals, translators and AIS users for industry-specific areas irrespective of their location and health conditions. Unlike the multilingual dictionaries, the controlled multilingual thesaurus makes it possible to define the meaning of a term with the help of descriptions, correlations with other concepts and their groups and relate them to broader and narrower terms. Moreover, the content of the multilingual thesaurus can be used to feed the knowledge bases of artificial intelligence systems, as well as to build the foundation for a Kazakh language corpus by unifying and systemizing the Kazakh industry-specific terms in a multilingual way.

Acknowledgments

The article has been written within the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan PhD Program (2017–2020), under grant agreement No. 01–57,

dated 30 October 2017. The article has been written by a group of authors with the support of the State Material Reserve Committee of the Ministry of National Economy of the Republic of Kazakhstan to support developing industry-specific terminology with the involvement of experts from vulnerable communities. We thank the State Material Reserve Committee of the Ministry of National Economy of the Republic of Kazakhstan for its expertise in industry-specific terminology.

Conflict of Interests

The authors declare no conflict of interests.

References

- Aitbaiuly, O. (2013). *Qazaq til bilimining terminologiyasy maseleleri* [Terminological issues of Kazakh linguistics]. Almaty: Abzal-ai.
- ANSI/NISO. (2003). *Information retrieval (Z39.50): Application service definition and protocol specification* (ANSI/NISO Z39.50-2003). Bethesda, MD: NISO Press. Retrieved from <https://www.loc.gov/z3950/agency/Z39-50-2003.pdf>
- ANSI/NISO. (2005). *Guidelines for the construction, format and management of monolingual controlled vocabularies* (ANSI/NISO Z39.19-2005). Bethesda, MD: NISO Press. Retrieved from https://groups.niso.org/apps/group_public/download.php/12591/z39-19-2005r2010.pdf
- Bayekeyeva, A. (2018). Information technologies applied in compiling multilingual thesaurus. In *Conference Proceedings of the I International conference "Translation activity as interaction of cultures and languages" for students and young researchers* (pp. 325–331). Astana: L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University.
- Bayekeyeva, A., Tazhibayeva, S., Shaheen A., Beisenova, S. Z., & Mamayeva, G. (2020). Multilingual thesaurus of industry-specific terms as major aids for translators. *Opción*, 36(27), 1864–1900.
- Beisenova, Z. (2011). *Otraslevaya terminologiya: Sistemnost, tipologiya, funkcionirovanie* [Industry-specific terminology: Consistency, typology, functioning] (2nd ed.). Astana: TsBO & MI LLP.
- Beisenova, Z. (2014). *Intercultural approach of professional lexicon in veterinary medicine*. London: Aitmatov Academy.
- Cabrè, M. T. (1998). *Terminology: Theory, methods and applications*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Fedotov, A., Tussupov, J., Sambetbayeva, M., Fedotova, O., Sagnayeva, S., Bapanov, A., & Tazhibayeva, S. (2016). Classification model and morphological analysis in multilingual scientific and educational information systems. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Information Technology*, 86(1), 96–111.
- IFLA. (2009). *Guidelines for multilingual thesauri* (IFLA

- Professional Reports No. 115). Haia: International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions. Retrieved from <http://www.ifap.ru/library/book411.pdf>
- International Organization for Standardization. (1985). *Documentation—Guidelines for the establishment and development of multilingual thesauri* (ISO 5964:1985). Geneva: International Organization for Standardization.
- International Organization for Standardization. (1986). *Documentation—Guidelines for the establishment and development of monolingual thesauri* (ISO 2788:1986, 2nd ed.). Geneva: International Organization for Standardization.
- International Organization for Standardization. (2011). *Information and documentation—Thesauri and interoperability with other vocabularies—Part 1: Thesauri for information retrieval* (ISO 25964–1:2011). Geneva: International Organization for Standardization.
- International Organization for Standardization. (2013). *Information and documentation—Thesauri and interoperability with other vocabularies—Part 2: Interoperability with other vocabularies* (ISO 25964–2:2013). Geneva: International Organization for Standardization.
- Kaidarov, A. (1993). *Qazaq terminologiyasyna jańasha kózqaras* [New view to Kazakh terminology]. Almaty: Rauan.
- Kurmanbaiuly, S. (2014). *Qazaq terminologiyasy* [Kazakh terminology]. Almaty: Sardar.
- Kydyralina, Z. (2014). Alimhan Ermekov i Kanysh Satpaev: Puti v nauke i linii sudeb. [Alimkhan Yermekov and Kanysh Satpayev: Ways in science and lines of fortune]. *Qazaqstan Tarihy*. Retrieved from <https://e-history.kz/ru/library/show/24072>
- Library of Congress. (n.d.). Legislative indexing vocabulary. *Library of Congress*. Retrieved from <https://id.loc.gov/vocabulary/subjectSchemes/liv.html>
- Marác, L., & Adamo, S. (2017). Multilingualism and social inclusion. *Social Inclusion*, 5(4), 1–4. <http://doi.org/10.17645/si.v5i4.1286>
- Masterman, M. (1961). Semantic message detection for machine translation, using an interlingua. In *Proceedings of the 1961 international conference on machine translation of languages and applied language analysis* (Vol. 13, pp. 438–475). London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office. Retrieved from <http://www.mt-archive.info/NPL-1961-TOC.htm>
- Nevskaya, I., & Tazhibayeva, S. (2015a). Sociolinguistic situation of Oguz Turks in Post-Soviet Kazakhstan. In T. Güzüz & M. Cengiz (Eds.), *Oguzlar. Dilleri, tarihleri ve kültürleri* [The Oguz. Their languages, histories and cultures] (pp. 321–335). Ankara: Hacettepe University.
- Nevskaya, I., & Tazhibayeva, S. (2015b). Turkic languages of Kazakhstan: Problems and research perspectives. *Turkic Languages*, 18(1/2), 289–302.
- Republic of Kazakhstan. (2020). Resolution No. 43 of the Chief State Sanitary Doctor of the Republic of Kazakhstan on further strengthening measures to prevent coronavirus infection among the population of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Retrieved from https://online.zakon.kz/Document/?doc_id=37566604#pos=202;-54
- Salton, G. (1979). *Dynamic information and library processing*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Shokin, Y., Fedotov, A., Zhizhimov, O., & Fedotova, O. (2015). Evolyuciya informacionnyh sistem: ot Websaitov do sistem upravleniya informacionnymi resursami [Evolution of information systems: From web sites to information resource management systems]. *Bulletin of Novosibirsk State University. Series: Information Technology*, 13(1), 117–134.
- Shreider, Y. (1965). Ob odnoi modeli semanticheskoi teorii informacii [On one model of semantic information theory]. In A. Lyapunov (Ed.), *Problemy kibernetiki* [Problems of cybernetics] (Vol. 13, pp. 233–240). Moscow: Nauka.
- Tussupov, J., Sambetbayeva, M., Fedotov, A., Fedotova, O., Sagnayeva, S., Bapanov, A., & Tazhibayeva, S. (2016). Classification model and morphological analysis in multilingual scientific and educational information systems. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Information Technology*, 86(1), 96–111.
- Tussupov, J., Sambetbayeva, M., Fedotov, A., Sagnayeva, S., Bapanov, A., Nurgulzhanova, A., & Yerimbetova, A. (2016). Using the thesaurus to develop IT inquiry systems. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Information Technology*, 86(1), 44–61.
- Well Drillers Association. (n.d.). About boreholes and wells. *Well Drillers Association*. Retrieved from <https://www.welldrillers.org/faq/about-boreholes-and-wells>
- Yeskeldiyeva, B., & Tazhibayeva, S. (2015). Multilingualism in modern Kazakhstan: New challenges. *Asian Social Science*, 11(6), 56–64.

About the Authors



Ainur Bayekeyeva is a PhD candidate in the Department of Translation Theory and Practice at L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University. Her main research interests are translation theory and practice, controlled thesaurus, industry-specific terminology, multimodal texts, multilingual Kazakh, Russian and English thesaurus. Within the framework of PhD program, granted by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan, she had internships on terminology and thesaurus at Goethe University Frankfurt (Germany) and Novosibirsk State University (Russian Federation).



Saule Tazhibayeva is a Professor, Doctor of Philology at the Philological Faculty, L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University. Her main research interests are general linguistics, Turkology, computer linguistics, Kazakh, Russian and English comparative and contrastive linguistics. The author of research articles and monographs on Turkic languages, cross subject and multidimensional studies published in Kazakhstan and abroad. She supervised the project “Turkic World of Kazakhstan: Language Variants, Cultural Archetypes and Self-Identification of Turkish Diaspora” granted by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan (2015–2017) and co-supervised the project “Interaction of Turkic Languages in the Post-Soviet Kazakhstan,” jointly funded by Volkswagen Foundation (2014–2018).



Zhainagul Beisenova is a Professor, Doctor of Philology at the Philological Faculty, L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University. Her main research interests are industry-specific terminology, intercultural communication, comparative linguistics, and transcultural literature. Holder of such awards as *Best University Lecturer* and *Professor of the Year*, she is the author of research articles and monographs on industry-specific terminology published in Kazakhstan and abroad.



Aigul Shaheen is an Associate Professor, PhD at the Philological Faculty, L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University. Her main research interests are general linguistics, terminology, the Russian language and literature. She is the author of research articles and monographs on general linguistics and terminology published in Kazakhstan and abroad.



Aisaule Bayekeyeva is a Chief Civil Service expert at the State Material Reserve Committee of the Ministry of National Economy of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Her main research interests are translation theory and practice, the Kazakh language, language policy, language teaching and industry-specific terminology. She is responsible for implementing state language policy and state language use within the State Material Reserve Committee documents.

Article

Language Provision in the Scottish Public Sector: Recommendations to Promote Inclusive Practice

Róisín McKelvey^{1,2}

¹ Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Stirling, Stirling, FK9 4LA, Scotland; E-Mail: roisin.mckelvey@stir.ac.uk

² School of Literatures, Languages and Cultures, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, EH8 9YL, Scotland

Submitted: 30 July 2020 | Accepted: 28 September 2020 | Published: 14 January 2021

Abstract

Public service providers in Scotland have developed language support, largely in the form of interpreting and translation, to meet the linguistic needs of those who cannot access their services in English. Five core public sector services were selected for inclusion in a research project that focused on the aforementioned language provision and related equality issues: the Scottish Courts and Tribunal Service, NHS Lothian, NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde, the City of Edinburgh Council and Glasgow City Council. The frameworks within which these public service providers operate—namely, the obligations derived from supranational and domestic legal and policy instruments—were analysed, as was the considerable body of standards and strategy documents that has been produced, by both national organisations and local service providers, in order to guide service delivery. Although UK equalities legislation has largely overlooked allochthonous languages and their speakers, this research found that the public service providers in question appear to regard the provision of language support as an obligation related to the Equality Act (UK Government, 2010). Many common practices related to language support were also observed across these services, in addition to shared challenges, both attitudinal and practical. A series of recommendations regarding improvements to language provision in the public sector emerged from the research findings and are highlighted in this article.

Keywords

education; equality law; healthcare; interpreting; language provision; policy recommendations; public services; Scotland; translation

Issue

This article is part of the issue “Social Inclusion and Multilingualism: The Impact of Linguistic Justice, Economy of Language and Language Policy” edited by László Marác (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands / L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Kazakhstan) and Zsombor Csata (Babeş-Bolyai University, Romania / Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Hungary).

© 2021 by the author; licensee Cogitatio (Lisbon, Portugal). This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY).

1. Introduction

Public sector service providers in Scotland have in recent years developed language support, principally available in the form of interpreting and translation services, in response to diverse communication needs within the Scottish population. The language-related legal and policy frameworks within which Scottish public service providers operate, which determine the equality obligations to which they are subject, have been established at the supranational and national levels; the latter by both UK and Scottish political institutions. Evaluating the lan-

guage support available in key Scottish public services thus necessitated analysing the legal and policy norms that guide such provision in the public sector.

The criminal justice system, healthcare boards and local authorities were identified as most appropriate for inclusion in this service review, because they deliver public sector, rather than private sector or third sector, provision across a range of domains that are pertinent to the needs of the Scottish population: access to justice, healthcare, housing, social care and education, among others. This provision includes public-facing services, which necessarily involve communication and

interaction with service users, and therefore engages language issues. Since the chosen research settings were Edinburgh and Glasgow, the following public service providers were selected for evaluation: the Scottish Courts and Tribunals Service (SCTS) and the interpreting and translation services for NHS Lothian, NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde (NHS GGC), the City of Edinburgh Council (the CEC) and Glasgow City Council (GCC). Scottish education services fall within the remit of local authorities and so the role of language support in schools was considered accordingly, with interviews carried out with the English as an additional language (EAL) services developed by the CEC and GCC (for a more detailed discussion see McKelvey, 2017).

In the process of evaluating the language provision made available by the aforementioned public service providers, the policy and strategy documents that they have developed were considered and a series of interviews was carried out with managers from each of the selected services, in which operational details, language demand and challenges, both pragmatic and attitudinal, encountered in service delivery were discussed. A semi-structured interview format was followed because, while there were necessarily slight variations in the interview schedule according to service provider (due to operational differences in the source and nature of language provision, for example), a broadly comparable structure was desired, in order to facilitate a cross-service evaluation of provision. This approach to the interview process also provided a degree of openness, which allowed participants to offer insights and discuss experiences of service delivery as appropriate.

It was important to reflect on the research process itself, in terms of researcher positionality, potential limitations and the professional context in which the interviews occurred. These issues are discussed in greater depth elsewhere (McKelvey, 2020), but it should be noted here that the interview-data-as-topic approach (De Fina & Perrino, 2011) was adopted in analysing findings; participants' responses were viewed as co-constructed, influenced by the presence of the researcher and the context in which the interviews occurred. Data arising from the interviews were also analysed using the symptomatic approach (Block, 2000; Kvale, 1996), which considers interview responses to reflect the context of the interview and participants' relationship to the research topic. This was particularly relevant to the research project because experiences of service delivery and attitudes towards language were significant considerations.

In addition to the research interviews, strategy documents produced by each of the selected service providers and quantitative data concerning demand for language support were analysed, in order to review language provision as comprehensively as possible. Following the appraisal of individual services, a comparative approach allowed for the identification of common themes and shared challenges, and therefore for recom-

mendations to improve provision across the public sector. These recommendations will be summarised in this article, in the hope that they may be useful to public service providers that wish to promote more inclusive approaches in service delivery and minimise language barriers that may hinder equal access.

2. The Place of Language in UK Equality Law

In order to evaluate provision in Scotland for those whose access to public services depends on language support, it was necessary to analyse the legal norms established at the supranational and domestic levels which determine the equality obligations that service providers must fulfil. A range of legal and policy norms are relevant to this research topic (McKelvey, 2020) but, for the purposes of this article, the key one to highlight is the Equality Act (UK Government, 2010). This is a significant piece of domestic UK legislation, which consolidated and replaced several earlier anti-discrimination laws, such as the Sex Discrimination Act (UK Government, 1975), the Race Relations Act (UK Government, 1976) and the Disability Discrimination Act (UK Government, 1995), to safeguard against discrimination for nine 'protected characteristics': age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation (UK Government, 2010, c. 1(4)).

Although language has been recognised as a protected characteristic in a number of supranational instruments, for instance the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (United Nations, 1948, Article 2) and the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR; Council of Europe, 2010, Article 14), in addition to the establishment of a range of language-specific rights, such as those related to the criminal justice system in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (United Nations, 1966, Articles 9 and 14), this is not the case in UK law. In fact, although the UK is subject to the ECHR, which was incorporated into domestic law by the Human Rights Act (UK Government, 1998), it has not ratified Optional Protocol No. 12 (Council of Europe, 2010), which includes a general prohibition of discrimination based on listed identity markers, including language, association with a national minority and national origin, and additionally prohibits any discrimination by public authorities on those grounds (Council of Europe, 2010, Protocol No. 12, Article 1(2)). Article 14 of the ECHR was, however, brought into UK law by the Human Rights Act (UK Government, 1998), and prohibits any discrimination based on those same identity markers that would hinder the enjoyment of other rights that are protected by the ECHR.

Nevertheless, despite these examples of supranational legal instruments in which language is considered a protected characteristic with regard to equality and protection from discrimination, UK domestic law has often overlooked language-related issues, which

have been perceived as “minor and peripheral” (McLeod, 2008, p. 202) in the political sphere. Language policy in the UK has been described as “highly variegated and amorphous,” consisting of an ad hoc series of “largely independent decision-making processes and discourses,” rather than a formal or systematic approach to enshrining particular principles or standards (McLeod, 2008, pp. 201–202). As such, language is not explicitly protected, or referenced, under the Equality Act (UK Government, 2010), although there is potential scope for the prevention of discrimination on the grounds of language due to its definition of ‘race’: This particular characteristic is stated to include ethnic and national origins.

The Equality Act (UK Government, 2010) requires listed public authorities, including Scottish local authorities and NHS Boards, to prevent discrimination according to the legislation, in order to facilitate equality of opportunity for those with ‘protected characteristics’ (UK Government, 2010, s. 149(1)(b)) and to “foster good relations” (s. 149(1)(c)) by challenging prejudices and promoting understanding (s.149(5)(a), (b)). As part of this responsibility, public authorities are obliged to prevent or minimise any “disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic” (UK Government, 2010, s. 149(3)(a)) and act to fulfil related needs, facilitating participation in public life for those people, where such participation is “disproportionately low” (s. 149(3)(c)). These legal provisions are relevant to public sector provision and thus to my research, because they establish a legal framework that obliges public service providers to actively promote equality of opportunity and to remove access barriers. Given the potential for language to be indirectly protected as an identity marker under the ‘race’ characteristic in the Equality Act (UK Government, 2010), this may require the delivery of language support by service providers, in order to minimise or eliminate language barriers.

As there is a precedent in domestic case law for the recognition of language as relevant to ethnic identity, there is a further argument to be made that language could be indirectly protected under the Equality Act and should therefore be explicitly recognised in the legislation. In the *Mandla and another v Dowell Lee and others* (1983) case, a shared language was recognised as a marker that “could also be relevant” to understandings of ethnicity, which potentially applies to allochthonous in addition to autochthonous languages, due to the reflection that a common language does “not necessarily have to be peculiar to the group.” Discrimination on language grounds may therefore amount to discrimination on the grounds of ethnicity and thus to legal protection for allochthonous (and autochthonous) language speakers under UK equality law, which reinforces the conclusion that language should be explicitly included under the ‘race’ characteristic in the Equality Act.

One of the findings that arose from my research was that there was a tendency among the public service

providers in question to reference the Equality Act as a key source of their equality obligations and, indeed, in addition to the pragmatic aspect of meeting the needs of service users, to consider language provision to be part of fulfilling said legal obligations (CEC, 2018; NHS GGC, 2012, 2014, 2015; NHS Scotland, 2018), despite the fact that this is not explicitly required by the legislation. NHS Scotland’s (2018) draft *Interpreting and Translation–National Policy (National Policy)*, for instance, noted both that the provision of language support facilitates equal access to healthcare and that providing such support is a legislative duty, referring explicitly to the Equality Act regarding access issues for those who cannot engage in healthcare services in English. NHS GGC (2014, p. 10) stated in guidance on the legislation that the production of appointment details in only written form and small print English could constitute “indirectly discriminating against specific patient cohorts,” and that consistently high frequencies of non-attendance at appointments “may be indicative of issues with legislative compliance and therefore risk.” This illustrates the connection perceived between language provision and equal participation and raises the possibility that failure to offer adequate language support amounts to non-compliance with equality legislation.

There was recognition across services that language barriers can serve as obstacles to equal access (GCC, 2015; ITS Manager, personal communication, August 25, 2017; NHS GGC, 2017, 2019a; NHS Health Scotland, 2009; NHS Lothian, 2011a) and that there is a connection between racial, or ethnic, identity and language (NHS GGC, 2012, 2015). This approach represents a broad, inclusive interpretation of the legal obligations introduced by UK equality law, suggesting that service providers perceive language needs to be equally important as those related to the characteristics explicitly protected by the Equality Act (UK Government, 2010). Nevertheless, while an entitlement to language support may be recognised in practice at the local level, this is not currently enshrined as an explicit legislative right, which could hinder both inclusion and consistency of provision. In light of these findings, it was concluded that, if language were to be incorporated into the anti-discrimination principles established by the Equality Act (UK Government, 2010), this would increase standardisation in the public sector and service providers would be better able to embed such principles into practice (McKelvey, 2020).

3. Cross-Service Perspective: Language Demand and Challenges Encountered by Public Service Providers

3.1. Language Needs in the Research Setting

The results of the 2011 UK Census offer an insight into the linguistic composition of Scotland and are therefore useful context regarding language needs in the chosen research setting. The figures are now a little out-

dated and, in any case, census data should of course be used carefully, due to their self-reported and subjective nature, which may result in respondents not “report[ing] their skills in a consistent or comparable way, particularly when a variety of interpretations are, or can be applied to a language” (National Records of Scotland [NRS], 2015, p. 19). It is nevertheless useful information and, now that allochthonous language-related questions are included in the UK census, it will become possible to gather a more comprehensive picture of linguistic diversity and language needs over time. In the meantime, the existing data are indicative of language demographics in the research setting and, given their stated relevance to “resource allocation and service planning” (NRS, 2015, p. 19), pertinent to this research. As can be seen from Table 1, the 2011 Census results indicate that the provision of language support is necessary in order to ensure access to core services. Once responses to the 2021 census have been collected and the data are available, this will provide a clearer picture of demographics and the linguistic composition of Scotland, which will be useful for future research in this field and additionally for the development of public sector language provision.

The public service providers included in this research support service users with a range of language needs, gathering data on the languages in which services are required, which allows shifts in demand to be monitored over time. Figure 1 shows the five languages for which each service provider most often received requests for language support (in 2016 for the SCTS and the CEC, April 2016–2017 for NHS GGC and GCC and in 2017 for NHS Lothian, following the 2017 launch of its in-house interpreting service). The data illustrate broad similarities in language demand while also highlighting regional and service-specific variations. Polish, for example, was among the five most required languages for every service and, with the exception of the SCTS, this was also the case for Arabic and at least one Chinese language. During the research interviews, several service providers reported that shifts in language demand are common and often reflect socio-political factors and their impact on demographics (ITS Manager, personal communication; Jaouen, personal communication, February 16, 2018; Stewart, personal communication, October 25, 2017; Zduniak, personal communica-

tion, September 21, 2018). Increased demand for Arabic and Kurdish language support, for example, was noted following the establishment of the Syrian Vulnerable Person Resettlement Programme (ITS Manager, personal communication).

As previously mentioned, Scottish local authorities are responsible for education provision, including language support for EAL pupils. Several significant international legal instruments have addressed language-related rights in education settings (for a detailed discussion of this see McKelvey, 2020) but, with regard to domestic legislation, the Education (Additional Support for Learning) (Scotland) Act (the ASL Act; Scottish Government, 2004) is noteworthy. While the legislation itself does not specify any language-related additional support needs, the Code of Practice that was published to support the implementation of the ASL Act identifies having EAL as an example of additional support needs, and references language support for EAL pupils as an example of provision that fulfils the requirements of the ASL Act (Scottish Government, 2017). EAL service demand has risen in recent years (Scottish Parliament, 2017). 46,951 EAL pupils (approximately 6.7% of the total number of pupils) were recorded in the 2019 Summary Statistics for Schools in Scotland (Scottish Government, 2019b), which is a slight increase from the 2018 figures (Scottish Government, 2019a), which reported 44,311 EAL pupils (approximately 6.4% of the total pupil number). It is, however, a significant rise from the 2010 data, in which the 22,740 EAL pupils recorded represented approximately 3.4% of the overall pupil population (Scottish Government, 2010).

3.2. Parallels and Common Practice across Services

Similar practices were observed across services, for instance, the gathering of data about access to language support services (see Figure 1) in order to monitor language demand. One of the recommendations that arose from my research, however, was that service users’ language preferences should be consistently recorded at the first point of access, thus allowing service providers to better understand language needs and plan provision accordingly. Similarly, seeking feedback from service users and incorporating this into service

Table 1. 2011 Census: English language skills in the research setting.

	All people aged 3 and over	Understands but does not speak, read or write English	Speaks but does not read or write English	Speaks and reads but does not write English	Reads but does not speak or write English	Speaks, reads and writes English	Other combination of skills in English	No skills in English
NHS Lothian	804,825	13,410	24,734	5,677	322	755,736	3,449	1,497
CEC	460,103	7,266	13,292	3,351	198	433,030	1,925	1,041
NHS GGC	1,097,979	26,580	33,078	7,732	511	1,022,197	5,147	2,734
GCC	572,633	16,517	18,330	4,452	358	527,674	3,064	2,238

Source: NRS (2013a, 2013b).




Figure 1. Language demand recorded by the selected service providers. Sources: ITS Manager (personal communication), Jaouen (personal communication), Operations Manager (personal communication, May 17, 2019), Stewart (personal communication), Zduniak (personal communication) and McKelvey (2020).

design and delivery would help service providers to meet these needs and to challenge potential bias due to the enduring prevalence of monolingual mentalities in the UK (Edwards, 2001; Hancock, 2014; McLeod, 2008). Furthermore, greater engagement with service users and any resulting shifts in service design and delivery could, over time, improve the under-representation of Black and Minority Ethnic (NHS GGC, 2015, p. 34) communities in public services (Council of Europe, 2012).

Information about language provision was included on each service provider’s website, although there was some variation: In most cases, access to language support was explained, while some websites featured more extensive information about policy and practice, and others signposted users to policy documents for further details (McKelvey, 2020). NHS GGC (2019d) webpages provided word and picture signposting, as well as hyperlinks to written statements, translated into often required languages, which directed users to language support and set out a noteworthy policy regarding translations (NHS GGC, 2019c), although the latter did not appear to be available. With the exception of NHS GGC, however, these online resources seemed to be available only in English, or to only be provided in other languages upon request. There are indications that service providers aim to improve accessibility; for example, the CEC (2016, p. 9) has committed to more consistently promoting translation options using the Happy-to-Translate icon and increasing the availability of documents in plain and ‘easy read’ English. In most cases, however, the provision of translated documents appeared patchy at best (GCC, 2016; NHS Lothian, 2011b; SCTS, 2019; Scottish Executive, 2006), which undermines stated policies regarding accessibility (GCC, 2019; Glasgow City Health and Social Care Partnership, 2016; NHS GGC, 2019b; also relevant was Jaouen, personal communication). Such an ad hoc approach that relies on an assumed ability to read English is a missed opportunity for greater inclusion, representing a significant barrier to service users who require language support. Although resource constraints may be argued to influence the production of translations (Scottish Executive, 2006), any potential obstacles posed by such resource implications could be lessened by cross-service collaboration, such as the shar-

ing of materials and good practice, which could assist service providers in meeting translation needs more fully and more consistently. The wider use of visual resources, such as language charts (McKelvey, 2013; NHS GGC, 2019e; also relevant was Jaouen, personal communication; Ng, personal communication, August 15, 2013) and the Happy-to-Translate icon that both local authorities include in their publications, is additionally recommended, as this would increase accessibility (CEC, 2019; GCC, 2015; also relevant was Dundas, personal communication, August 21, 2013).

Value appeared to be widely ascribed to the Diploma in Public Service Interpreting (DPSI) by service providers. Several significant policy and strategy documents produced at the Scottish level have emphasised the importance of the qualification for those delivering language support in the public sector (NHS Health Scotland, 2008; Scottish Translation, Interpreting and Communication Forum, 2004). While many of the service providers included in my research specified a preference, or in some cases an expectation, that their interpreters hold the DPSI (ITS Manager, personal communication; Jaouen, personal communication; Operations Manager, personal communication; Zduniak, personal communication), due to human resource constraints and the need to provide language support so as to ensure equal access, it is reportedly difficult for service providers to guarantee or enforce such a standard. It therefore seemed to be viewed as a preference rather than a requirement, which risks contributing to a lack of standardisation across the Scottish public sector. Without a consistent requirement regarding qualifications, there may be differences between geographical areas, service providers or even languages, in terms of the quality of language support available. Increasing consistency in this regard by promoting and prioritising the DPSI (and equivalent qualifications) could both facilitate recruitment processes and improve the quality of provision.

3.3. Practical and Ethical Challenges Encountered by Service Providers

Shifting language needs are only one example of the pragmatic challenges that service providers encounter

in the delivery of language support, one that necessitates adaptability and flexibility in order to meet the language needs of service users. Doing so in such contexts may be complicated by a further challenge that was highlighted by my research participants: human resource constraints. Due to the aforementioned shifts in service demand, but also due to geographical factors and requests for more rarely required languages, service providers may have difficulty in accessing sufficient numbers of interpreters, particularly since services operating in the same region often draw from similar pools of interpreters (ITS Manager, personal communication; Jaouen, personal communication; Zduniak, personal communication). Certain services are also subject to challenges due to the nature of their provision; in healthcare and criminal justice settings, for example, language support is often required at short notice (ITS Manager, personal communication; Jaouen, personal communication; Stewart, personal communication; Zduniak, personal communication).

Relying on sessional interpreters, who may work with multiple organisations, can also bring availability challenges (Operations Manager, personal communication), while engaging interpreters from external agencies may lead to quality control issues and a potential lack of support for interpreters in dealing with difficult cases (ITS Manager, personal communication; Jaouen, personal communication). Additionally, while language proficiency alone was stated to be insufficient qualification (Jaouen, personal communication), certification and training requirements may differ for interpreters who work with external agencies, which may raise further ethical and quality standard challenges. Human resource constraints do reportedly require the engagement of external agencies in order to meet service users' needs, however, which, if it results in discrepancies in quality, could lead to inequality of service provision. Increasing standardisation regarding quality standards, certification requirements and support and training for interpreters would therefore help to promote equal and high-quality provision across services.

Further ethical issues that arose in relation to service delivery included the potential use of non-professional interpreters to support people who cannot access public services in English, such as members of staff who are not qualified or accredited interpreters, or family members—including children—of service users (Jaouen, personal communication; Stewart, personal communication). The practice of allowing relatives, particularly children, to interpret is widely discouraged across (particularly healthcare) services (NHS GGC, 2015; NHS Scotland, 2018; Scottish Translation, Interpreting and Communication Forum, 2004), due to ethical considerations regarding quality control, the risk of misunderstandings and abuses of power, and the nature of the responsibility that such support entails (NHS Health Scotland, 2008; NHS Lothian, 2010). The issue, and policy cautioning against it, was also raised during research inter-

views (Jaouen, personal communication; Stewart, personal communication), with emphasis placed on the inappropriate nature of allowing children to participate in interpreting (Jaouen, personal communication).

Advice and policy appear to vary regarding members of staff who are not professional interpreters providing language support for service users. For instance, documents published by both the CEC and GCC have noted that bilingualism among employees can promote inclusion and support language provision (CEC, 2004; GCC, 2005), whereas the previously mentioned publications related to healthcare adopted a more circumspect position on the matter, with NHS Health Scotland (2008, p. 21) describing the practice as “unethical and unprofessional” in clinical settings. NHS Scotland's (2018) more recent draft *National Policy* cautioned against allowing staff to directly provide language support, excepting members of staff who are accredited interpreters, due to legal and quality control concerns.

Wider ethical issues that may be encountered include structural inequalities that may disadvantage certain service users and hinder equal access. Wodak and Boukala (2015, p. 269) noted the role of language as an “institutionalised gatekeeper” in the immigration process, because language proficiency requirements are increasingly being adopted in Europe as conditions of entry, permanent residency and citizenship, and therefore influence inclusion and access to social rights. The Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX; 2015) found that people from vulnerable groups, such as refugees, older people and women, are often disproportionately disadvantaged by immigration and family reunion requirements, including language testing, while the Scottish Government (2013) highlighted the English language learning needs of refugees and asylum seekers and identified additional barriers that women may face. The public service providers included in my research showed awareness of access issues among vulnerable groups: Interview participants noted the language needs of refugees and asylum seekers (ITS Manager, personal communication; Operations Manager, personal communication) and good practice was highlighted (NHS Health Scotland, 2009), as was the necessity of raising awareness among service users of the availability and entitlement to language support (GCC, 2017; NHS GGC, 2015; Stewart, personal communication). Such practice should be developed and promoted in order to increase engagement with language support services; cross-service collaboration could benefit efforts to widen access and participation, particularly given potential resource constraints.

4. The Scope for Collaborative Approaches in the Public Sector

Relatively ad hoc and inconsistent language provision was found in the Scottish public sector (McKelvey, 2020), which may be related to the previously discussed lack

of explicit legislative requirements regarding language. While there were numerous examples of good practice—which, in some cases, were shared between services—and considerable awareness of the language needs of service users, there did not seem to be many recent, coherent, standardised approaches (such as national or sector-wide frameworks or strategies) in place. Since lack of consistency and collaboration may increase the vulnerability of public sector language provision to the impact of limited resources and other practical challenges, this is one area for potential improvement.

More recent developments do suggest that there has been an increase in good practice sharing between service providers, such as NHS Lothian following NHS GGC's model by launching an in-house interpreting and translation service (Jaouen, personal communication) and the publication of guidelines by national bodies. Examples of the latter include NHS Scotland (2011, 2018) and the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (2015a, 2015b, 2016), which has published reports and organised events related to inclusion, English for Speakers of Other Languages provision and the *Language Learning in Scotland: A 1+2 Approach* (Scottish Government, 2012) strategy. An overall tendency towards localised approaches to language provision was, however, noted in relation to the healthcare sector in NHS Scotland's (2018) draft *National Policy*. It will be interesting to see if further cross-sector or cross-service policies emerge in the future.

While service demand varies between services and geographic areas, as do resources, many of the common themes and challenges that have been noted in the preceding discussion have highlighted that further cross-service collaboration, in addition to the standardisation of guidance and quality standards related to language support across public services, could greatly improve provision in the Scottish public sector. Many services reported similar practical challenges, such as difficulties in engaging adequate numbers of interpreters and concerns about ensuring high quality language support when working with external agencies. The sharing of good practice and of resources that enable such practice to be implemented could potentially facilitate problem-solving and assist service providers in meeting the language needs of service users with not only greater consistency, but also to a higher standard. McPake et al. (2002) recognised the scope for cross-service collaboration online, highlighting the opportunity represented by the internet for communication and the sharing of ideas, good practice and materials. More recent strategy developments, such as the draft *National Policy* (NHS Scotland, 2018), are promising because they suggest a more collaborative, cross-service approach that will consolidate policies and encourage consistency. Indeed, the research participant from NHS GGC commented that, despite some operational variations between Scottish NHS Boards, a shared ethos exists, with ongoing communication between respective equal-

ities teams (Stewart, personal communication). There may also be beneficial learning opportunities across sectors—particularly given past cooperation between, for example, local authorities and NHS Boards in delivering language support, which indicates that there may be scope for service providers from different sectors to work together to develop and improve provision.

Education services, which are delivered by local authorities, could greatly benefit from increased collaboration between mainstream (state-run schools for pupils who do not need to attend specialised schools to meet their support needs) and complementary schools (community-led schools that operate in the evenings and weekends to provide cultural and linguistic education; Hancock & Hancock, 2018), in order to facilitate diversity in language learning options and to better support the cultural education provided by the latter. Policies and practices adopted in education settings are related to the “wider socio-political conditions of which they are a part” (Costley, 2014, p. 276) and thus language learning options at mainstream schools are “determined by changing ideologies mediated through political and economic considerations” (Hancock & Hancock, 2018, p. 13). The intergenerational transmission of those languages that are not included in the curriculum is largely left to families and communities (Hancock, 2014) and, while complementary schools play a role in this language maintenance, they largely operate with little to no support from local authorities or mainstream schools and with limited resources (Hancock, 2017). At present, although the “1+2 Approach” promotes an inclusive curriculum in which a range of languages are considered, including “community languages of pupils in schools” (Scottish Government, 2012, p. 18), the reality is that in many cases mainstream schools continue to teach traditionally taught Western European languages (Hancock, 2014).

The exclusion of languages other than these “popular” languages (Hancock, 2014, p. 174) from the curriculum, particularly at secondary school qualification level, risks reinforcing negative perceptions of certain language communities, even within those communities themselves, since enduring prejudice and misconceptions concerning allochthonous languages (Creese, 2010) can discourage intergenerational transmission among their speaker communities (Akoğlu & Yağmur, 2016; Sorace, personal communication, June 10, 2013). Public sector staff sometimes still advise parents to speak English, rather than their allochthonous languages, with their children (Sorace, personal communication) and, during school enrolment, parents occasionally record their child's home language as English when this is not the case, because they believe that acknowledging another language will disadvantage their child (Depute Head Teacher, personal communication, August 17, 2017; Walker, personal communication, May 11, 2017). Even if linguistic diversity is explicitly celebrated in education, Creese (2010) observed that its implicit problematisation is recognised, and can be internalised, by pupils.

The exclusion from mainstream curricula of languages with large speaker communities, such as Polish (which, as seen in Figure 1, is also frequently requested in terms of public sector language support), could therefore constitute a significant barrier to inclusion.

Negative or disinterested attitudes towards language learning, in addition to hierarchical perceptions that prioritise Western European languages, have emerged from social research such as the 2015 Scottish Social Attitudes Survey (Scottish Government, 2016) and the Young People in Scotland Survey 2017 (Scottish Government, 2018). In light of the considerable economic implications of limited language skills within the UK's labour force (Foreman-Peck, 2007), in addition to the possible connection between the promotion of language learning and increased social inclusion (McPake et al., 2002), such attitudinal challenges may have far-reaching implications. Education can help to shift perceptions: EAL services, for example, engage in fostering positive, inclusive attitudes within school communities (Depute Head Teacher, personal communication; Walker, personal communication). These services are, however, responding to growing service demand with resources that have not increased proportionally (Depute Head Teacher, personal communication; Scott, personal communication, August 7, 2017), which can compromise the quality of provision and negatively impact pupils' experiences (National Association for Language Development in the Curriculum, 2011, pp. 3–4; Scott, personal communication). If complementary schools were more substantially supported at both local and national levels and if there were greater collaboration between complementary and mainstream schools, more positive perceptions of linguistic diversity could be further encouraged, and language teaching resources and expertise could be shared, which would facilitate more inclusive approaches within mainstream education while also supporting educational activities within language communities themselves.

5. Conclusion

This research project found noteworthy language provision within the Scottish public sector, in addition to associated, and relatively extensive, policy and strategy addressing language needs among service users. It additionally became clear that service providers tend to consider the delivery of language support to be an obligation under UK equality law, despite the absence of language-related provisions in the most often cited legislation, the Equality Act (UK Government, 2010). It can therefore be concluded that the inclusion of language in the legislation would establish a clearer, more rigorous legal framework that would better support inclusive practice at the local level. This is particularly pertinent since, despite a range of promising strategies and provision, it appears that at present service delivery is relatively ad hoc and inconsistent, partly due to human resource constraints and (often shared) practical challenges. Although there

are certainly arguments to be made for greater investment in language provision by the Scottish and UK governments, particularly in light of the aforementioned connection to legal equality obligations, this research found that there are ways in which service developments at the local level could also improve language support. There is significant scope for greater cross-service, and cross-sector, collaboration and the development of related standards and guidelines, which would facilitate inclusivity and assist service providers in ensuring high quality provision despite resource limitations. The sharing of good practice and of materials themselves would allow collective problem-solving and increased consistency of provision. Wider attitudinal challenges remain, however; enduring, negative perceptions of linguistic diversity can discourage language learning and the inter-generational transmission of allochthonous languages, and this has significant socioeconomic implications and may hinder inclusion. In addition to supporting public sector practice, the aforementioned legal and policy recommendations, if implemented, may over time help to foster more positive attitudes that promote equality and inclusion across language communities in Scotland.

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank Professors Rob Dunbar and Wilson McLeod for their guidance and support over the years. This research was possible due to the contributions of my interview participants, to whom I am very grateful. Certain aspects of this article were discussed in my doctoral thesis, *Language Provision in Scottish Public Services: Inclusion in Policy and in Practice* (McKelvey, 2020). The research leading to these results received funding from the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme under grant agreement No. 613344 (Project MIME), and was carried out at the University of Edinburgh, which has been acknowledged accordingly as an affiliated institution. I am now based at the University of Stirling, however, and have therefore also cited this affiliation. Thank you also to Mariana Pires from Cogitatio Press, for her patience and for all her work during the publication process.

Conflict of Interests

The author declares no conflict of interests.

References

- Akoğlu, G., & Yağmur, K. (2016). First-language skills of bilingual Turkish immigrant children growing up in a Dutch submersion context. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 19(6), 706–721.
- Block, D. (2000). Problematizing interview data: Voices in the mind's machine? *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(4), 757–763.
- City of Edinburgh Council. (2004). *Advisory committee on*

- the review of equalities services*. Edinburgh: City of Edinburgh Council.
- City of Edinburgh Council. (2016). Equality, diversity, and rights framework 2017–21. *City of Edinburgh Council*. Retrieved from <https://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/equalitiesframework>
- City of Edinburgh Council. (2018). *Mainstreaming the equality duty and equality outcomes progress report: Edinburgh integration joint board* (Report Item 5.4). Edinburgh: City of Edinburgh Council. Retrieved from [https://democracy.edinburgh.gov.uk/Data/Edinburgh%20Integration%20Joint%20Board/20180302/Agenda/\\$item_54_-_mainstreaming_the_equality_duty_and_equality_outcomes.xls.pdf](https://democracy.edinburgh.gov.uk/Data/Edinburgh%20Integration%20Joint%20Board/20180302/Agenda/$item_54_-_mainstreaming_the_equality_duty_and_equality_outcomes.xls.pdf)
- City of Edinburgh Council. (2019). *In on the act: Supporting children and young people with additional support needs. Information for the General Public*. Edinburgh: City of Edinburgh Council.
- Convention of Scottish Local Authorities. (2015a). Migration policy toolkit: An online guide to welcoming, integrating and engaging migrant communities in Scotland. *Migration Scotland*. Retrieved from <http://www.migrationscotland.org.uk/migration-toolkit/introduction/1-1-getting-started>
- Convention of Scottish Local Authorities. (2015b). *Welcoming our learners: Scotland's ESOL strategy 2015–2020. The English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) strategy for adults in Scotland 2015*. Scotland: COSLA, Scottish Government, Education Scotland.
- Convention of Scottish Local Authorities. (2016). *Education, children and young people strategic plan—September 2016*. Scotland: COSLA.
- Costley, T. (2014). English as an additional language, policy and the teaching and learning of English in England. *Language and Education*, 28(3), 276–292.
- Council of Europe. (2010). *Convention for the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms (European convention on human rights—ECHR). Amended by the provisions of Protocol No. 14 (CETS no. 194) as from its entry into force on 1 June 2010*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. Retrieved from https://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/Convention_ENG.pdf
- Council of Europe. (2012). *Resolution CM/Res CMN(2012)22 on the implementation of the framework convention for the protection of national minorities by the United Kingdom*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. Retrieved from https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?ObjectId=09000016805c94cf
- Creese, A. (2010). Two-teacher classrooms, personalized learning and the inclusion paradigm in the United Kingdom: What's in it for Learners of EAL? In K. Menken & O. Garcia (Eds.), *Negotiating language policies in schools: Educators as policymakers* (pp. 32–51). New York, NY: Routledge.
- De Fina, A., & Perrino, S. (2011). Introduction: Interviews vs. 'natural' contexts: A false dilemma. *Language in Society*, 40(1), 1–11.
- Edwards, V. (2001). Community languages in the United Kingdom. In G. Extra & D. Gorter (Eds.), *The other languages of Europe: Demographic, sociolinguistic and educational perspectives* (pp. 243–260). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Foreman-Peck, J. (2007). *Costing Babel: The Contribution of language skills to exporting and productivity in the UK*. Cardiff: Welsh Institute for Research in Economics and Development.
- Glasgow City Council. (2005). *Race equality policy statement and action plan: The Race Relations Act 1976 (Statutory Duties) (Scotland) Order 2002*. Glasgow: Glasgow City Council.
- Glasgow City Council. (2015). *Equality progress report 2015: Mainstreaming equality in service delivery and progress towards the equality outcomes*. Glasgow: Glasgow City Council.
- Glasgow City Council. (2016). *Every child is included and supported: Getting it right in Glasgow, the nurturing city—Additional support for learning: Parent's guide*. Glasgow: Glasgow City Council.
- Glasgow City Council. (2017). *Equality outcomes 2017 to 2021*. Glasgow: Glasgow City Council.
- Glasgow City Council. (2019). English as an additional language service (EAL). *Glasgow City Council*. Retrieved from <https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/article/17860/English-as-anAdditional-Language-Service-EAL>
- Glasgow City Health and Social Care Partnership. (2016). *Putting equality at the heart of Glasgow City HSCP: mainstreaming & equality plan 2016–18*. Glasgow: Glasgow City Council.
- Hancock, A. (2014). Language education policy in multilingual Scotland: Opportunities, imbalances and debates. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 38(2), 167–191.
- Hancock, A. (2017). *Heritage language learning in Scotland: A case of linguistic apartheid?* Paper presented at the Centre for Education for Racial Equality in Scotland (CERES) 3rd International Conference 2017 "Activism and antiracism in education: Telling our stories," Edinburgh, Scotland.
- Hancock, A., & Hancock, J. (2018). *Extending the 1+2 language strategy: Complementary schools and their role in heritage language learning in Scotland*. Edinburgh: Centre for Education for Racial Equality in Scotland.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *Interview views: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. London: Sage Publications.
- Mandla and another v Dowell Lee and others, 2 AC 548 (1983).
- McKelvey, R. (2013). *Allochthonous languages in the UK: Acceptance through assimilation?* (Unpublished Master's dissertation). University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, Scotland.
- McKelvey, R. (2017). Language provision in education: A view from Scotland. *Social Inclusion*, 5(4), 78–86.
- McKelvey, R. (2020). *Language provision in Scottish public services: Inclusion in policy and in practice* (Unpub-

- lished Doctoral dissertation). University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, Scotland.
- McLeod, W. (2008). An opportunity avoided? The European charter for regional or minority languages and UK language policy. In D. Ó. Riagáin (Ed.), *The European charter for regional or minority languages: Legal challenges and opportunities* (Vol. 5, pp. 201–218). Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- McPake, J., Johnstone, R., Lo Bianco, J., McColl, H., Rodriguez Prieto, G., & Speakeet, E. (2002). *Translating, interpreting and communication support services across the public sector in Scotland: A literature review*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive, Central Research Unit.
- Migrant Integration Policy Index. (2015). *Migrant Integration Policy Index 2015*. Barcelona and Brussels: CIDOB and MPG. Retrieved from <https://www.mipex.eu/sites/default/files/downloads/files/mipex-2015-book-a5.pdf>
- National Association for Language Development in the Curriculum. (2011). National ethnic minority achievement education survey: A summary of findings. *NALDIC*. Retrieved from <https://www.naldic.org.uk/Resources/NALDIC/Advocacy/Documents/NUT%20NALDIC%20SurveyOctober%202011.pdf>
- National Records of Scotland. (2013a). Scotland's census 2011: Table QS213SC—English language skills. *Scotland Census*. Retrieved from https://www.scotlandscensus.gov.uk/documents/censusresults/release2a/healthboard/QS213SC_HB.pdf
- National Records of Scotland. (2013b). Scotland's census 2011: Table QS213SC—English language skills. *Scotland Census*. Retrieved from https://www.scotlandscensus.gov.uk/documents/censusresults/release2a/councilarea/QS213SC_CA.pdf
- National Records of Scotland. (2015). Scotland's census 2021—Topic consultation. *Scotland Census*. Retrieved from https://www.scotlandscensus.gov.uk/documents/census2021/Topic_Consultation.pdf
- NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde. (2012). *Spoken language, British sign language and communication support interpreting policy*. Glasgow: NHS GGC.
- NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde. (2014). *The Equality Act 2010: A guide for managers in NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde*. Glasgow: NHS GGC.
- NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde. (2015). *Meeting the requirements of equality legislation: A fairer NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde 2016–2020*. Glasgow: NHS GGC.
- NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde. (2017). How we are addressing race issues. *NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde*. Retrieved from http://www.equalitiesinhealth.org/public_html/addressing_race_issues.html
- NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde. (2019a). Communication support & language plan. *NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde*. Retrieved from <https://www.nhsggc.org.uk/your-health/equalities-in-health/areas-of-work/communication-support-language-plan>
- NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde. (2019b). Patients and visitors—FAQs: Health rights. *NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde*. Retrieved from <https://www.nhsggc.org.uk/patients-and-visitors/faqs/health-rights>
- NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde. (2019c). Alternative format/language text. *NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde*. Retrieved from <https://www.nhsggc.org.uk/your-health/equalities-in-health/info-resources/for-staff/interpreting-and-language-resources/alternative-formatlanguage-text>
- NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde. (2019d). Patient information. *NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde*. Retrieved from <http://live.nhsggc.org.uk/your-health/equalities-in-health/info-resources/for-staff/interpreting-and-language-resources/producing-accessible-information/patient-information>
- NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde. (2019e). *Language identification card*. Glasgow: NHS GGC. Retrieved from https://www.nhsggc.org.uk/media/253581/194401_2_0-languages-identification-pocket-card-hq.pdf
- NHS Health Scotland. (2008). *Now we're talking: Interpreting guidelines for staff of NHS Scotland*. Edinburgh and Glasgow: National Resource Centre for Ethnic Minority Health, NHS Health Scotland.
- NHS Health Scotland. (2009). *Final report: Achievements and challenges in ethnicity and health in NHS Scotland*. Edinburgh and Glasgow: NHS Health Scotland.
- NHS Lothian. (2010). Interpreting and translation in NHS Lothian: Policy for Meeting the Needs of People with Limited English proficiency. *NHS Lothian*. Retrieved from <https://www.nhslothian.scot.nhs.uk/yourrights/tics/documents/interpreting-translationpolicy.pdf>
- NHS Lothian. (2011a). Translation, interpretation and communication support. *NHS Lothian*. Retrieved from <https://www.nhslothian.scot.nhs.uk/YourRights/TICS/Pages/default.aspx>
- NHS Lothian. (2011b). Translation. *NHS Lothian*. Retrieved from <https://www.nhslothian.scot.nhs.uk/YourRights/TICS/Pages/Translation.aspx>
- NHS Scotland. (2011). *NHS Scotland competency framework for interpreting*. NHS Scotland. Retrieved from <http://www.healthscotland.com/documents/5227.aspx>
- NHS Scotland. (2018). *Interpreting and translation—National policy* (Draft Policy). Edinburgh: NHS Scotland. Retrieved from <https://www.nubsli.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/2018-National-Interpreting-and-Translation-policy-v7-0-JR-LR-19-Jan-003W.pdf>
- Scottish Courts and Tribunals Service. (2019). About the Scottish Courts and Tribunals Service—Information in other languages. *Scottish Courts and Tribunals Service*. Retrieved from <https://www.scotcourts.gov.uk/about-the-scottish-court-service/about-the-scottish-court-service---other-languages>

- Scottish Executive. (2006). *Translating, interpreting and communication support: A review of provision in public services in Scotland*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive Social Research.
- Scottish Government. (2004). *Education (Additional Support for Learning) (Scotland) Act*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government. Retrieved from https://www.legislation.gov.uk/asp/2004/4/pdfs/asp_20040004_en.pdf
- Scottish Government. (2010). Statistical bulletin: Summary statistics for schools in Scotland (Report No. 1 2010). *The Scottish Government*. Retrieved from <https://www.webarchive.org.uk/wayback/archive/20170106143425/http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2011/03/04154230/21>
- Scottish Government. (2012). Language learning in Scotland: A 1+2 approach. The Scottish Government's response to the report of the Languages Working Group. *Scottish Government*. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.scot/publications/1-2-language-learning-policy-scottish-gov-response>
- Scottish Government. (2013). *New Scots: Integrating refugees in Scotland's communities 2014–17*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- Scottish Government. (2016). Attitudes towards language learning in schools in Scotland. *The Scottish Government*. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.scot/publications/scottish-social-attitudes-survey-language-learning-schools>
- Scottish Government. (2017). Code of practice—Supporting children's learning: Statutory guidance on the Education (Additional Support for Learning) Scotland Act 2004 (as amended) code of practice (third edition) 2017). *The Scottish Government*. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.scot/publications/supporting-childrens-learning-statutory-guidance-education-additional-support-learning-scotland>
- Scottish Government. (2018). STEM and language choices in school: Young people in Scotland survey 2017—Research findings 11/2018. *The Scottish Government*. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.scot/publications/young-people-in-scotland-survey-2017-stem-and-language-findings>
- Scottish Government. (2019a). Summary statistics for schools in Scotland (No. 9: 2018 Edition). *The Scottish Government*. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.scot/publications/summary-statistics-schools-scotland-9-2018>
- Scottish Government. (2019b). Summary statistics for schools in Scotland (No. 10: 2019 Edition). *The Scottish Government*. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.scot/publications/summary-statistics-schools-scotland-no-10-2019-edition>
- Scottish Parliament. (2017). *How is additional support for learning working in practice?* (Education and Skills Committee SP Paper 140). Edinburgh: Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body. Retrieved from http://www.parliament.scot/S5_Education/Reports/ASN_6th_Report_2017.pdf
- Scottish Translation, Interpreting and Communication Forum. (2004). *The Scottish translation, interpreting and communication forum: Good practice guidelines*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government. Retrieved from <https://www2.gov.scot/Resource/Doc/47210/0025542.pdf>
- UK Government. (1975). *Sex Discrimination Act—Chapter 65*. London: UK Government. Retrieved from https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1975/65/pdfs/ukpga_19750065_en.pdf
- UK Government. (1976). *Race Relations Act—Chapter 74*. London: UK Government. Retrieved from http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1976/74/pdfs/ukpga_19760074_en.pdf
- UK Government. (1998). *Human Rights Act—Chapter 42*. London: UK Government. Retrieved from https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1998/42/pdfs/ukpga_19980042_en.pdf
- UK Government. (1995). *Disability Discrimination Act—Chapter 50*. London: UK Government. Retrieved from http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1995/50/pdfs/ukpga_19950050_en.pdf
- UK Government. (2010). *Equality Act—Chapter 15*. London: UK Government. Retrieved from https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/pdfs/ukpga_20100015_en.pdf
- United Nations. (1948). Universal declaration of human rights 1948. *United Nations*. Retrieved from <https://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights>
- United Nations. (1966). International covenant on civil and political rights. *United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner*. Retrieved from <https://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/ccpr.aspx>
- Wodak, R., & Boukala, S. (2015). (Supra)national identity and language: Rethinking national and European migration policies and the linguistic integration of migrants. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 253–273.

About the Author



Róisín McKelvey completed her doctorate, which evaluated allochthonous language provision in Scottish public services, at the University of Edinburgh. Her research interests include policy and practice relevant to allochthonous languages, inclusion for marginalised communities and the role of language in identity construction. She is currently working at the University of Stirling on a Scottish Government initiative, the “Making a Positive Difference” project, which is a critical investigation into the translation of equity imperatives into practice by education professionals.

Article

Multilingual Education in the Republic of Kazakhstan: Problems and Prospects

Nurmira Zhumay^{1,*}, Saule Tazhibayeva¹, Azhar Shaldarbekova², Botagoz Jabasheva¹, Ainur Naimanbay³ and Aigul Sandybayeva⁴

¹ Department of Translation Theory and Practice, Faculty of Philology, L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, 010000 Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan; E-Mails: nurmiraali@mail.ru (N.Z.), sauletazhibaeva@mail.ru (S.T.), botagoz_dzhabash@mail.ru (B.J.)

² Department of Turkic Studies, Faculty of International Relations, L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, 010000 Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan; E-Mail: ajars@mail.ru

³ Department of Practical Kazakh language, Faculty of Philology, L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, 010000 Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan; E-Mail: ainura-1978@mail.ru

⁴ The Eurasian Humanities Institute, 010000 Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan; E-Mail: akaleka@mail.ru

* Corresponding author

Submitted: 10 August 2020 | Accepted: 19 November 2020 | Published: 14 January 2021

Abstract

The article is devoted to the problem of multilingual education in modern Kazakhstan. Currently, Kazakhstan is fully modernising the education system and introducing a multilingualism policy in the educational process. Experimental sites for multilingual education have been created in several Kazakh universities and secondary schools. The young Kazakhstani generation brought up in independent Kazakhstan is involved in the process of multilingual education. By 2020 it is expected that 100% of the population will speak Kazakh, 95% will also speak Russian and 25% will also speak English. The research results are based on sociolinguistic data that were collected in all regions of the country using sociolinguistic data collection methods.

Keywords

education system; educational institutions; educational process; Kazakhstan; multilingual education; multilingualism policy; youth

Issue

This article is part of the issue “Social Inclusion and Multilingualism: The Impact of Linguistic Justice, Economy of Language and Language Policy” edited by László Marác (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands / L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Kazakhstan) and Zsombor Csata (Babeş-Bolyai University, Romania / Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Hungary).

© 2021 by the authors; licensee Cogitatio (Lisbon, Portugal). This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY).

1. Introduction

The Republic of Kazakhstan is carrying out a radical modernisation of the education system and actively introducing a multilingualism policy in the educational process. Not many countries from the Commonwealth of Independent States develop multilingualism at the state level. Most post-Soviet republics from the category of countries with pronounced bilingualism turned their

language policy towards monolingualism. In Kazakhstan, multilingualism is developing at the state level in accordance with the tasks set by the Governmental programme of the Republic of Kazakhstan. The initiative of the Head of State is being implemented via the “The Trinity of Languages” project (Aliyasova, & Kovtunenکو, 2012). Multilingualism, as a strategically important task of education, is also set in the State Program for the Development of Education for 2011–2020. By 2020,

100% of the population of Kazakhstan should speak the Kazakh language, 95% should also speak Russian and 25% should also speak English (Republic of Kazakhstan, 2010). However, there are also intermediate points of the problem in Kazakhstan.

Now we can state that the formation of Kazakhstan's statehood and civil society is at the beginning of a new stage of development, which is qualitatively different from the previous one: On the one hand, there is every reason to assert that in the first two decades of independence in Kazakhstan, the Kazakhstan model of interethnic and interfaith tolerance was successfully formed. Largely due to this, such strategically important tasks as preserving the independence and territorial integrity of the country, achieving a lasting interethnic and interfaith peace, economic and political stability were successfully solved. On the other hand, at present, the Kazakhstani public and the expert community are realising that interethnic and interfaith peace and harmony as such are only a necessary starting condition for the successful consolidation of society into a single political nation; this awareness of the strategically important task of the new stage of development of the country is reflected in Kazakhstan's doctrine of national unity. Different approaches can be found in the works of Kazakhstani researchers, expressing the main problems of the education system and issues with multilingualism (Aktanov, 2015; Aliyasova & Kovtunenkov, 2012; Amalbekova, 2009). European and West-world practice of studying issues of multilingualism has been divulged in the works of García and Náñez (2011), McLeod and Goldstein (2011), Meyer (2010), Stern (1995) and Trisnawati (2017), among others.

The strategic goal at a new stage of the country's development is not simply to further maintain what has been achieved but to transform the Kazakhstani society into a prosperous new state that can be achieved through knowledge of the original culture and language of the Kazakh people and all other people living in the territory of modern Kazakhstan.

2. Multilingualism in the Education System

There are already reasonable results in the development of multilingualism in the education system. In world practice, research on issues related to the problems of multilingualism and multilingual education is studied comprehensively. Multilingual education is under the scrutiny of UNESCO. The American Association of Psychologists conducts special studies on the cognitive abilities of multilingualism in pedagogy and politics. The problems of multilingualism, education and culture have been considered annually at the meetings of the Commission of the European Community since 2007. Moreover, the European Commission provides grants for multilingualism research using e-learning tools such as the Babylon & Ontology project "Multilingual and Cognitive e-Learning Management System via PDA Phone" (Kubeev & Zhetpisbaeva, 2008).

An experience in the implementation of multilingual education in the system of secondary and higher education has also accumulated in the Kazakh educational space. This is the experience of multilingual education in Nazarbayev intellectual schools, in Kazakh-Turkish lyceums, in schools for gifted children like the Daryn Centre, among others.

In 2019 there were more than 30 schools with instructions in three languages in the Republic of Kazakhstan. It is planned that 476 schools will switch to a multilingual education system and nine universities of the Republic will train specialists in special disciplines in English. Work has begun on preparing English-language pedagogical staff for secondary, technical and vocational education as part of the Bolashak international scholarship (Zhetpisbayeva & Arinova, 2012).

L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, like other universities in the country, is working to increase their responsibility and identify key tasks for modernizing the higher education system—an important key to modernizing the system is the training of multilingual staff for the country.

In order to achieve a developed multilingual education and integrate Kazakhstan's national education system into the global economic and educational space, it is necessary to involve a wide range of students in multilingual education, as well as to train multilingual specialists, teachers of secondary schools and universities. This is especially important in connection with the upcoming transition to a 12-year education system.

The study we carried out to define the present state of multilingual education in Kazakhstan showed that some sequential measures should be taken by the government. These are:

1. To study the real situation with multilingual education in the Republic of Kazakhstan.
2. To explore the best international practices in the implementation of multilingual education.
3. To develop a model for the implementation of multilingual education in the aspect of the requirements of the State Program for the Development of Education in the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2011–2020.
4. To develop a model of multilingual specialists by the government for rural secondary schools.

The search for effective ways to train multilingual staff indicates the need to solve the following problems: inconsistency of qualification requirements and characteristics for multilingual specialists; lack of normative and programmatic support for multilingual education; lack of a unified concept for the training of multilingual specialists based on a competency-based approach; insufficient knowledge of the experience of foreign countries concerning the introduction of multilingual education and lack of development of a mechanism for assessing the productivity of a multilingual specialist.

Multilingual education is inextricably linked with the implementation of the basic parameters of the Bologna process (a process of convergence and harmonisation of higher education systems in European countries aiming to create a single European higher education area) and the correlation and unification of curricula with European standards of education. As an implementation of the concept of the 12-year education system, one of the solutions proposed is the introduction of the foundation program (real 12th grade) with an emphasis on multilingualism and the study of the foundations of basic sciences that will be mastered in the first year of study at a university. In this case, a full bachelor's training course should be five years (one year of foundation program plus four years of bachelor's degree). Starting from the second year, training in specialised disciplines is offered. From our perspectives, specialised disciplines should be studied in the following proportion: half in the state language, one fourth in Russian and one fourth in English for groups with the Kazakh language of education. As for the students receiving education in the Russian language, one fourth of the subjects should be taught in the Kazakh language, half in Russian and one fourth in English. In this case, students can pass a general education unit and enhanced language training. Foundation programs would first solve the problem of multilingual education, then the problem of transition to the 12-year education system and, thirdly, the problem of multilingual staff who will conduct the educational process, solved in the short term. Let us explain what we mean:

1. The modern education system makes high demands on the teaching staff of higher education. The quality of activities is directly related to the quality of training of future specialists. Universities offer the possibility to master English for free. Currently, many faculty members of Kazakhstani universities are fluent in foreign languages. More than 100 faculty members of L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University in Nur-Sultan participated in summer language schools over the past two years. Also, they undergo a professional internship in foreign universities. After getting their certificates, the faculty members conduct classes in graduate and post-graduate programs in English. The level of scientific publications of L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University faculty members in foreign journals included in the Thomson Reuters and Scopus databases has doubled. This is the evidence of the intensification of multilingual activities of the faculty of our university.
2. The opportunities that international cooperation provides for the training of multilingual staff should be noted. The Ministry of Education and Science also provides great support in attracting well-known foreign scientists to L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University. In just one academic year, 307 leading professors from 40 countries of the world conducted a cycle of disciplines for students attending our university. The expansion of this kind of interaction allows increasing the competitiveness of future specialists, as well as improving the quality of multilingual staff. Another form of international cooperation is the international scholarship Bolashak granted by the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan. In L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, under the Bolashak scholarship, more than 200 teachers undergo international internships at top universities in the world every year. Some activities are also being held at L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University to prepare an educational and methodological complex of disciplines in the Kazakh, Russian and English languages. There are plans to conduct specialised copyright programs in foreign languages in fundamental areas of science.
3. Moreover, in Kazakhstan, large-scale financing of programs of external academic mobility of students in Kazakhstani universities has been launched. During the academic period, they will be studying abroad at the expense of the state. Undoubtedly, training programs within the framework of students' academic mobility should be integrated into the multilingual training system. This is an effective way of training multilingual staff, as students of all specialities, from all regional universities around the country, are involved in the program of academic mobility.
4. Another way to effectively carry out the primary training of multilingual staff is the inclusion on the list of basic disciplines of standard curricula of disciplines such as "Professionally-Oriented Foreign Language" and "Professional Kazakh/Russian." In the context of multilingualism, the state compulsory education standard of pedagogical specialities has also been developed, providing for specialisation in the preparation of a subject teacher with knowledge of a foreign language.

3. The Role of Kazakh and Russian Languages in Education

In the multilingual process, a large role is given to the state and the official language. At present, a generation of Kazakh-speaking Kazakh youth, both rural and urban, has already grown up to enter "the big life"—an idea formed in the years of the independence, from the mid- to late-1980s. They have graduated from schools with the Kazakh language of education and have continued education in universities mainly with courses in the Kazakh language. Students from the younger gen-

eration have rather serious social expectations regarding their linguistic sphere and develop an appropriate behaviour strategy. Unlike their parents, they react much more painfully and actively to the fact that a significant part of their fellow citizens does not speak or even understand Kazakh.

The following can be said about the social expectations of this youth contingent in the context of the language policy of Kazakhstan from 1990 to the present: Regardless of how realistic and doable these expectations are today they already exist and will not disappear. The idea of the Kazakh language becoming the state language has become the property of public consciousness and has already been taken seriously by a significant part of society.

The state strictly monitors the implementation of the "Law on Languages." Before our eyes, there are cardinal changes in the expansion of the functions of the Kazakh language. The Russian-speaking population of our Republic—by which we mean Kazakhs who do not speak their native language—which are mainly concentrated in large cities, must not only master the Kazakh language but also communicate and answer test questions and be able to think in this language. Therefore, our task in this matter is to attract the Russian-speaking population to the study of Kazakh culture and their active involvement in educational and cultural life in the state language. It is necessary to support the life of the Kazakh language as the language of natural national creativity.

The implementation of the main tasks of multilingual education under the State Program for the development of education in the Republic of Kazakhstan (Republic of Kazakhstan, 2010), as we all understand, requires well-considered organisational and institutional mechanisms. That is why it is necessary to create a coordinating scientific and methodological Republican centre (institute) for the development of multilingualism, the tasks of which will become: analysis of the language situation in educational institutions; development of the conceptual foundations of multilingual education and training of multilingual staff; organisation of a pedagogical experiment to improve teaching in three languages, as well as dissemination of the results of the experiment and the use of e-learning for effective training of multilingual staff.

Such a coordinating centre can be the L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University and among the pedagogical universities of the Republic the Abay Pedagogical National University in Almaty and Nazarbayev University in Nur-Sultan. The methodological recommendations developed by the Centre for the effective implementation of multilingual education and the training of multilingual staff can later be used in the activities of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Kazakhstan Republic, as well as used in the system of training and advanced training of teachers and senior educators through seminars and continuing education courses.

Due to its multifaceted and multidimensional nature, the problem of multilingualism requires the attention of

scientists from various scientific schools. Therefore, the Centre for multilingualism should be multidisciplinary. The implementation of multilingualism needs constant scientific support. In this regard, it is necessary to analyse the sociolinguistic and intercultural factors affecting the development of multilingualism in the Republic of Kazakhstan. This will make it possible to identify the real situation of multilingual education to further prepare proposals and comments on the training of multilingual staff.

It is necessary to study the advanced multilingual experience of leading countries (Canada, USA, France, Switzerland, Belgium, Finland, Singapore and Malaysia). The systematisation and generalisation of the world experience of multilingual education and the introduction into practice of effective teaching methods by educational level will allow the Centre of multilingualism to develop detailed proposals for introducing the most modern teaching methods and technologies into the multilingual education process, provide an increase in the level of professionalism of teachers, which in turn will affect the quality of training of multilingual staff and increase the competitiveness of alternative language educational programs.

We think that it is necessary to comprehensively disseminate the experience of Kazakhstani universities for the effective training of multilingual staff in various fields, to develop common solutions and proposals.

The study of languages in the educational system of Kazakhstan has a well-established tradition: Teaching material for Kazakh and Russian as a second foreign language is developed by the faculty of leading Kazakhstan universities—Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Abay Kazakh Pedagogical University and Abylay Khan Kazakh University of International Relations and World Languages. The experimental sites for the implementation of multilingual education in our Republic are the E. A. Buketov Karaganda State University (Karagandy) and Abylay Khan Kazakh University of International Relations and World Languages (Almaty). International Associations for Intercultural Communication, which closely monitor the development of language policy in the Republic of Kazakhstan, are interested in the theoretical and methodological base being developed.

4. New Challenges in Translation

The independence of the Republic of Kazakhstan has resulted in the development of trilingualism (Kazakh, Russian and English) in higher education. It has also led to the advancement of literary translation as well. Before Kazakhstani independence, specialists in Translation had never been prepared in Kazakhstan. Kazakh writers' literary works were translated from Kazakh into Russian and then through the intermediary Russian language to other foreign languages such as English, German, French, Turkish, Arabic, Korean, Japanese, etc. However, after gaining independence, the increase in the num-

ber of translators who mastered foreign languages as well as their mother tongue enabled them to translate imaginative writings directly from Kazakh into different languages such as English, German, French, Turkish, Arabic, Korean, Japanese, among others. In this way, Kazakh literature, Kazakh culture, Kazakh customs and traditions spread to foreign readers.

The following activities were implemented in the field of translation studies after the independence of the country (see Table 1).

Here, the most important thing is that the main literary works were translated into English or vice versa via intermediary Russian language before Kazakhstan gained its independence. Nonetheless, after gaining independence, the increase in the number of translators who mastered foreign languages as well as their mother tongue enabled the translation of imaginative writings directly from English into Kazakh or from Kazakh into English. Thus, the field of domestic translation studies achieved positive results. In recent years, a lot of research has been done on existent types of translation, including the translation of literary works from

Kazakh into English (see, e.g., Zhumay, Maira, Zhunissova, Zhunissova, & Zhazira, 2020).

5. Conclusion

The comprehensive introduction of multilingual education for a wide range of students in the Republic, the training of multilingual specialists and the training of multilingual personnel for the training of future specialists are strategically important tasks that the universities of the Republic of Kazakhstan Ministry of Education and Science must take on, and they can do so through joint efforts.

The realities of today are such that we, university teachers, actively implement the tasks of reforming the education system on a daily basis. Therefore, we sincerely hope that our joint active work will be embodied in a society built by competitive multilingual staff.

In our opinion, multilingualism contributes to the development of a dynamic personality for the future, an increase in the level of education of citizens, increasing their overall cultural level, and the development

Table 1. Published works in the sphere of translation studies after the independence of the Republic of Kazakhstan, in 1991.

No.	Sponsors	Published works
1	The <i>Ruhani zhangiru</i> ("spiritual revival") program of the National translation bureau	<i>Zhana gumanitarlik bilim. Kazak tilindegi 100 zhana okulik</i> ("New Humanitarian Knowledge: 100 New Books in the Kazakh Language").
2	The <i>Madeni mura</i> ("cultural heritage") program, on-going since 2004	537 books were published in total: <i>Babalar sozi</i> ("Ancestors Words"; 100 volumes); <i>Zhuz Qazaq romany</i> ("Hundred Kazakh Novels"; 200 volumes); 10 volume Kazakhstan encyclopaedias (five of which were published in Russian and in English); Al Farabi's works (20 volumes).
3	Audarma (publishing house)	21 main works of Kazakh writers were translated into English.
4	The <i>Altin kopir</i> translators contest held in 2009, sponsored by the Ministry of Culture and Sport	Several works in the poetry and prose genres, authored by the contest winners, were translated into the Kazakh and Russian languages.
5	The Pen Club program	13 novels by Kazakh writers were translated into English.
6	The Anthology of Contemporary Kazakh literature state program	An anthology of contemporary Kazakh literature was translated, including tales such as: <i>The Stories of the Great Steppe</i> (2013), <i>Summer Evening</i> , <i>Prairie Night</i> , <i>Land of Golden Wheat</i> (2015); <i>The Outside World in Kazakh Literature</i> (2015).
7	The National Translation Bureau	Ilyas Zhansugurov's poem <i>Kulager</i> (translated by Belinda Kuk).
8	The <i>Zhahandagi zamanui Kazakstandik madeniet</i> ("Contemporary and global Kazakhstani culture") program	The aim of the program was to translate imaginative Kazakh writings into six UN languages. The work of 60 Kazakh authors, in the poetry and prose genres, were translated.
9	Atamura (publishing house)	<i>Kazakh Customs and Traditions</i> (2015), <i>Kazakh dastarkhan</i> (2011), <i>Alpamys Batyr</i> (2014), <i>Koblandy Batyr</i> (2014), <i>Kozy Korpesh-Bayan Sulu</i> (2011).

of their readiness for international and intercultural cooperation.

The conducted research and the results obtained do not claim to be an exhaustive solution to all aspects of multilingual education. Prospects for further developments can be expressed in the study include the problems of continuity of multilingual education at different levels of the education system, comparative aspects of teaching Kazakh, English and Russian, lingua-didactic aspects of the development and compilation of educational and methodological complexes of not only linguistic but also non-linguistic disciplines, lingua-didactics as a methodological guideline in the development of the content of modern multilingual education and foreign experience in teaching multilingualism, among others.

Acknowledgments

We thank our colleagues from L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, who provided insight and expertise that greatly assisted the research.

Conflict of Interests

The authors declare no conflict of interests.


References

- Aktanov, D. (2015). The language policy of Kazakhstan. *Gumilev Center*. Retrieved from <https://www.gumilev-center.ru/yazykovaya-politika-kazakhstana>
- Aliyasova, A. V., & Kovtunenka, V. A. (2012). *Cultural project "Trinity of Languages" as the implementation of the idea of multilingual education in Kazakhstan*. Pavlodar: Pavlodar State University Press.
- Amalbekova, M. B. (2009). *Peculiarity of bilinguals in*

Kazakhstan. Astana: Eurasian National University Press.

- García, E. E., & Náñez, J. E. (2011). *Bilingualism and cognition: Informing research, pedagogy and policy*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Kubeev, E. K., & Zhetpisbaeva, B. A. (2008). *Multilingual education concept*. Karaganda: Karaganda State University Press.
- McLeod, S., & Goldstein, B. (2011). *Multilingual aspects of speech sound disorders in children*. Bristol: Communication Disorders across Languages.
- Meyer, B. (2010). *Multilingualism at work: From policies to practices in public, medical and business settings*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Republic of Kazakhstan. (2010). *State program for the development of education of the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2011-2020*. Astana: Republic of Kazakhstan. Retrieved from http://planipolis.iiep.unesco.org/sites/planipolis/files/ressources/kazakhstan_state_program-of-education-development-in-the-republic-of-kazakhstan_2011-2020.pdf
- Stern, P. (1995). Why do people sacrifice for their nations? *Political Psychology*, 16(2), 217–235.
- Trisnawati, I. K. (2017). Maintaining the identity of bilingual individuals in multicultural/multilingual settings. *Englisia*, 5(1), 8–16.
- Zhetpisbayeva, B., & Arinova, O. (2012). From the idea of "Trinity of Languages": N. A. Nazarbayev to multilingual education in Kazakhstan. *Vestnik KarGU*, 4(68), 19–23. Retrieved from https://pedagogy-vestnik.ksu.kz/apart/srch/2012_pedagogics_4_68_2012.pdf
- Zhumay, N., Maira, G. T. Z., Zhunissova, A., Zhunissova, J. A., & Zhazira, S. (2020). Lexemes with the "camel" component in Kazakh: Problems of translation. *Opción*, 36(27), 1660–1674.

About the Authors



Nurmira Zhumay is a PhD student at the Department of Translation Theory and Practice, Philological Faculty, L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University. She completed her internship programs at Leiden University (2014) and Amsterdam University (2019). Her main research interests are actual problems of translation studies and Kazakh, Russian and English comparative and contrastive linguistics. She is the author of several research articles on these topics.



Saule Tazhibayeva is Professor Doctor of Philology at the Department of Translation Theory and Practice, Philological Faculty, L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University. Her main research interests are general linguistics, Turkology, computer linguistics and Kazakh, Russian and English comparative and contrastive linguistics. She is the author of research articles and monographs on Turkic languages, cross-subject and multidimensional studies published in Kazakhstan and abroad. She supervised the project "Turkic World of Kazakhstan: Language Variants, Cultural Archetypes and Self-Identification of Turkish Diaspora" granted by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan (2015–2017) and co-supervised the project "Interaction of Turkic Languages in the Post-Soviet Kazakhstan," jointly funded by the Volkswagen Foundation (2014–2018).



Azhar Shaldarbekova (PhD) is Associate Professor in the Department of Turkology at L. N. Gumilyev Eurasian National University. After earning her MA in History from the Department of History at A. Yassawi IKTU, in 1996, she completed a PhD in History from the Department of Ancient Languages and Civilizations (Sumerology) at the University of Ankara (Turkey) in 2005. Her scientific interests include history of Ancient civilization, Ancient Anatolian history, Ancient Turkic history, source studies and methods of historical research. She was Senior Researcher in the project “The Turkic World of Kazakhstan: Language Variants, Cultural Archetypes, Self-Identification of Turkish Diaspora” and Reader in “Methods of Historical and Archaeological Research of Ancient Turkic Runic Inscriptions,” “Ancient Turkic Civilization” and “Ethnopolitical Factors of Formation of Turkic People.”



Botagoz Jabasheva is a Senior Teacher at the Department of Translation Theory and Practice, Philology Faculty, L. N. Gumilyev Eurasian National University. Her main research interests are education, educational leadership and management and comparative and contrastive linguistics. She did her MA at the University of Warwick in educational leadership and management speciality. Her thesis was about transformational leadership.



Ainur Naimanbay holds a PhD in Philological Sciences and is Associate Professor at the Department of Practical Kazakh Language of the L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University. She is engaged in communicative grammar, lexicology, and stylistics of Kazakh linguistics. Her scientific and methodological articles have been published in national and international publications. She is the author of two textbooks and participates in research projects. In 2011, she worked as a teacher of the Kazakh language at the Department of Turkology of the Yerevan State University of the Republic of Armenia. She won of the Republican contest “Best Teacher of Kazakhstan,” announced by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan.



Aigul Sandybayeva is a Master of Pedagogical Sciences, Senior Lecturer of the Department of Kazakh and Russian Philology of the Eurasian Humanities Institute. Her scientific interest is in the field of Turkic studies, Kazakh philology, comparative grammar and vocabulary of the Turkic languages. She is the author of scientific articles in the field of lexicology of Turkic words, in particular, the polysemy of words in the work of Mahmud Kashkary *Divani lugat it-Turks*. She is the author of the textbook for students *Subject of Action (Based on Scientific Discourse)* (2014).

Article

Members of the Polish Language Council on the Problems of Linguistic Diversity and Linguistic Inclusion in Poland

Tadeusz Wallas and Bartosz Hordecki *

Faculty of Political Science and Journalism, Adam Mickiewicz University, 61–614 Poznań, Poland;
E-Mails: tadeusz.wallas@amu.edu.pl (T.W.), bartosz.hordecki@amu.edu.pl (B.H.)

* Corresponding author

Submitted: 20 August 2020 | Accepted: 26 October 2020 | Published: 14 January 2021

Abstract

The last couple of decades have brought a significant increase in personal movement from and to Poland. In consequence, it is very probable that the issues of linguistic diversity and linguistic inclusion more and more frequently will become subjects of multi-level and multi-institutional discussion reshaping the Polish public sphere. It is a matter of consideration which institutions will take leading positions in this debate, formulating main narratives and polemics. However, answering its advisory and opinion-making responsibilities, the Polish Language Council may be expected as one among the crucial actors in this discourse. The article presents pivotal attitudes of the Council's members referring to the problem of linguistic diversity and linguistic inclusion in Poland. The presentation of the sources is combined with endeavours to answer the question: Do these materials allow considering the Council as a strong candidate for an essential designer of incoming public debate on linguistic diversity and linguistic inclusion in Poland? The research is conducted concerning the main assumptions of Joshua Fishman's (1997) sociology of language and Harold Schiffman's (2006) analysis of language policies as parts of linguistic cultures. Moreover, the methodological foundation of the text is supported by a general theoretical framework of historical institutionalism, and finally by Peter M. Haas's conceptualisation of 'epistemic community.'

Keywords

linguistic diversity; linguistic inclusion; migrations in Central Europe; multilingualism; Polish language; Polish Language Council

Issue

This article is part of the issue "Social Inclusion and Multilingualism: The Impact of Linguistic Justice, Economy of Language and Language Policy" edited by László Marác (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands / L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Kazakhstan) and Zsombor Csata (Babeş-Bolyai University, Romania / Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Hungary).

© 2021 by the authors; licensee Cogitatio (Lisbon, Portugal). This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY).

1. Introduction

Public debates on linguistic diversity and linguistic inclusion in the context of migration flows are a frequent subject of research. Analysis and interpretation of such debates are also within the spectrum of interests of numerous disciplines and sub-disciplines co-constituting the sphere of contemporary humanities and social science.

One of them, although less popular than sociolinguistics, is the sociology of language in a sense proposed by Joshua Fishman. Studies in this area allow focusing

on interactions between the use of language and its social conditions. In consequence, "the sociology of language focuses upon the entire gamut of topics related to the social organisation of language behaviour, including not only language usage per se, but also language attitudes and overt behaviours toward language and language users" (Fishman, 1997, p. 25).

Among various dimensions remaining within the interest of broadly understood sociology of language, political aspects of linguistic phenomena should also be located. Here belong studies on the opinions of key socio-political actors who co-shape or may have the

potential to co-shape collective perceptions and practices regarding the organisation and implementation of language policies.

The article approaches selected views delivered by members of an institution obliged by law to participate in the process of conceptualising Polish language policy, i.e., the Polish Language Council. Their opinions are related to linguistic diversity and linguistic inclusion in the conditions of increased migration from and to Poland. These movements stimulate the public debate on directions of the state's activity in the mentioned area. Moreover, along with the intensification of migration flows, the linguistic situation in the territory of Poland significantly diversifies, providing both new possibilities and challenges.

The attitudes of the Council's members are perceived as vital elements of the Polish linguistic culture, understood as a specific example of linguistic culture in general, defined by Harold Schiffman "as the totality of ideas, values, beliefs, attitudes, prejudices, myths, religious structures, and all the other cultural *baggage* that speakers bring to their dealings with language" (Schiffman, 2006, p. 112; emphasis in original).

Simultaneously, it is not forgotten that the analysed sources were delivered by the representatives of an institution belonging to the system of state agendas. It was assumed in the spirit of historic-institutional studies that these do not develop themselves unconditionally but are subjected to the influence of *longue durée*. Thus, to interpret their statements, it is generally necessary to present two dimensions co-constituting context of their appearance. The first dimension is historical, the second socio-institutional. However, it should be remembered that both are not separate but pass into and determine each other.

Within this methodological frame, the main research problem of the article emerges. It can be expressed as follows: Do the attitudes of the Council's members allow predicting it as a crucial designer of incoming public debate on linguistic diversity and linguistic inclusion in Poland?

Aiming to address this issue, the authors reconstructed, in general, the views of the Council's members concerning the problem of linguistic diversity and linguistic inclusion, dating from the late 1990s until the present day. This set of opinions was evaluated according to the criteria of stability, coherency and intensity, enabling us to address the question: Is it appropriate to recognise the intellectual and axiological bonds between the Council's members as typical to the epistemic community in a sense proposed by Peter M. Haas (1992)? Being such a community means not only sharing aims and interests but also fundamental beliefs and values. Due to this, its existence seems to be an essential source of considerable agenda-setting potential for any institution engaged in a discussion on public matters.

The article consists of five sections. The introduction presents the methodological foundations of the

analysis. Then, the historical context of the Polish experiences with language diversity and language inclusion has been sketched. After that, the legal foundations of the Council's activities and competences have been characterised. The fourth section creates the central part of the article, providing the description and evaluation of the most quoted and opinion-making publications delivered by the Council's members concerning linguistic diversity and linguistic inclusion in the Polish environment. In this part, the current statements of the Council's members regarding these issues were also approximated. The text concludes by referring to the historic-institutional embeddedness of the overall analysed materials. Moreover, a careful estimation is made about the Council's future position in Polish public discourses concerning linguistic diversity and linguistic inclusion.

2. Historical Context

Contemporary Polish culture remains immersed in a rich but discontinuous tradition of regulating and shaping linguistic situation.

An essential point of reference in this respect is the complex period of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth's existence. Concerning the history of this state, many mythical imaginings have arisen and are continually cultivated. Undoubtedly, its past still resonates in the discussion on the relationship between Polish and other national identities rooted and developed in Central and Eastern Europe.

The Commonwealth covered a vast territory, settled by a profoundly diversified population in its ethnic, cultural, religious and language dimensions. Thus, for several centuries, the experience of language variety was a particularly important factor in reshaping cognitive horizons of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth's inhabitants. Pluralism in the sphere of communication appeared to them as a natural phenomenon, which, however, does not mean that language issues did not generate vital controversies (Szul, 2009; Tazbir, 2011; Temčinas, 2017; Walczak, 2017, 2018).

After the final collapse of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in 1795, its former lands went under Austrian, Prussian and Russian rule. However, the borders of the partitions in the first half of the nineteenth century were fluent until 1846. Nevertheless, the divisions meant three separate language policies, which resulted in establishing three different cultures and sets of linguistic patterns. In Galicia, at the beginning of the 1860s, autonomy was initiated and then developed, giving gradual rise to socio-political liberties also within the sphere of linguistic relations. However, in Prussia, and then in Germany, the policy of Germanisation was implemented (especially in times of Bismarck's chancellorship and further). Simultaneously, in Romanov's empire, the authorities were intensifying their pursuits to impose Russian in administration, courts, education and every-

day life until 1905. Consequently, Polish and other local languages played a role of cultural ramparts for more than one hundred years (Burke, 2004; Cywiński, 2013; Pavlenko, 2009; Walczak, 1995).

The regaining of independence by Poland in 1918 again changed the linguistic situation significantly. In the restored state, Polish became a dominant language, receiving strong support from its authorities. Nevertheless, the society of the Second Polish Republic remained highly diverse, constituting a complicated ethnic, religious, cultural and linguistic mosaic. Minorities accounted for over 30% of the population, aspiring for various forms of autonomy, also including official status for their languages. The state agendas were calling for inter-cultural integration, but their endeavours proved not sufficient to weaken antagonisms successfully. Many internal and external factors did not allow the situation to change, including the following: massive poverty sharpening the ideological attitudes, the Great Depression, escalating popularity of nationalisms, post-war revisionisms, the destabilising influence of Germany and the USSR (Woźniak, 2015).

World War II brought about the occupation of Poland by the two states mentioned above. The linguistic situation in this period was transformed dramatically again. Under the Third Reich's control, German remained the only affirmed language. Slavic languages were seen as products of 'subhumans' (*Untermenschen*) who had to be turned into passive and obedient slaves of 'the master race' (*Herrenvolk*). The Bolsheviks theoretically claimed that the principle of linguistic equality, formulated by Lenin, remained in force. In practice, however, they aimed at spreading Russian to the maximum, in the USSR as well as the territories under its control. The policy resulted from the beliefs that broad dissemination of this language would facilitate administrative and governing processes, accelerating the desired social changes (Davies, 2010; Łuczak, 1979).

After World War II, Poland became a satellite state of the USSR. Importantly, it was created within completely new borders in comparison to those before 1939. The new territorial shape of Poland was imposed mostly by Stalin, while the Western allies approved his demands in Yalta and Potsdam. This was accompanied by a policy of mass resettlements, compulsory to a significant extent (Szul, 2009).

In the People's Republic of Poland, there were not many incentives and enhancements that would systematically encourage an individual to cultivate multilingualism. As part of the educational system, it was expected that the student should acquire proficiency in literary Polish and Russian—recognised as the language of international communication in the socialist bloc. The emphasis on learning other foreign languages was generally not strong. The few national minorities were struggling with numerous economic and administrative problems and experiencing the policy of their marginalisation or even stigmatisation (e.g., state-supported mass

media campaigns disseminating negative ethnic stereotypes). As a result, learning minority language or cultivating it as a language of instruction remained limited. Such practices were reluctantly supported by the authorities, although regulated by bilateral international agreements (Pisarek, 1999).

3. Socio-Institutional Context

After 1989, Poland has experienced a kind of moderate return to the state of multilingualism. The doctrine of a society without national minorities is not applicable anymore. In 2005, Poland adopted the *Act on National and Ethnic Minorities and on the Regional Language* and in 2009 ratified the *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages*. This created the legal basis for practising a broad spectrum of language rights by national minorities, especially in culture and education but under some conditions also in topographic and administrative spheres (e.g., schools with minority languages as languages of instruction, access to public broadcasting with TV and radio programs in minority languages, double names of topographic objects in the areas of Poland inhabited numerously by the national minorities representatives, the possibility to use the minority language in local public offices; see Kleina & Lemańczyk, 2018; Łodziński, 2019).

Russian ceased to be a compulsory foreign language in every Polish school. This solution in the last decade of the 20th century led to its general displacement by other foreign languages, mainly English, as well as German, Spanish, French, Italian. Nowadays Russian is gradually regaining its popularity among young Poles, primarily focusing on a perspective of economic or cultural cooperation with partners from the post-Soviet countries. However, the question of its popularisation remains controversial to some extent (Pawłowski, 2008, pp. 130–131). The opening of borders and Poland's accession to the European Union have stimulated an increased demand in linguistic education. Teaching languages is no longer a matter of individual passion or ideological obligations but remains associated with specific challenges and opportunities that are currently met worldwide.

It is of great importance to notice that after the 2004 enlargement of the European Union until 2017, the number of Poles who temporarily stayed abroad increased from 1 million to over 2.5 million (Central Statistical Office, 2019; see also Table 1). This means the on-going internationalisation of Polish society, which, among others, results in growing numbers of bilinguals and multilinguals.

Simultaneously, over the last 30 years, Poland has developed its economy significantly. This growth makes it more and more attractive to foreigners. Particularly, in recent years, the movement of people to Poland from the post-Soviet countries has reached a mass scale. Migrations are of various types, but most often, foreigners come in search of work, education, security and

Table 1. Estimation of emigration from Poland for a temporary stay in 2004–2005 and 2010–2018 (number of people staying abroad at the end of the year).

Year	Number of migrants in thousands										
	2004	2005	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Overall	1 000	1 450	2 000	2 060	2 130	2 196	2 320	2 397	2 515	2 540	2 455

Source: Central Statistical Office (2019).

safety. Their activity should be recognised as an essential element of the Polish cultural characteristic, seriously influencing the language situation. Profound changes open questions not only of linguistic diversity but also of linguistic inclusion. In consequence, both issues become more and more often a subject of theoretical considerations, legal amendments and practical endeavours (Korniychuk, 2016).

According to these notions, the number of migrants staying temporarily in Poland in 2010 was still less than 30,000 but in 2020 it reached over 270,000 (Office for Foreigners, 2020; see also Table 2).

Moreover, while in 2010 the Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Policy registered 180,000 declarations on entrusting work to a foreigner in Poland, in 2019 the number of these declarations exceeded 1,700,000 (Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Policy, 2017, 2020; see Table 3).

The vast majority of migrants in Poland are Ukrainians, and people from outside Europe are not numerous. However, especially in 2015–2016, in the course of the European migration crisis, the flows of individuals from the Middle East and North Africa became the subject of intense public debate. Particularly, politi-

cians of Law and Justice strongly opposed Poland’s opening to the influx of migrants from these regions. At the same time, other mainstream parties were generally suggesting a more flexible approach.

Within the context of dynamic changes, the institutional foundations of Polish language policy remain significantly stable. Its main principles were determined in the Constitution of the Republic of Poland 1997, which establishes Polish as the official language. However, the reservation has also been made that this provision “shall not infringe upon national minority rights resulting from ratified international agreements” (National Assembly of Poland, 1997).

At the same time, the *Polish Language Act 1999*, defines the general directions and aims of the Polish language policy, indicating instruments and mechanisms for its implementation (Parliament of Poland, 1999). The ideological overtone of the act is especially expressed in the preamble which recalls “the experience of history when the struggle of partitioners and occupiers with the Polish language was an instrument of denationalisation” (Parliament of Poland, 1999). Moreover, this part of the law characterises the Polish language as “a basic element of national identity” which helps to protect it “in the

Table 2. Estimation of emigration to Poland for a temporary stay in 2010–2020.

Year	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Number of migrants	26 488	29 188	34 210	34 488	37 668	60 380	97 821	140 070	177 033	230 623	275 802

Source: Office for Foreigners (2020).

Table 3. Declarations on entrusting work to a foreigner in 2010–2020. (Only citizens of Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, Russia and Ukraine may work on the basis of the declaration on entrusting work to a foreigner. This is a simplified procedure).

Year	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
		(1st half of the year)		(2nd half of the year)							(1st half of the year)
Number of declarations registered by Poviats Labor Offices	180 073	163 984	243 736	89 363	387 398	782 222	1 314 127	1 824 464	1 582 225	1 722 977	670 430

Source: Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Policy, 2017, 2020.

process of globalisation” (Parliament of Poland, 1999). Additionally, the legislator claimed that “Polish culture is a contribution to the building of a common, culturally diverse Europe” (Parliament of Poland, 1999) as well as proclaimed that all public agendas in Poland, as well as Polish citizens, are obliged to protect it.

The document ensures a special place for the Council, whose status and competences are regulated in chapter 3 (Parliament of Poland, 1999; Stroińska & Andrews, 2018; Wiertelwski, 2011).

The body counts above 30 members, grouping currently mainly linguists (25), journalists (2), an IT specialist, a lawyer, social scientists (2), a theoretician of literature, a poet/writer, an actor, a cultural anthropologist, a military specialist and a theologian.

According to the *Rules of Procedure of the Polish Language Council at the Presidium of the Polish Academy of Sciences* (Polish Language Council, 2019), the Council used to operate under the *Resolution by the Presidium of the Polish Academy of Sciences No. 17/96 1996* initially. Then, the *Polish Language Act 1999* became the legal basis for incorporating the Council into the system of state institutions. In 1996–2000, the President of the Council was Walery Pisarek; then, in 2000–2019, Andrzej Markowski stepped in. Katarzyna Kłosińska has performed this function since 2019.

In light of the relevant provisions of *The Polish Language Act 1999* (Parliament of Poland, 1999, section 12.1), the Council is an opinion-making and advisory body. It reflects on the Polish language condition and use, acting as a scientific committee within the meaning of article 34 of the *Act on the Polish Academy of Sciences 2010* (Parliament of Poland, 2010). The Council term of office is four years.

At least every two years, the body presents a report on the protection of the Polish language to the Sejm and Senate (Parliament of Poland, 1999).

Also, the Council, at the request of numerous state institutions, as well as on its own initiative:

Expresses, by way of a resolution, opinions on the use of the Polish language in public activities, in a trade involving the participation of consumers as well as in the process of labour law implementation in the territory of Poland, and establishes the rules of spelling and punctuation of the Polish language. (Parliament of Poland, 1999)

Scientific societies, associations of artists and universities also may contact the Council in matters of using Polish. In case of ‘significant concerns’ regarding the official use of Polish, the opinion of the Council may be sought by numerous state- or self-government organs and agendas. Furthermore, a manufacturer, importer and distributor of a good or service, for which there is no appropriate name in Polish, may apply to the Council for an opinion on the appropriate language form for marking this good or service.

The Council does not include politicians, distinguishing it from many other state institutions. Therefore, the findings of the Council are not the result of political rivalry, but discussions among experts in matters of language and its practical applications.

The Council’s scientific authority is confirmed by its close cooperation with many linguistic bodies. Jerzy Bralczyk and Andrzej Markowski indicated as particularly important the Committee of Linguistics (the Polish Academy of Sciences), the Institute of Polish Language (the Polish Academy of Sciences), the Commission for the Language Culture of the Warsaw Scientific Society, the Polish Linguistic Society, the Society of Polish Language Lovers, the Society for Language Culture, and other educational institutions and publishing houses.

According to Bralczyk and Markowski (2005), the Council should be the primary institution conducting Polish language policy. However, it “should make more use of the current linguistic research of the Institute of Polish Language at the Polish Academy of Sciences and university institutions” (Bralczyk & Markowski, 2005, p. 82).

The Council’s members often underline that their voices, as well as the whole body’s voice, should serve primarily as a diagnostic source. They do not perceive themselves as the Polish language owners, executing the right to decide how its users should speak or write. The Council functions following the emancipatory model, directed to develop linguistic consciousness and invigorate discussion concerning the Polish language as a common good (Polish Language Council, 2020).

However, the Council’s representatives also do not forget the past, frequently coping with traditions of managing linguistic diversity developed by the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Polish state between two world wars. These legacies are profoundly complicated, delivering cultural richness mixed with deep symbolic conflicts. Addressing them, the Council’s members quite often suggest how to rethink and transform old patterns in new circumstances (Gajda, 2019).

4. Discussion of the Data

The discussion concerns works of the Council’s members who are recognised in the Polish academic world as leading experts in conceptualising language policy issues.

The analysis is focused on publications regarding Polish language policy by Anna Dąbrowska (linguist, vice-president of the Council), Stanisław Gajda (sociolinguist, member of the Polish Academy of Sciences), Władysław T. Miodunka (linguist, chair of the Polish Language Abroad Section at the Council), Walery Pisarek (1931–2017, linguist, a specialist in the field of social communication and media studies, president of the Council in 1996–2000 and honorary president of the Council since 2000 until his death) and Władysław Lubaś (1932–2014, linguist, member of the Council in 2003–2006).

The material was supported with the data of the survey “Dimensions and Conceptualisations of Polish Language Policy in Views of the Polish Language Council’s Members,” developed in July and August 2020 by Tadeusz Wallas, Tomasz R. Szymczyński and Bartosz Hordecki. The questionnaire of the research was addressed to all interested members of the Council. The survey referred to selected issues of Polish language policy, containing: questions of defining language policy, questions of status and the Polish language prospects, questions concerning European aspects of Polish language policy, and questions of linguistic transformations and challenges associated with intense migration flows to and from Poland.

The survey was answered by Andrzej Blikle (computer scientist), Anna Dąbrowska, Katarzyna Kłosińska (linguist, president of the Council), Władysław T. Miodunka and Barbara Sobczak (linguist). In response to the survey, Stanisław Gajda referred to his latest publication on language policy, also analysed in this article.

The statements derived from the data, exposed in the text, were translated by the authors of the article.

By analysing the collected material, an attempt was made to reconstruct the overall attitudes of the Council’s members referring to the issues of language diversity and language inclusion in Poland. The nature of these attitudes was assessed in three main dimensions which were their stability, coherence and intensity. While assessing stability, a question was considered whether significant changes in the Polish migration situation were indicating essential shifts in the Council members’ opinions. While considering the coherence, the problem was raised whether the attitudes analysed are mainly supportive or polemical to each other. While referring to the intensity, the authors of the article took into account two aspects: (1) How many of the Council’s members did express a deep interest in the subject of linguistic diversity and linguistic inclusion? (2) Were these issues a frequent subject of the Council’s attention?

In light of the materials chosen, Polish as the official language remains at the centre of the Council’s attention and activity. Nevertheless, over the years, the body more and more often has been focusing its interest on other languages.

Walery Pisarek—the first president of the Council, and then its honorary president—convincingly pointed out this issue almost ten years ago. He expressed his comments in the text entitled *The Language Policy of the Republic of Poland, a Member State of the European Union* (Pisarek, 2012). The Council presents this material on its website, probably as a kind of signpost in thinking about language policy issues.

According to the author’s words:

While in the 70s and 80s, language policy was equated with language pedagogy, with combating forms, especially borrowed ones, considered to be erroneous, derailed and inappropriate, starting from the

1980s, the benevolent attention of Polish linguists turned to the languages of national minorities in Poland and unveiling—in the name of *the truth*—the manipulative nature of slogans on posters and banners. (Pisarek, 2012, p. 332; emphasis in original)

Moreover, the author continued:

In the 1990s, as described by many authors, there was a characteristic shift in the subject of Polish language policy. Then, in the twenty-first century, *the framework* for the discussion on language policy [happening] in Poland was *moved* from a *national one*, close to the French model, to a *civic one*, closer to the British model. (Pisarek, 2012, p. 333; emphasis in original)

In recent years, Pisarek’s diagnosis has been even more adequate. There came a time when the Council had undertaken some loud initiatives aimed at the evaluation and improvement of the linguistic layer of the Polish public debate. In this context, it is worth mentioning the Council’s social campaign “You Speak—I Feel. The Good Word—A Better World” concerning ethics of speaking and prevention of verbal violence in various social spaces. Besides, the Council’s report for the years 2016–2017, which was devoted to assessing the state of Polish in political communication, resonated strongly in public opinion. The study, prepared by Kłosińska, Zimny, and Żukiewicz (2018), carefully examined the news tickers accompanying *Wiadomości*, the leading news service broadcasted by the Polish public television. In particular, this document brought about a conclusion that in light of the expertise, the journalists “do not provide citizens with objective information, but their own vision of the events in question” (Kłosińska et al., 2018, p. 7). The Council therefore critically assessed the activities of the public broadcaster controlled by the Polish state. It is an eloquent example that the body is determined to position itself as an objective reviewer of speech practices enacted by all participants of the Polish public sphere (Kłosińska et al., 2018, p. 7; Zgółka, 2019).

In the context indicated by Pisarek, the Council has so far focused primarily on two issues related to the differentiation of the linguistic reality in Poland. The first concerns the status of the Polish language in the European Union, as well as activities aimed at popularising and promoting it at home and abroad. The second covers numerous and complicated issues of the Polish state’s attitude towards minority and foreign languages. It also refers to the influence of language policy in this area on the linguistic situation and inter-ethnic relations in Poland.

Both issues were raised in a final resolution paper approved by the participants of the Conference entitled “Polish Communication and Language Policy in the Face of the Challenges of the 21st Century” (co-organised by the Council on October 21–23, 2004; see Pisarek, n.d.). Concerning the status of the Polish language in the

European Union, the authors of the document were calling rather idealistically for planned and consistent efforts to strengthen the real presence of Polish in the everyday work of European Union bodies. Regarding the complicated issues of the Polish state's attitude towards minority and foreign languages, the resolution stated that "in order to meet the challenges resulting from the European integration...issues of multiculturalism should be introduced into the didactic and educational process, which will contribute to increasing respect for other cultures and tolerance towards ethnically and culturally distinct people" (Pisarek, n.d.; cf. Dąbrowska, Miodunka, & Pawłowski, 2012; Lubaś, 2009; Pawłowski, 2005, 2008; Warchala, 2013).

In this context, Pisarek formulated an opinion that the Polish state's obligations towards migrants are not limited only to ensuring their right to practice native languages privately and in specific dimensions of public life. Moreover, according to his position, Poland should provide migrants with a wide range of educational services that would guarantee them successful learning of the official language. Moreover, the Polish state should also respond to their needs in teaching native languages. As the author stated:

Immigrants in Poland should learn Polish (similar to Polish emigrants in Austria, France, Germany, Sweden or the USA who learn German, French, Swedish and English) as its knowledge enables and conditions full participation in public life in multilingual Poland inhabited by multilingual citizens, where the official language is Polish. And they should be helped by the Polish state in learning Polish, which is a foreign language for them, as well as in teaching their mother tongue. (Pisarek, 2012, pp. 336–337; see also Zgółka, 2011)

Importantly, Pisarek emphasised that the implementation of the tasks proposed by him should not be considered only in the category of burdens for Poland and its budget. Polish authorities' openness to the needs of migrants should mean tangible benefits for Poles and the Polish language abroad. In connection with the principle of reciprocity, it can be expected that: "Such a solution...would enable the language of a few hundred thousand Polish diaspora in Germany to be granted with the status of a national minority language" (Pisarek, 2012, p. 337).

Pisarek's comments are very close to those of Władysław Lubaś, who claimed that the promotion of minority language rights in Poland was primarily motivated by the desire to join the European Union (Lubaś, 2012). At the same time, the author did not shy away from the assessment that "as a result of the nationalist resistance of some parties, sometimes we observe tardiness and mistrust towards non-Polish nationalities and their languages" (Lubaś, 2009, p. 466). Moreover, Lubaś (2009) pointed out that, like other post-communist states, Poland experiences a strong dispute as to the

nature of the new state. In this context, according to this author, in the public debate "national views" prevail over "multi-ethnic views" and "civic views" (Lubaś, 2009, pp. 466–467).

Lubaś' diagnosis largely coincides with Stanisław Gajda's recommendations. Already in 1999, defining the aims of Polish language policy, he included among them: (1) promotion of languages other than Polish; (2) creation of conditions conducive to the preservation and development of national and ethnic minorities' languages; (3) training of language users with a rich linguistic personality, prepared for comprehensive participation in communication; (4) establishment of the Polish linguistic community, involving ethnic and national minorities and oriented on harmonious coexistence and development (Gajda, 1999, pp. 172, 182; Miodunka & Tambor, 2018).

Moreover, a few years later, Gajda emphasised that Polish language policy should be viewed in the context of changes taking place throughout the European Union. According to the author, it should be expected that in the future within EU structures, there will be competition between three scenarios of ethnic and linguistic reality. These scenarios can be briefly described as multiculturalism, transculturalism and interculturalism. The first means "the relative separation of cultures from each other," and the second, "the integration of contacting cultures, the development of which aims to create a unified cultural melt" (Gajda, 2008, p. 61). Finally, interculturalism is, in a way, an intermediate variant, within the frame of which "interacting cultures A and B retain their distinctiveness and specificity, but at the same time a third C culture is created, common to the carriers of the cultures A and B" (Gajda, 2008, p. 61).

It seems that nowadays sympathy towards the third scenario prevails among the members of the Council. This observation can be confirmed with some of their voices, obtained in July and August 2020.

Referring to the facilitating linguistic acclimatisation of migrants from the post-Soviet countries in Poland, Władysław T. Miodunka did not doubt that Poland should help them in learning Polish (e.g., free evening courses, access to textbooks in English, Ukrainian and Russian, launching the TVP channel for migrants from the East). He also drew attention to the fact that valuable activities are undertaken by local governments, although due to financial constraints on a limited scale. Katarzyna Kłosińska and Anna Dąbrowska also agreed that free Polish language courses for foreigners would be a good practice. They also recommended broad access to teaching aids for learning Polish, prepared in native languages of migrants and the possibility to watch TV/movies in cinemas with subtitles in these languages. Dąbrowska also suggested that linguistic inclusion programs for migrants working and living in Poland are insufficient. In her opinion, there is no long-term national plan in this respect. Barbara Sobczak, on the other hand, expressed her opinion in favour of actions "which could serve integration, and therefore should be focused

on teaching migrants the Polish language and culture.” Additionally, she opted for giving migrants easy access to Polish language courses, combined with good information about the possibilities in this area, preferably in their native languages. According to Sobczak, especially basic courses should be free, and the sphere of distance learning well developed. Going further, Andrzej Blikle asserted that state support in the discussed sphere should be intended for all migrants, not only those from post-Soviet countries.

Parallely, criticism dominates among the answers to the question about the promotion of bilingualism and multilingualism by the Polish state (inside and outside its territory). Referring to the issue, Miodunka stated in the survey that “such a policy is not implemented, excepting knowledge of a compulsory foreign language at the matura exam. It is run by academic institutions, but with rather poor results.” Dąbrowska also assessed the activity of the Polish state in the discussed area as “quite poor.” In her opinion, “local governments in schools do the most in this regard.” Blikle, on the other hand, spoke more mildly, pointing to “enormous progress over the last 30 years” in the field of foreign languages teaching in Poland. At the same time, however, he emphasised that this assessment is relative, as it takes into account “previous negligence.” In his opinion, it should not be forgotten that also in the case of multilingual people, knowledge of Polish as a mother tongue remains an essential competence.

All members of the Council who answered the survey in July–August 2020 believed that mass migration from post-Soviet states to Poland did not pose a threat to the Polish language. In justifying this assessment, Dąbrowska concluded that its accuracy was proved by various examples from other countries (Germany, Great Britain, Spain or Scandinavia). Following their experiences, she claimed in the survey, Poland should “promote and facilitate Polish learning as the language of the country of residence.” At the same time, Miodunka expressed the view that migration processes “do not pose any threat to the Polish language, but on the contrary—prove its power and attractiveness, highlighting the fact that Polish is becoming an international language in Central Europe.” Moreover, in light of Miodunka’s position, the Polish state accurately supports this process by introducing special obligations to persons applying for the right of permanent residence in Poland (knowledge of Polish as a foreign language at the B1 level, confirmed with a certificate issued by the State Commission for the Certification of Proficiency in Polish as a Foreign Language).

In light of all of the sources discussed above, the Council members’ views regarding linguistic diversity and linguistic inclusion in Poland can be characterised as significantly similar. It allows claiming that the Council’s community shares an elaborated but not formalised vision of Polish language policy, especially involving a conviction that this policy should be focused on: (1) the Polish language promotion and (2) other languages cultivation. These two aims are perceived as supplementary

and possible to achieve without conflicts and tensions between linguistic communities inhabiting Poland.

The mass influx of people unfamiliar with the Polish language was perceived by the Council’s members as a challenge, but not a threat. They emphasised that the Polish state has significant linguistic obligations towards migrants. It is, in particular, about providing high-quality language courses that may enable them to acquire Polish as an official language. The Council’s members also supported the opinion that learning Polish should go hand in hand with openness to preservation and development of migrants’ native languages. The expenses in this area were presented as a kind of investment, aimed at strengthening the Polish authorities’ position in striving to guarantee the Polish diaspora’s language rights.

It is also essential to emphasise the strong continuity in the development of the views on linguistic diversity and linguistic inclusion in Poland, formulated by the Council’s members for over the last 20 years. The overall tone of all analysed sources, as well as leading opinions expressed by their authors, has not changed (notwithstanding the profound social transformations).

As for the intensity: The Council’s engagement in the discussion on linguistic diversity and linguistic inclusion in Poland should be estimated as moderate. A query of sources indicates that this issue regularly came up during the various events initiated by the Council and remained an important issue for some of its members. However, it cannot be said that this domain of problems was located in the centre of the whole body’s interest.

The sources analysed are rooted primarily in linguistic knowledge, which results undoubtedly from the strong predominance of linguists among the Council’s members. As a result, the opinions taken into consideration appear to be synthetic rather than analytical, general rather than detailed. Simultaneously, it is evident that the views of the body representatives are based on broad knowledge about the Polish linguistic past, being presented as a meaningful inspiration but also a cautionary tale for the present and future. However, the sources did not usually contain references to sociological theories, which can serve as a basis for interpretation and predictions concerning the development of the linguistic situation in Poland. There were also no references to extensive empirical diagnoses concerning the social dimension of bilingualism and multilingualism in the Polish environment. The issue of tensions and conflicts rooted in the linguistic background was not discussed in detail but accompanied by postulates of harmonious linguistic coexistence in contemporary Poland. However, these postulates require in-depth comprehension of their possibility conditions. It seems to be one of the most urgent challenges for the Council’s representatives.

5. Conclusion

The high level of stability and coherence of the statements analysed in the text allows saying that their

authors contribute to the epistemic community as understood by P. M. Haas. It has at least a national scope, including academics from various disciplines, but with a vast majority of linguists. Its members have developed and proliferated:

(1) A shared set of normative and principled beliefs, which provide a value-based rationale for the social action of community members; (2) shared causal beliefs, which are derived from their analysis of practices leading or contributing to a central set of problems in their domain and which then serve as the basis for elucidating the multiple linkages between possible policy actions and desired outcomes; (3) shared notions of validity—that is, intersubjective, internally defined criteria for weighing and validating knowledge in the domain of their expertise; and (4) a common policy enterprise—that is, a set of common practices associated with a set of problems to which their professional competence is directed, presumably out of the conviction that human welfare will be enhanced as a consequence. (Haas, 1992, p. 3)

The activity and statements of the Council's members appear to be based on the belief that the Polish state should cultivate values of open patriotism in the field of language policy (generally understood as promotion of Polish as the official language plus respect for minority language rights following the European Charter). According to their claims, such patriotism finds its strength in diversity and pluralism, interpreting intercultural meetings as an inspiration and an opportunity to share ideas and design new cultural patterns.

In light of many statements endorsed by the Council's members, the implementation of the appropriate solutions requires a reasonable reconstruction of Polish self-perception. According to Gajda (2019, p. 25):

The new project of Polishness should combine Polish identity with universal values, so while maintaining national uniqueness, it should create a new quality, patriotism more open to the affairs of the world and politically responsible. This project also includes a patriotic language policy that creates linguistic consciousness and influences linguistic behaviour oriented not only towards linguistic correctness and immediate effectiveness but also ethical responsibility.

Members of the Council also did not abstain from emphasising that contemporary Polish identity requires being modernised and reshaped by breaking old discursive patterns and divisions. According to Kłosińska, it would be particularly desirable to develop models that can narrow the gap between vocabularies of 'uncompromising ethics' (based on the assumption that politics is a moral battle for fundamental values and symbols) and 'technocratic pragmatism' (based on the assumption that

politics is a utilitarian game of interest and influences), which has evolved parallelly after 1989. Thanks to this, Kłosińska claimed, Poles would have a chance to "redefine the concepts that are fundamental to both discourses" and determine new priorities of their national community (Kłosińska, 2012, p. 313). It is hoped that this achievement may ease the inclusion of migrants into the circuit of contemporary Polish socio-cultural life, diversifying it constructively and adjusting to the challenges of the 21st century.

Moderation present in various statements delivered by the Council's members can also be understood as an expression of responsibility, implied by belonging to the body co-shaping Polish linguistic awareness. It should be noted that the intensive migration flows so far have not resulted in the chronic politicisation of linguistic issues in Poland. Admittedly, linguistic change was temporarily the subject of intense political debate in the second half of the 1990s, when the Polish language law was adopted. At that time, the plot of the not very precisely defined threat to the Polish language was exploited. In consequence, there were concerns that the *Polish Language Act 1999* would become one of the instruments of instilling conservative-national or even xenophobic postulates in the policy of the Polish state (the preamble of the document was a good basis for such expectations). However, shortly after the adoption of the law, the enthusiasm of politicians towards debating language policy issues declined (excluding vivid deliberation on the status of the Silesian). On the other hand, the Council, strengthened by this regulation, for more than two decades of its activity, have confirmed itself as an institution that consistently promotes and animates world-view pluralism as well as civic virtues within the Polish communication sphere.

Currently, the language issue is not the subject of significant collective controversies in Poland. Especially, political actors do not undertake it to distinguish themselves from their rivals. Nevertheless, the changing demographic situation allows assuming that language policy dilemmas soon may attract the attention of public opinion again. Moreover, in the context of increasing linguistic diversification, the attitudes in this sphere can transform into new notable socio-political divisions. Moreover, the intensifying populist discourse in Poland also seems to create a climate in which matters of language policy can be used as an instrument for mobilising and antagonising social groups.

For the above reasons, it may be advisable if the Council in the coming years intensify its reflection referring to the issues of linguistic diversity and linguistic inclusion. It can be admitted that the body have built and focused around itself a community of people who have a potential to present coherent, in-depth and well-balanced conceptualisations of Polish language policy. These achievements would be essentially helpful in constituting future directions in the process of elevating linguistic awareness and openness among Polish society.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Tomasz R. Szymczyński, who is the co-author of the survey “Dimensions and conceptualisations of Polish language policy in views of the Polish Language Council’s members.” We would like to extend our sincere thanks to Katarzyna Kłosińska and Barbara Sobczak who helped us disseminate the survey among the members of the Polish Language Council. We deeply appreciate the responses received from Andrzej Blikle, Anna Dąbrowska, Stanisław Gajda, Katarzyna Kłosińska, Władysław T. Miodunka and Barbara Sobczak.

Conflict of Interests

The authors declare no conflict of interests.

References

- Bralczyk, J., & Markowski, A. (2005). Rola i miejsce instytucji językoznawczych w kształtowaniu polityki językowej [The role and place of linguistic institutions in shaping language policy]. In A. Markowski & J. Porayski-Pomsta (Eds.), *Polska polityka komunikacyjnojęzykowa wobec wyzwań XXI wieku [Polish communication and language policy in the face of the challenges of the 21st century]* (pp. 82–89). Warsaw: Elipsa.
- Burke, P. (2004). *Languages and communities in early modern Europe* (1st ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Central Statistical Office. (2019). *Informacja o rozmiarach i kierunkach czasowej emigracji z Polski w latach 2004–2018* [Information on the size and directions of temporary emigration from Poland in the years 2004–2018]. Warsaw: Główny Urząd Statystyczny. Retrieved from https://stat.gov.pl/download/gfx/portalinformacyjny/pl/defaultaktualnosci/5471/2/12/1/informacja_o_rozmiarach_i_kierunkach_czasowej_emigracji_z_polski_w_latach_2004-2018.pdf
- Cywiński, B. (2013). *Szańce kultur. Szkice z dziejów narodów Europy Wschodniej* [Ramparts of cultures. Sketches from the history of the Eastern Europe’s nations] (1st ed.). Warsaw: Centrum Europejskie Natolin—Wydawnictwo Trio.
- Dąbrowska, A., Miodunka, W., & Pawłowski, A. (2012). *Wyzwania polskiej polityki językowej za granicą: Kontekst, cele, środki i grupy odbiorcze* [Challenges of the Polish language policy abroad: Context, objectives, means and target groups] (1st ed.). Warsaw: Ministerstwo Spraw Zagranicznych.
- Davies, N. (2010). *Boże igrzysko. Historia Polski* [God’s playground: A history of Poland] (7th ed.). Kraków: Znak.
- Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Policy. (2017). *Foreigners working in Poland—Statistics*. *Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Policy*. Retrieved from <https://archiwum.mpips.gov.pl/analizy-i-raporty/cudzoziemcy-pracujacy-w-polsce-statystyki>
- Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Policy. (2020). *Declarations on entrusting work to a foreigner in 2018–2020*. *Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Policy*. Retrieved from <https://psz.praca.gov.pl/-/8180211-oswiadczenia-o-powierzeniu-wykonywania-pracy-cudzoziemcowi-wpisane-do-ewidencji-oswiadczen-obowiazujace-od-2018-r>
- Fishman, J. A. (1997). The sociology of language. In N. Coupland & A. Jaworski (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: A reader* (1st ed.). London: Palgrave.
- Gajda, S. (1999). Program polskiej polityki językowej [Polish language policy programme]. In J. Mazur (Ed.), *Polska polityka językowa na przełomie tysiącleci* [Polish language policy at the turn of the Millennium] (pp. 37–46). Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Gajda, S. (2008). Językowa przyszłość a polityka językowa [Language future and language policy]. In J. Warchala & D. Krzyżyk (Eds.), *Polska polityka językowa w Unii Europejskiej* [Polish language policy in the European Union] (pp. 50–66). Katowice: Wydawnictwo UŚ.
- Gajda, S. (2019). Polska polityka językowa 1918–2018 [Polish language policy 1918–2018]. In R. Przybylska, B. Batko-Tokarz, & S. Pręcerek-Kisielak (Eds.), *Niepodległa wobec języka polskiego* [Independent Poland and the Polish language] (pp. 13–27). Kraków: Wydawnictwo UJ.
- Haas, P. M. (1992). Introduction: Epistemic communities and international policy coordination. *International Organization*, 1(46), 1–35.
- Kleina, K., & Lemańczyk, M. (Eds.). (2018). *Różnorodność językowa w Polsce jako dobro wspólne (wybrane przykłady)* [Linguistic diversity in Poland as a common good (selected examples)] (1st ed.). Warsaw: Kancelaria Senatu.
- Kłosińska, K. (2012). Na ile sposobów mówimy o sprawach publicznych? [How many ways do we talk about public affairs?]. In A. Markowski & R. Pawelec (Eds.), *Oblicza polszczyzny* [Faces of the Polish language] (pp. 305–313). Warsaw: Narodowe Centrum Kultury.
- Kłosińska, K., Zimny, R., & Żukiewicz, P. (2018). *Sprawozdanie ze stanu ochrony języka polskiego za lata 2016–2017—Język informacji politycznej* [Report on the Polish language protection 2016–2017—Language of political information]. *Polish Language Council*. Retrieved from https://rjp.pan.pl/images/Sprawozdanie_o_stanie_ochrony_j%C4%99z._pol._2016-2017.pdf
- Korniyuchuk, A. (2016). *Nauka języka w integracji uchodźców—Doświadczenia innych państw* [Language learning in refugee integration—Experiences of other countries] (1st ed.). Warsaw: Instytut Spraw Publicznych. Retrieved from <https://www.isp.org.pl/pl/publikacje/nauka-jezyka-w-integracji-uchodzcow-doswiadczenia-innych-panstw>
- Łodziński, S. (2019). *Języki mniejszości narodowych*

- w przestrzeni publicznej. Czy zmiana krajobrazu językowego w Polsce? [Languages of national minorities in public space. Is the language landscape in Poland changing?]. *Nauka*, 3, 125–145.
- Lubaś, W. (2009). *Polityka językowa. Komparacja współczesnych języków słowiańskich* [Language policy. Comparison of contemporary Slavic languages] (1st ed.). Opole: Wydawnictwo UO.
- Lubaś, W. (2012). O polskiej polityce językowej [On Polish language policy]. *Poradnik Językowy*, 6, 11–33.
- Łuczak, C. (1979). *Polityka ludnościowa i ekonomiczna hitlerowskich Niemiec w okupowanej Polsce* [The demographic and economic policy of Nazi Germany in occupied Poland] (1st ed.). Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie.
- Miodunka, W., & Tambor, J. (Eds.). (2018). *Nauczanie i promocja języka polskiego w świecie: Diagnoza—stan—perspektywy* [Teaching and promotion of the Polish language in the world: Diagnosis—condition—prospects] (1st ed.). Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Office for Foreigners. (2020). *Estimation of emigration to Poland for a temporary stay in 2010–2020*. Office for Foreigners. Retrieved from <https://migracje.gov.pl/statystyki/zakres/polska/typ/dokumenty/widok/tabele/rok/2020>
- National Assembly of Poland. (1997). *The Constitution of the Republic of Poland*. Warsaw: Parliament of Poland.
- Parliament of Poland. (1999). *Polish Language Act 1999*. Warsaw: Parliament of Poland.
- Parliament of Poland. (2010). *The Act on the Polish Academy of Sciences 2010*. Warsaw: Parliament of Poland.
- Pavlenko, A. (2009). Linguistic russification in the Russian Empire: Peasants into Russians? *Russian Linguistics*, 1(33), 331–350.
- Pawłowski, A. (2005). Język polski w Unii Europejskiej: Szanse i zagrożenia [The Polish language in the European Union: Opportunities and threats]. *Poradnik Językowy*, 10, 4–27.
- Pawłowski, A. (2008). Zadania polskiej polityki językowej w Unii Europejskiej [Polish language policy's tasks in the European Union]. In J. Warchał & D. Krzyżyk (Eds.), *Polska polityka językowa w Unii Europejskiej* [Polish language policy in the European Union] (pp. 113–147). Katowice: Wydawnictwo UŚ.
- Pisarek, W. (1999). Istota i sens polskiej polityki językowej [The essence and meaning of Polish language policy]. In J. Mazur (Ed.), *Polska polityka językowa na przełomie tysiącleci* [Polish language policy at the turn of the Millennium] (pp. 13–23). Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Pisarek, W. (2012). Polityka językowa Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej, państwa członkowskiego Unii Europejskiej [Language policy of the Republic of Poland, a member state of the European Union]. In A. Markowski & R. Pawelec (Eds.), *Oblicza polszczyzny* [Faces of the Polish language] (pp. 331–341). Warsaw: Narodowe Centrum Kultury.
- Pisarek, W. (n.d.). Uchwała końcowa konferencji Polska polityka komunikacyjnojęzykowa wobec wyzwań XXI wieku [Final resolution of the conference Polish communication and language policy in the face of the challenges of the 21st century]. *Polish Language Council*. Retrieved from https://rjp.pan.pl/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=383:polska-polityka-komunikacyjnojęzykowa-wobec-wyzwa-xxi-wieku&catid=50&Itemid=50
- Polish Language Council. (2019). Regulamin Rady Języka Polskiego przy Prezydium Polskiej Akademii Nauk 2019 [Rules of procedure of the Polish Language Council at the Presidium of the Polish Academy of Sciences 2019]. *Polish Language Council*. Retrieved from https://rjp.pan.pl/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=194:regulamin-rady&catid=40&Itemid=48
- Polish Language Council. (2020). Oświadczenie Prezydium Rady Języka Polskiego w sprawie opinii językowej o słowie “Murzyn” [Statement of the Presidium of the Polish Language Council on the linguistic opinion about the word ‘Murzyn’]. *Polish Language Council*. Retrieved from https://rjp.pan.pl/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1898&catid=98&Itemid=59
- Schiffman, H. (2006). Language policy and linguistic culture. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy. Theory and method* (pp. 111–125). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Stroińska, M., & Andrews, E. (2018). The Polish Language Act: Legislating a complicated linguistic-political landscape. In E. Andrews (Ed.), *Language planning in the post-communist era: The struggles for language control in the new order in Eastern Europe, Eurasia and China* (pp. 241–260). Cham: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Szul, R. (2009). *Język—naród—państwo. Język jako zjawisko polityczne* [Language—nation—state. Language as a political phenomenon] (1st ed.). Warsaw: PWN.
- Tazbir, J. (2011). Język polski a świadomość narodowa [Polish language and national consciousness]. *Polish Language Council*. Retrieved from http://www.rjp.pan.pl/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1351&Itemid=50
- Temčinas, S. (2017). Języki kultury ruskiej w Pierwszej Rzeczypospolitej [Languages of the culture Russe in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth]. In M. Kuczyńska (Ed.), *Między Wschodem a Zachodem: Prawosławie i unia* [Between East and West: Orthodoxy and the Union] (pp. 81–120). Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Walczak, B. (1995). *Zarys dziejów języka polskiego* [Outline of the history of the Polish language] (1st ed.). Wrocław: SAWW.
- Walczak, B. (2017). Wielojęzyczność naszego świata dawniej i dziś [Multilingualism of our world: Past and

- present]. In M. Pachowicz & K. Choińska (Eds.), *Świat słów. Jedność w różności* [The world of words. Unity in diversity] (pp. 17–26). Tarnów: Wydawnictwa PWSZ.
- Walczak, B. (2018). Ruszczyzna—Drugi język Rzeczypospolitej [The Russian language as a second language of the Polish-Lithuanian commonwealth]. In L. Citko (Ed.), *Języki ruskie w rozwoju historycznym i kontaktach z polszczyzną* [Russian languages in historical development and contacts with Polish] (pp. 277–287). Białystok: Prymat.
- Warchala, J. (2013). O współczesnej polszczyźnie w duchu polityki językowej i promocji [About contemporary Polish in the spirit of language policy and promotion]. In A. Achtelek & J. Tambor (Eds.), *Sztuka, więc rzemiosło. Nauczyć Polski i polskiego* [Art, so craft. To make Poland and Polish learned] (Vol. 3, pp. 78–89). Katowice: Gnome.
- Wiertelwski, S. (2011). Wielopodmiotowość współczesnej polskiej polityki językowej [Multi-agency of contemporary Polish language policy]. *Język, Komunikacja, Informacja*, 6, 99–107.
- Woźniak, E. (2015). Polityka językowa państwa polskiego w okresie międzywojennym [Language policy of the Polish state in the interwar period]. *Socjolingwistyka*, 29, 7–20.
- Zgółka, T. (2011). Dydaktyka szkolna języka polskiego jako ojczystego w perspektywie europejskiej [School teaching of the Polish language as a mother tongue in the European perspective]. *Polish Language Council*. Retrieved from http://www.rjp.pan.pl/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1356&Itemid=50
- Zgółka, T. (2019). Czas (dez)informacji [(Dis)information time]. *Kultura u Podstaw*. Retrieved from <https://kulturaupodstaw.pl/czas-dezinformacji-tadeusz-zgolka-anka-adamowicz>

About the Authors



Tadeusz Wallas is a Professor habilitated in Political Science and Head of the Department of Political Culture at the Faculty of Political Science and Journalism at Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań. He is scientifically interested in contemporary political systems, contemporary political culture, political aspects of globalisation and European integration.



Bartosz Hordecki is an Assistant Professor at the Faculty of Political Science and Journalism at Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań. He is a member of the Executive Board of the Research Committee 50: Politics of Language (International Political Science Association). He specialises in studies on language politics and policies, political philosophy and political rhetoric. His research also concerns the evolution of political and legal cultures as well as transformations of key-concepts and methodological approaches in political and media studies.

Article

Two Linguas Francas? Social Inclusion through English and Esperanto

Federico Gobbo ^{1,*} and László Marác ^{2,3}

¹ Amsterdam Center for Language and Communication, University of Amsterdam, 1012 VB Amsterdam, The Netherlands; E-Mail: f.gobbo@uva.nl

² Faculty of Humanities, University of Amsterdam, 1012 CX Amsterdam, The Netherlands; E-Mail: l.k.maracz@uva.nl

³ Department of International Relations, L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, 010000 Astana, Kazakhstan

* Corresponding author

Submitted: 19 September 2020 | Accepted: 5 November 2020 | Published: 14 January 2021

Abstract

New forms of mobility presuppose a technological factor that frames it as ‘topological proximity,’ regardless of the nature of the mobile agent (human being, robot ware, animal, virus, digital object). The appeal of the so-called *linguas francas* is especially evident in human beings showing high propensity to move, i.e., motility. They are usually associated with transnational communication in multilingual settings, linguistic justice, and globalization. Paradoxically, such global languages foster mobility, but, at the same time, they may hinder social inclusion in the hosting society, especially for people in mobility. The article compares English as a *lingua franca* and Esperanto in the European context, putting together the linguistic hierarchy of transnational communication (Gobbo, 2015) and the notion of linguistic unease, used to assess sociolinguistic justice (Iannàccaro, Gobbo, & Dell’Aquila, 2018). The analysis shows that the sense of belonging of their respective speakers influences social inclusion in different ways. More in general, the article frames the linguistic dimension of social inclusion in terms of linguistic ease, proposing a scale suitable for the analysis of European contexts.

Keywords

Esperanto; hyper-place; *lingua franca*; linguistic easiness; linguistic justice; mobility; onlife; social inclusion; sociolinguistic justice

Issue

This article is part of the issue “Social Inclusion and Multilingualism: The Impact of Linguistic Justice, Economy of Language and Language Policy” edited by László Marác (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands / L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Kazakhstan) and Zsombor Csata (Babeş-Bolyai University, Romania / Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Hungary).

© 2021 by the authors; licensee Cogitatio (Lisbon, Portugal). This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY).

1. Introduction

Humanity is currently facing the greatest challenges of urbanization in its whole history. According to the United Nations Population Fund, more than half of the world population will live in global cities by 2030. The increase of urbanization raises opportunities (such as economic well-being) and simultaneously raises problems (such as social inequality). However, the existing literature on this topic lacks clarity regarding the role played by technology in re-defining topological proximity. In fact, the pervasiveness of ICTs eventually blurs the distinction between reality and virtuality. In sharp contrast with

Marg Augé’s concept of non-places, Lussault (2017) talks about hyper-places, where dimensions of real and virtual locality co-exist. Hyper-places exist at the same time locally and globally, and this means that what happens there has repercussions in all dimensions in their topological proximity. An example of this is Times Square, which is local (place in New York), national (within the USA) and global: A demonstration held there reaches a different audience according to other parts of the world, e.g., Paris, Tokyo, Dubai. In other terms, what happens collectively in a hyper-place influences not only the local space but also and mainly the connected hyper-places, re-defining the concept of human geography. The world

did become neither ‘flat’ nor ‘liquid,’ i.e., a supposed homogeneous isotropic space, but on the contrary its topology is more complex than ever. For instance, there are now digital divides, connection gaps as well as information highways.

What does it mean to be close, under the emic perspective of a (human) agent? Basically, proximity is defined by the kind of information that can be accessed by the agent. Houtkamp (2018, 2020) argues that motility, i.e., the propensity to move to a new country, is predictive of actual behavior with reasonable accuracy. In terms of language attitudes, if I am from country X and I want to move to country Y, it is probable that I would look for digital resources about the national language(s) of country Y before the physical move even occurs. Most analysts, for instance Lussault (2017), are in agreement that mobility cannot be limited to the physical act, transport and logistics. In particular, mobility is a factor regardless of the nature of the mobile agent: human being, robot ware, animal, virus, digital object, etc. However, this essentialist vision conceives agents as completely independent according to their nature, while in many cases they are not: For instance, many human agents carry digital agents with them most of the same time, as they constantly transmit information, mainly through mobile devices.

In other words, most of the human population does no longer live purely in a real world, as phones and similar devices, even if not actively engaged with them, constantly put them online and offline at the same time, i.e., onlife (Floridi, 2015). Even the anthropic environment where we live is more and more shaped in order to accommodate the needs of ICTs—for instance, think about domotics. On the other hand, scholarly literature reflecting on this hyperconnected world rarely takes into account how much language choices impact the propensity to move.

2. Two Global Languages in Comparison: English and Esperanto

This article explores the issue of complex linguistic diversity in the choice of using global languages, such as English and Esperanto, and the consequences on the notion of lingua franca, and how it influences social inclusion in an onlife world. Two fundamental dimensions in the design of public policies aiming in managing linguistic diversity should be considered: mobility and social inclusion. Grin et al. (2018) show that the academic discourse around the interplay between mobility and social inclusion has been fragmented across disciplines for too long and call for more in-depth and coherent analyses. In particular, the role of languages as indicators is still underestimated as an indicator of social inclusion and is currently under scrutiny from a variety of angles. In order to illustrate our argument, which is mainly theoretical, we will refer to the European context only in general terms: Case study analyses in concrete settings are left as further work.

One of the clearest phenomena associated with globalization is the globalization of languages (Steger, 2003, p. 72). Where communities are no longer characterized by shared primary socialization nor by a common native language, Seidlhofer (2009, p. 39), for instance, argues that the need for a lingua franca is growing. However, situations may differ greatly depending on the situation and place in the world, therefore we need to analyze their linguistic panoramas in their complexity. Such facts make us rely on the concept of complex linguistic diversity described by Kraus (2012, p. 13) as follows: Complex linguistic diversity is:

Meant to come to grips with a constellation in which cultural [and linguistic aspects], identities and social cleavages overlap and intertwine in manifold ways...[pointing] at a social and political context in which diversity has become a multidimensional and fluid phenomenon.

Thus, complex linguistic diversity is tackled in terms of independent linguistic layers, each one serving a specific purpose, but both in terms of mobility and social inclusion (Marácz, 2014). Paradoxically, global languages, with their promise of fostering mobility may ultimately impact social inclusion in the hosting society.

Hülmbauer, Böhringer, and Seidlhofer (2008, p. 27) define the concept of a lingua franca as a language that acts as a bridge between persons who share neither a common native tongue, nor a common (national) culture, and for whom the lingua franca is the chosen foreign language of communication. According to the definition presented above, such a definition usually implies that a lingua franca is also a global language. Strictly speaking, a lingua franca should be the neutral language involved in communication with speakers that are not familiar with each other’s languages. The adjective ‘neutral’ here, which renders ‘franca’ as in ‘free,’ is essential: The language should belong to none of the speakers involved in communication. When native and non-native multilingual interaction is involved, it would be better to speak of a ‘vehicular language,’ in the case of English but not only. However, we will refer to this variant as a lingua franca in the remainder of the argumentation. We compare a variant of English functioning as a lingua franca (Jenkins, 2014; Seidlhofer, 2011) and Esperanto, in order to illustrate our discussion on the linguistic dimension of social inclusion.

2.1. English as a Lingua Franca

The spread of English at a global level after the fall of USSR and the end of the Cold War did not get unnoticed. Pennycook (2017) identifies and discusses the three main paradigms found in the literature that analyze the position of English vis-à-vis the other languages in a given multilingual context: the Circle model of World Englishes (since at least Kachru, 1992); linguistic imperi-

alism (since at least Phillipson, 1992); English as a lingua franca (ELF; see at least Seidlhofer, 2011). Let us discuss ELF in more detail.

The definition of globalization covers these key qualities, including world-wide cultural homogenization, migration, foreign language learning and tourism, Internet and international scientific publications. Apart from the number of declining languages, there is some consensus on the growing global significance of a few set of languages over all the others, particularly English, Chinese and Spanish. Commentators stress the power of the Anglo-American culture industry to make English the global lingua franca of the 21st century. This lingua franca has been labeled ELF (Jenkins, 2014, pp. 39–40; Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 16). Crystal (2004, p. 40) already depicted the situation that started to emerge in the early years of the new millennium as follows:

The situation is unprecedented, with more people using English in more places than at any time in the language's history, and unpredictable, with the forces promoting linguistic identity and intelligibility competing with each other in unexpected ways. For those who have to work professionally with English, accordingly, it is a very difficult time. After all, there has never been such a period of rapid and fundamental change since the explosions of development that hit the language in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.

Seidlhofer (2009, p. 48, emphasis by the authors) identifies as main features of ELF “its characteristic variability, *hybridity* and fluidity.” Jenkins, on the other hand, advocates for:

The legitimate appropriation of the English language by its majority expanding circle users [by definition, non-native], together with whatever diversity and *hybridity* suited their own purposes rather than the purposes of inner circle speakers. (Jenkins, 2014, pp. 39–40, emphasis by the authors)

Based mainly on Jenkins (2006, 2014), Hülmbauer et al. (2008), Seidlhofer (2009, 2011), Hülmbauer (2009), and Marácz (2018), we argue that hybridity entails three consequences on ELF that impact social inclusion.

First, on an individual level, ELF is seen as a flexible mode of intercultural communication rather than a fixed code (Marácz, 2018, pp. 102–103), showing as fundamental traits variability, hybridity and fluidity. In other words, it is negotiated and individually shaped by its users according to the needs of the situation, in which effectiveness of communication rules over correct grammatical usage. It can potentially take any form and can potentially fulfil any function. Ultimately, this is determined by accommodative strategies typically characterized by plurilingual elements and the emergence of new patterns of lexical elements and grammar.

Second, on a group level, ELF is supposed to integrate all speakers, including native speakers. There are more ELF speakers—and more interactions among them—than native speakers of English. The group of users is not fixed but scattered. In other words, instead of forming a speech community or a community of practice, which defines itself through ELF, speakers using ELF rely on a pragmatic and situational basis, possibly with no face-to-face interaction. It is a matter of research in what sense ELF is associated with a new linguistic global identity instead of the old ethnic identity; in particular, the relevance of the society where ELF is used cannot be underestimated and should be taken into account in order to understand its impact (Gobbo, 2015).

Third, on a more general level, ELF appears in different forms because it fosters an intercultural mode, combining the cultural background of English-speaking countries with other lingua-cultural backgrounds and their interplay. In Europe, ELF has become an essential component of multilingual contexts in general and of Europeans' plurilingual repertoires in particular. These key qualities of ELF discussed above most strikingly illustrate the hybrid nature of ELF, i.e., it appears in an intercultural context, it has no standard code and it is affected by different lingua-cultural backgrounds and their interplay. ELF constantly relates to other languages in the sense that it is ever-changing within the multilingual contexts in which it is found. Influences of other languages are a natural and crucial characteristic of ELF at all linguistic levels, i.e., phonological, morphological, syntactical, lexical and pragmatic (Hülmbauer et al., 2008, p. 29). Jenkins (2006, p. 140) refers to these native language influences as “bilingual resources.” Hence, these first language interactions on ELF involves communicative strategies such as the exploitation of parallel structures in different L1s, code-switching techniques, intercomprehension, and so on, may be universal, i.e., language-independent (Hülmbauer et al., 2008, p. 32). Much of the linguistic research in the field of ELF takes these linguistic strategies into account.

The functional motivation of ELF makes it impossible to elaborate on a standard code, for languages are unstable, always in flux, react to outer circumstances and conditions (see Jenkins, 2006; Jenkins, Cogo, & Dewey, 2011, pp. 283–284). If a language spreads particularly wide, and fast and it is confronted with massive language contact it will also change fast. According to their advocates, this functional motivation of ELF yields hybridization comparable to pidginization and creolization which are well-documented instances of hybrid language creation. However, studies on pidgins and creoles show that the colonial and post-colonial contexts in which pidgins emerge and creoles develop are radically different in comparison to the onlife world we are living in today (as illustrated above; for onlife see Floridi, 2015), therefore their respective linguistic phenomena are different indeed. In particular, the technological factor fosters language use in written form much more than before, espe-

cially using non-standard graphization (for English see Crystal, 2008).

We argue that the onlife world is radically different, and therefore that it cannot be compared to the old colonial contexts where pidgins emerged. According to Jenkins and collaborators, ELF is occupying a “third space” between two further language variants of English (Jenkins, 2006, p. 155), including English as a native language and English as a foreign language, that is a target language with a standard code for non-native speakers of English. However, eventually Jenkins et al. (2011) and Jenkins (2014) find empirical evidence of such ‘third space’ mainly in two specific domains, i.e., academia and business, where it leads to consequences in language teaching and acquisition. Eventually, even the proponents of ELF admit that it is only used in a restricted number of settings.

The question arises what the position of ELF is within Europe, a continent that has been historically characterized by linguistic diversity, where major languages such as English, French, Spanish played a crucial role in colonialism. In the history of European multilingualism and the use of communication languages, i.e., so-called *linguas francas*, by speakers with a different mother tongue have been changing over time. Most probably ELF will not be sufficient to cover all the communicational settings, as it seems to work only in domain-specific settings; therefore, further language resources are required in order to cope with the complexity of multilingual settings found across the continent. At present, this linguistic diversity of Europe is supported by the EU’s language policy facilitating the practice of multilingualism at all tiers of governance.

The position of ELF in a multilingual Europe is not that strong as it is generally perceived. It is true that ELF or a European variant of it has made an important expansion in that it is used more frequently than German or French as a *lingua franca*. Although, German has the highest number of speakers, i.e., 16 percent of the population, only 11 percent of the total speakers of the EU know German as a foreign language, that is 27 percent in total. English is used most commonly in the EU with 13 percent native speakers and 38 percent foreign speakers, in total 51 percent. French is the third frequently spoken language in the EU, namely 12 percent native speakers and 12 percent foreign speakers, that is 24 percent in total (Directorate-General for Communication, 2012; we use the terms ‘native speakers,’ ‘mother tongue’ and ‘foreign language’ as they are used in the Eurobarometer, even if they are social constructions made up to establish the nation-state after the Treaty of Westphalia and in particular during Romanticism; see Bonfiglio, 2013, 2010; Myhill, 2006).

Some commentators are worried that ELF seems to endanger the vitality of other European languages as vehicular languages. In an article summarizing this problem, Seidlhofer, Breiteneder, and Pitzl (2006, p. 8) admit: “This situation is obviously problematic. The need for a

common means of communication is in potential conflict with the ideals of societal multilingualism and individual plurilingualism.” The authors distinguish two major types of communicative situations in which English serves as:

A direct mediator between participants in a discourse that would otherwise have to rely on translation or a third party....The current role of English in Europe is thus characterized by the fact that the language has become a *lingua franca*, a language of wider communication, and that it has entered the continent in two directions as it were, top-down by fulfilling functions in various professional domains and, simultaneously, bottom-up by being encountered and used by speakers from all levels of society in practically all walks of life. (Seidlhofer et al., 2006, p. 5)

It is in situations of the first type that the employment of English subjects, the participants to the norms of a native like competence will be relevant: conversations with natives, international conferences with participation of native speakers, English-as-foreign language instructional contexts of various kinds, and so forth. But there is also the usage of English in ‘informal settings’ as a vehicle of communication among groups of non-native participants, as a *lingua franca* in a strict sense. In this type lies—according to Seidlhofer et al. (2006)—the basis for the genesis of new varieties of English which are ‘endonormative,’ with rules of communication of their own right. Undoubtedly, the respective source languages of the non-natives can be seen as reflected in the usage of ELF. In this sense, one speaks of ‘Englishes.’ But it would “seem premature to ask questions about the degree to which English as a *lingua franca* in Europe can be regarded as an actual variety, i.e., Euro-English in any meaningful sense” (Seidlhofer et al., 2006, p. 21). In sum, we argue that, while playing a role as a domain-specific communication strategy, ELF will not be the ultimate solution to manage Europe’s multilingual realities.

In the case of ELF, hybridity consists in the emergence of various variants of English across the world, that do not rely on the distribution of British or American norms and standards. Thus, there are no firm norms associated with ELF as the interferences of the native tongues of speakers of ELF are present all over the place in various transient forms, hindering the process of ‘endonormation’ mentioned above. Hence, there are as much varieties of such Englishes as the communicative situations that are even extrapolated. What the speakers of ELF have in common is that they rely on a common set of accommodation and communication strategies, which are actually found in many other linguistic contexts involving non-native speakers, regardless of the language involved (Maráč, 2018, pp. 102–103).

Most of the discussion in the literature behind the feasibility of the expression ‘*lingua franca*’ questions the position of native speakers. In particular, on the one hand, native speakers are targeted as being in a posi-

tion of unfair advantage. On the other hand, what ‘native speakers’ exactly means is often unclear, especially in the case of early bilingual speakers (see Sorace, 2004), and in the case of ‘new speakers,’ emerging in language revitalization programs of minority languages (O’Rourke, Pujolar, & Ramallo, 2015).

In the essentialist view that English *is* a lingua franca tout court, English natives are questioned as such. In such a view, English does not belong to any specific group and therefore it is global and free (‘franca’). On the contrary, under an anti-essentialist view, the question of ‘nativeness’ is solved in emic vs etic terms: Even multilingual societies per se challenge the etic, objective, existence of native speakers, on the other hand the institutions devoted to keep the prestigious role of linguistic norm high—in the case of English, a good example is the British Council—are not diminishing their leading role, quite the contrary. From an emic, subjective, point of view, the normative register of a language is usually paired with the prototypical monolingual speaker. In other words, native speakers are identified as the gatekeepers of the linguistic norm.

Within this second view, the expression ‘lingua franca’ becomes more of a fluid set of strategies of linguistic accommodation where native speakers (in the emic perspective of the agents’ judgement) are not present, and therefore non-native speakers feel free to use language contact strategies to make themselves understood, going across the boundaries set by the normative register. However, such a strategy is volatile, as sooner or later the situation will involve either a shift to a formal register or the direct involvement of native speakers, and then the ‘magic of freedom’ in using ELF suddenly vanishes.

2.2. Esperanto as a Lingua Franca and the Question of Nativeness

It is interesting to notice that the path Esperanto is going through is reversed in many aspects. Since its launching as Zamenhof’s language project in 1887, Esperanto was conceived as a truly lingua franca for international communication, not being attached to a particular group of people but belonging—at least according to its mainstream ideology—to the whole world (Gobbo, 2017). From a typological point of view, it is a contact language between the three main language families of Europe: Romance, Germanic and Slavic. Moreover, it borrows some features from Ancient Greek and Latin. On a deep level, e.g., phonological, Esperanto seems to be more influenced by Slavic languages, in particular Russian and Polish (Lindstedt, 2009; Marcialis, 2011). On the other hand, on a surface level, e.g., lexical, Esperanto shows a predominance of Latin and Latinate roots (Gledhill, 2000). This delicate equilibrium is stable thanks to a small but clear set of morphological rules fixed by its launcher Zamenhof (1905) that formed the boundaries of language variation in the crucial years of the establishment of the community of practice, from the first

World Esperanto Congress (1905) until Zamenhof’s passing in 1917. It is important to underline the fact that Esperanto succeeded in becoming a living language, even if its linguistic sources are highly heterogeneous thanks to existence of such norms, as they guarantee mutual understanding among Esperanto speakers from different backgrounds and therefore they are the rails that permit anybody to be included in the Esperanto community, if desired.

This is very different from the concept of ‘hybridity’ carried out as a crucial feature of ELF. In the case of Esperanto, ‘endonormation’ is guaranteed by language planning of its core features. In fact, Zamenhof fixed the rules of the core features while leaving a certain amount of freedom in how to expand the vocabulary according to needs that change across time and context, in order to foster the use in as many domains as possible. In sum, we argue that it is not the absence of rules that guarantees mutual understanding in transnational communication but on the contrary their presence: Esperanto is a living proof of that.

It is without any doubt that Esperanto speakers in many cases show a strong degree of loyalty to their adopted language, as they feel it as a part of their identity (Fiedler, 2006, p. 76). If their language loyalty is very high, they may choose to use the language within the family, traditionally the most conservative domain in terms of language loyalty and identity (see Corsetti, 1996; Fiedler, 2012; Lindstedt, 2010). The existence of ‘denaskismo’ has been regarded as an argument against Esperanto, which goes as follows: If there are native speakers of Esperanto, then this language is no more international and neutral because it belongs to a kind of pseudo-people. In the remainder of this section we are going to explain why ‘denaskismo,’ at least in its current form, is no threat to Esperanto as a lingua franca.

First of all, it is important to note that people growing up using Esperanto are not ‘native’ speakers *stricto sensu*, as no monolingual Esperanto speaker ever existed. Esperanto is always found in multilingual contexts, as there is no existing country of ‘Esperantoland’ in which monolingual first speakers of Esperanto use the language as their main mean of communication in their daily aspects of social life, and it never has been. In particular, Esperanto families always speak at least the language of the hosting society, and not rarely and at least an additional language is present in the respective repertoires of family members. This means that Esperanto is never the strongest language in bilingualism, as the society outside the family domain—most notably at schools in the case of children—uses other languages.

However, it is true that from the emic perspective, family speakers resemble certain traits of standard ‘nativeness,’ because Esperanto is acquired ‘naturally,’ ‘from the cradle.’ The sociolinguistic profile of the Esperanto speakers illustrated by Caligaris (2016), although limited in scope, shows that such speakers tend to have different language attitudes than the rest of

the Esperanto speaking population, which justifies their treatment as a separate subgroup. Moreover, non-family speakers have polarized opinions towards them, either very positive (the majority) or totally negative (a fierce minority). Another important fact is that Esperanto families are still a tiny minority of the total population. The majority of the scholars in the field estimate approximately 1,000 family speakers on 100,000 active and passive Esperanto speakers worldwide (Lindstedt, 2010). An interest in forming stable couples of Esperanto speakers seems to be growing, and in such cases speaking Esperanto to the possible future children is at least considered an option (Caligaris, 2016). However, we would need longitudinal studies to confirm such attitude with more robust data. What is absolute certain is that, so far, there is no village or settling where Esperanto families want to live as a stable community in the sense of a ‘small world apart.’

Esperanto family members, as all other Esperanto speakers, live many fundamental parts of their everyday lives—such as grocery shopping, gas getting, going to the doctor or the lawyer, or paying taxes—outside the Esperanto reality. Moreover, what Esperanto family speakers lack in order to be considered native speakers tout court languages is an authoritative role: They do play no special role in keeping and developing the normative register and the process of standardization. In this respect, they resemble more ‘new speakers’ of lesser-used languages after successful revitalization programs, as illustrated and discussed by Jaffe (2015). Anecdotal evidence via participant’s observation by one of the authors suggests that not all family speakers are fluent in Esperanto and some of them show non-standard traits in their idiolect; unfortunately, there is no reliable empirical research to corroborate this evidence in more stable terms. In sum, their ‘nativeness’ is more an appealing metaphor for many Esperantists in order to reinforce their language loyalty: Family speakers are an argument arguing for Esperanto becoming a ‘normal’ language, whatever that means, as Esperanto is still contested as being a full-fledged language, in spite of its empirical reality as a living language.

Astori (2016) proposes to frame the Esperanto community as a kind of nation, as it shows some traits similar to the Deaf community where members’ origins are far less important than the fact of being Esperantist/Deaf, both being transnational identities (for a recent account of the latter see Leigh & O’Brien, 2019). Is there really an ‘Esperantohood’ similar to Deafhood? We argue that, whatever the similarities, there are fundamental differences as well: Most strikingly, there is no issue of hearing and orality at stake in the case of Esperanto, unlike the case of the Deafhood. Moreover, ideologies of sign language revitalization show different dimensions that are very specific of sign languages and are not easily applicable to spoken languages, Esperanto included. Such dimensions include: intergenerational transmission, representation, language shift, new signers and documenta-

tion (Snoddon & De Meulder, 2020). This proposal shows that the debate on the Esperanto identity is still open. We will now take a standpoint in relation to the dimension of social inclusion.

In conclusion, even if some Esperanto speakers argue for being a ‘kind of’ nation, stressing out their speciality, the Esperanto community of practice keeps important characters of genuine internationality, general openness towards any non-discriminatory ideology, and, above all, non-ethnicity. Consequently, anybody is welcome to join this worldwide community, regardless of ethnicity, nationality, religion, sexual orientation and other sociological variables, which is why it should not be treated as a *Gemeinschaft*, i.e., a speech community *stricto sensu*, but a community of practice. For this reason, we argue that, in terms of lingua franca use, Esperanto is much more inclusive than English, as the illustration of the role of their respective ‘native speakers’ have shown. In this respect, Esperanto should be given preference as a lingua franca for the norms, and standard, the lack of hybridity and native speakers will result into social inclusion, as we will show in the next sections.

2.3. *The Paradoxes of English and Esperanto as Lingua Francas: Language Prestige and Social Inclusion*

If we look at English and Esperanto as lingua francas in comparison to each other, we find opposite and somehow complementary paths in their respective language ideologies. In the case of English, there is a tension between the territories where English clearly belongs, starting from England, and its further use in the rest of the world, because of its global spread, which ultimately challenges the status of English native speakers up to the point of putting in question the existence of an ethnic-neutral variety (the so-called ELF) in terms of feasibility. In the case of Esperanto, its contemporary sociolinguistic reality, which shows a firm vitality but limited in numbers, is shifting its language representation from an original ethnic-neutral language by definition to the emic representation of Esperantists as a kind of minority, as if speakers form a ‘pseudo-nation’ or ‘quasi-people’; however, such claim seems to lack objective validity, as we have seen in Section 2.2 (see also discussion in Gobbo, 2017). Moreover, as argued in Section 2.1, on ELF is a variant of English that does not possess any explicit stated norms and standards. This means that ELF is a flexible variant of English, ever-changing and accommodating all the times to a new linguistic environment display a set of linguistic hybridity. Most importantly, whenever native speakers of English participate in ELF communicative events, their *de facto* authority impede social inclusion, if not leading to social exclusion.

Gobbo (2015) applies Calvet’s (2006) hierarchy of language prestige in the context of transnational communication, in other terms all the contexts where participants in the communication are non-native, i.e., there is no speaker who can claim ownership or special author-

ity on the language in use. Such use of the linguistic medium as a transient lingua franca, i.e., following the non-essentialist views already presented in the previous section, may be applied in principle to any language: international, super-national, national or sub-national. An example of the latter case is the situation where two migrants in Catalonia choose to use their Catalan learning varieties (interlanguages, starting from Selinker, 1972) instead of Spanish; their language choice signals their will to be included in the Catalanian society, regardless of their proficiency. Interestingly, Caligaris (2016) shows that Esperanto may play a similar role in the eyes of some of its speakers. In other words, analogously to many minoritized languages, in general Esperanto has a very high prestige among its speakers (emic perspective) and a very low prestige outside (etic perspective), often being contested because of its ‘artificial’ origin. This is reflected in its peculiar position in its digital presence: Unlike most other lesser-used languages, which suffer the digital language divide (Soria, 2016), Esperanto is relatively in a good position. For instance, its Wikipedia is relatively good, both in quantity and in quality, Facebook users may enjoy the interface in the language, and many Esperanto e-books may be purchased via major sellers. If we apply the Digital Vitality Language Scale by Ceberio Berger, Gurrutxaga Hernaiz, Soria, Russo, and Quochi (2018), Esperanto positions itself at least as developing, with some domains definitely vital. A detailed application of such scale to Esperanto would require another article and therefore it is left as a further direction of research. For the purposes of this article, it suffices to note that the position of Esperanto is relatively strong for a lesser-used language, and such positioning eventually reinforces the opportunities in learning the language through digital technologies, eventually fostering mobility.

3. Linguistic Unease and Social Inclusion

The survey on linguistic justice by Alcalde (2018) shows that Esperanto forces us to think again on an effective modelling for linguistic justice that takes into account both mobility (in every form: potential, i.e., motility, and actual; traditional and onlife), and social inclusion. Iannàccaro et al. (2018) stress the importance of an analytic description of the repertoire of speakers following certain parameters, in order to assess the power rela-

tions between groups in a given society reflected in their language choice, which lead to the introduction of the notion sociolinguistic justice in the ongoing discussion in the literature of linguistic justice. For this purpose, the individuation of linguistic unease is crucial in assessing sociolinguistic justice, which functions as a predictive indicator of the degree of inclusion in a given social context. A word apart should be devoted to the notion of *Wunschsprache*, literally ‘language of desire,’ indicating that language that does not belong to the members of the given speech community, but nonetheless has high social prestige being the point of reference of an idealized society taken as a model to follow. In general, *Wunschsprachen* are either international or super-national languages such as English or Standard German.

Most discourse around linguas francas in general and English in particular underlines the role played by the *Wunschsprache*, to the detriment of the role played by other languages in use, and in particular by the high variety of the in-group code. In many contexts across Europe such a standardized code was (re)defined during the second half of the past century. Some examples are: *neostandard* for Italian, *Algemeen Beschaafd Nederlands* for Dutch, *Hochdeutsch* for German and so on. On the level of national inclusion, the mastery of standardized codes guarantees an adequate social inclusion, drastically reducing linguistic unease in most relevant situations of societal life. An exception is the situation in German-speaking Switzerland, where the main in-group code is not the high variety but Swiss German. Table 1 shows the role played by codes, i.e., varieties of languages, in respect to social inclusion, which is valid in most European contexts.

In a given society, codes that foster social inclusion are labeled in-group. The high variety corresponds in many contexts with the standardized form, which is used in most formal situations, such as filing a request to a public officer, or asking a question to a teacher in a public school. Failing to master the high variety may lead to difficult situations, but paradoxically it is the mastering of the low variety that guarantees the support of the social network in informal situations. The low variety could be a dialect of the national language or a completely different language, e.g., a non-contested regional and minority language. Feeling uncomfortable with the low varieties hinders social inclusion, as the speaker does not ‘belong

Table 1. The scale of linguistic unease and social inclusion in European contexts.

Level	Position in social inclusion	Relevant languages in the repertoire
1	strong social inclusion, leading position	all in-group codes + <i>Wunschsprache</i>
0	adequate social inclusion	all in-group codes
-1	unease in formal situations	high variety of in-group codes
-2	unease in in-group situations	low variety of in-group codes
-3	out-grouped, respected	<i>Wunschsprache</i> (in-group codes)
-4	out-grouped, severe	other codes (no in-group, no <i>Wunschsprache</i>)

Source: Original elaboration of Gobbo and Alcalde (2016).

to us'; this may also happen in the case of compatriots moving in a different region of the same country, as their low variety differs from the one used by the locals.

Wunschsprachen may or may not foster social inclusion: in the first case (strong social inclusion; level: 1), they are like the cherry on the cake, strengthening an already unproblematic position guaranteed by the mastering of the in-group codes; in the second case (respected out-grouping; level: -3), such puts its speaker into a distinct bubble, perhaps a luxury one, but still a bubble, where no consistent contact exists with the hosting society except for very practical needs. The global expansion of English makes it a *Wunschsprache* in many societies in the world, as it is often associated with prestige and power; the point is that the *Wunschsprache* should be recognized as such not only by the speaker but by the hosting society as well. For this reason, Esperanto is a peculiar case study: in fact, it plays the role of the *Wunschsprache* for most of its speakers, who associate positive values to the language—for instance, being 'easy' to learn, 'logical,' and so on. However, most people in most societies across the world not only do not master it but they may even know nothing about it at all, so it is rubricated as an 'other' code, i.e., a language that does not foster in-grouping nor give any apart prestige in using it.

In spite of not belonging to any hosting society in particular, Esperanto may increase the motility, i.e., the inclination to move in that hosting society, especially while planning or setting the first steps there. In fact, the strong level of language loyalty among Esperanto speakers and their language ideology in practice gives the people in mobility a privileged access to these nationals who speak Esperanto who would be willing to be intercultural mediators with the newcomer. The prototypical Esperanto speaker in mobility will check the existence of language fellows living in the target destination as a way to reinforce its Esperanto network abroad as well as having a local ready to act as intercultural mediator with the hosting society. Anecdotal evidence made via a semi-structured interview shows that, for example, an Italian Esperanto young lady finding a job in Bratislava will most probably have the support of the local Slovak Esperanto community and therefore her motility to accept such a job position will increase a lot thanks to the presence of a relatively relevant community of Esperanto speakers there. In other words, Esperanto may play the role of reducing linguistic unease, i.e., reducing the inadequacy of the speaker in mastering the linguistic needs, especially of the high variety code.

The presence of teachers in general and language teachers in particular in the Esperanto community seem to be relevant, even if there are no longitudinal studies on that so far (for the early period see Garvía, 2015; for a recent fieldwork see Caligaris, 2016). A hypothesis may be that Esperanto becomes the language of instruction of the high variety of the newcomer in the hosting society, so to reduce linguistic unease to an acceptable

level (level: -1), especially if the target language is not so strong to have material for second-language learning ready off the shelf. More empirical research is needed to confirm or confute such a hypothesis.

We argue that in terms of fostering social inclusion English and Esperanto as *linguas francas* are very different. The limit of the literature advocating for ELF as the main 'solution' to multilingual contexts consider only the positive case where ELF is part of a repertoire, which includes the codes necessary for social inclusion in the hosting society (level: 1) while they do not consider the respected but out-grouping situation when such codes are absent (level: -2). Of course, the prestige of English in many societies at least guarantees being respected; the total ignorance of any language which is somehow relevant in the hosting society brings the unavoidable consequence of being severely cut out from the hosting society (level: -4). This latter situation should be avoided at any cost. Empirical evidence shows that because of its regularity a productive level of Esperanto can be acquired in a relatively short time, therefore it seems to be a good investment in increasing motility to all the parts of the world where there is a presence of Esperanto speakers.

4. Conclusion

Languages play an important role in analyzing societies in general and their respective modalities of social inclusion, in particular in reducing linguistic unease. In this article, we have given our contribution of their role in social inclusion. In particular, a relevant part of the literature focuses on the role played by *linguas francas* in general and by ELF in particular. However, such emphasis can lead to the risk of losing sight, as the societal linguistic repertoire of a given society plays a role in social inclusion, and that is not only considering the English language. In particular, the instable character of ELF, due to its hybridity and lack of normative standardization, as illustrated above, puts it as a valid solution to be used only for specific domains that generally pertain the high strata of the society, such as academia and international business.

We argue that, even if it is lesser-used, Esperanto has the intrinsic characteristics of being more apt for the role of *lingua franca*, it having a solid established norm that at the same time permits a good level of freedom in the lexical choices and general use. Moreover, in the case of Esperanto, there is no special group that may claim special authority on such normative standards (even not family users), unlike the case of English, where the role of native speakers should not be underestimated. Therefore, without considerations of power imbalance, under the perspective of fairness, Esperanto is more suitable over English in playing the role of *lingua franca*. Of course, the situation could change if Esperanto would be in use in considerable numbers in specific areas of the world, acquiring a territory, such as the EU. However, this is matter of speculation. In addition to that, we have pre-

sented a model that helps tackling situations of complex linguistic diversity that may be found across Europe, suggesting directions in designing adequate language policies fostering social inclusion as a whole.

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge the contribution of the anonymous reviewers for their many comments and suggestions.

Conflict of Interests

The authors declare no conflict of interests.

References

- 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). Cham: Springer.
- Astori, D. (2016). Definire una minoranza sociolinguistica: Dalle lingue segnate a quelle pianificate [How to define a sociolinguistic minority: From sign languages to planned languages]. In G. Agresti & J. G. Turi (Eds.), *Atti del primo congresso mondiale dei diritti linguistici* [Proceedings of the first world congress on language rights] (pp. 195–222). Rome: Aracne.
- Bonfiglio, T. P. (2010). *Mother tongues and nations: The invention of the native speaker*. New York, NY: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Bonfiglio, T. P. (2013). Inventing the native speaker. *Critical Multilingualism Studies*, 1(2), 29–58.
- Caligaris, I. (2016). *Una lingua per tutti, una lingua di nessun Paese: Una ricerca sul campo sulle identità esperantiste* [One language for all, one language belonging to no country: A fieldwork on Esperantists' identities]. Roma: Aracne.
- Calvet, L. J. (2006). *Towards an ecology of world languages*. London: Polity.
- Ceberio Berger, K., Gurrutxaga Hernaiz, A., Soria, C., Russo, I., & Quochi, V. (2018). How to use the digital language vitality scale (DLDP Project Report). *The Digital Language Diversity Project*. Retrieved from http://www.dldp.eu/sites/default/files/documents/DLDP_Digital-Language-Vitality-Scale.pdf
- Corsetti, R. (1996). A mother tongue spoken mainly by fathers. *Language Problems & Language Planning*, 20(3), 263–282.
- Crystal, D. (2004). *The language revolution*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Crystal, D. (2008). *Txting. The gr8 deb8*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Directorate-General for Communication. (2012). *Special Eurobarometer 286, Europeans and their languages*. Brussels: European Commission. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/commfrontoffice/publicopinion/archives/ebs/ebs_386_en.pdf
- Fiedler, S. (2006). Standardization and self-regulation in an international speech community: The case of Esperanto. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 177, 67–90.
- Fiedler, S. (2012). The Esperanto denaskulo: The status of the native speaker of Esperanto within and beyond the planned language community. *Language Problems & Language Planning*, 36(1), 69–84.
- Floridi, L. (2015). The onlife manifesto. In L. Floridi (Ed.), *The onlife manifesto: Being human in a hyperconnected era* (pp. 7–13). Cham: Springer.
- Garvía, R. (2015). *Esperanto and its rivals: The struggle for an international language*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Gledhill, C. (2000). *The grammar of Esperanto: A corpus-based description* (2nd ed.). Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Gobbo, F. (2015). Transnational communication in a 'globalized' world: In search of balanced multilingualism. *Język, Komunikacja, Informacja*, 10, 196–208.
- Gobbo, F. (2017). Beyond the nation-state? The ideology of the Esperanto movement between neutralism and multilingualism. *Social Inclusion*, 5(4), 38–47.
- Gobbo, F., & Alcalde, J. (2016). *Towards a tool to analyze linguistic justice: Essential interdisciplinary parameters*. Paper presented at the conference JDL2016/GDL2016, Teramo, Italy.
- Grin, F., Conceição, M. C., Kraus, P. A., Marácz, L. K., Ozoliņa, Ž., Pokorn, N., & Pym, A. (Eds.). (2018). *The MIME Vademecum: Mobility and inclusion in multilingual Europe*. Grandson: Artgraphic Cavin SA.
- Houtkamp, C. (2018). The relevance of motility in language shift research. *Language Problems & Language Planning*, 42(1), 1–15.
- Houtkamp, C. (2020). *Multilingual moves: Language and motility of migrant communities in Europe* (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
- Hülmbauer, C. (2009). We don't take the right way: We just take the way that we think you will understand: The shifting relationship between correctness and effectiveness in ELF. In A. Mauranen & E. Ranta (Eds.), *English as a lingua franca: Studies and findings* (pp. 323–347). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Hülmbauer, C., Böhringer, H., & Seidlhofer, B. (2008). Introducing English as a lingua franca (ELF): Precursor and partner in intercultural communication. *Synergies Europe*, 3, 25–36.
- 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* (pp. 363–391). Cham: Springer.
- Jaffe, A. (2015). Defining the new speaker: Theoretical perspectives and learner trajectories. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 231, 21–44.
- Jenkins, J. (2006). Points of view and blind spots: ELF

- and SLA. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 16(2), 137–162.
- Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a lingua franca in the international university: The politics of academic English language policy*. Oxford: Routledge.
- Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2011). Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching*, 44(3), 281–315.
- Kachru, B. (1992). *The other tongue*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Kraus, P. (2012). The politics of complex diversity: A European perspective. *Ethnicities*, 12(1), 3–25.
- Leigh, I. W., & O'Brien, C. A. (2019). *Deaf identities: Exploring new frontiers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lindstedt, J. (2009). Esperanto: An East European contact language? In C. Voß & A. Nagórko (Eds.), *Die Europäizität der Slawia oder dies Slawizität Europas. Ein Beitrag der kultur- und sprachrelativistischen Linguistik* [About the Europeanity of Slavia or the European Slavichood. A contribution linguistic and cultural relativity] (pp. 125–134). Munich: Otto Sagner.
- Lindstedt, J. (2010). Esperanto as a family language. In F. Dervin (Ed.), *Lingua francas: La véhicularité linguistique pour vivre, travailler et étudier* [Linguas francas: Vehicular languages to live, travel and study abroad] (pp. 69–80). Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Lussault, M. (2017). *Hyper-lieux: Les Nouvelles géographies de la mondialisation* [Hyper-places: The new maps of globalization]. Paris: Le Seuil.
- Marác, L. K. (2014). On norms and linguistic categories in linguistic diversity management. *Język, Komunikacja, Informacja*, 9, 9–26.
- Marác, L. K. (2018). Why should we combine different communication strategies? In F. Grin, M. C. Conceição, P. A. Kraus, L. K. Marác, Ž. Ozoliņa, N. Pokorn, & A. Pym (Eds.), *The MIME Vademecum: Mobility and inclusion in multilingual Europe* (pp. 102–103). Grandson: Artgraphic Cavin SA.
- Marcialis, N. (2011). Le fonti slave dell'esperanto [The influence of Slavic languages in Esperanto]. *Studi Slavistici*, 7, 327–341.
- Myhill, J. (2006). *Language, religion and national identity in Europe and the Middle East: A historical study*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- O'Rourke, B., Pujolar, J., & Ramallo, F. (2015). New speakers of minority languages: The challenging opportunity: Foreword. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 231, 1–20.
- Pennycook, A. (2017). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. London: Routledge.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2009). Orientations in ELF research: Form and function. In C. Mauranen & E. Ranta (Eds.), *English as a lingua franca: Studies and findings* (pp. 37–60). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Seidlhofer, B., Breiteneder, A., & Pitzl, M. L. (2006). English as a lingua franca in Europe: Challenges for applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 26, 3–34.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 10(3), 209–230.
- Snoddon, K., & De Meulder, M. (2020). Introduction: Ideologies in sign language vitality and revitalization. *Language & Communication*, 74, 154–163.
- Sorace, A. (2004). Native language attrition and developmental instability at the syntax-discourse interface: Data, interpretations and methods. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 7(2), 1–3.
- Soria, C. (2016). What is digital language diversity and why should we care? In J. Cru (Ed.), *Digital media and language revitalization* (pp. 13–28). Barcelona: Linguapax Review.
- Steger, M. B. (2003). *Globalization: A very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zamenhof, L. L. (1905). *Fundamento de Esperanto*. Paris: Hachette.

About the Authors



Federico Gobbo is Full Professor at University of Amsterdam. He is Vice-Chairing the EU funded project LITHME (Language in the Human-Machine Era). He has participated in various research projects and worked in various universities in Italy, the Netherlands and China. His research interests include sociolinguistics, interlinguistics, constructive linguistics and philosophy of information. The Esperanto phenomenon is one of his main research interests, and he has published research results about it since 1998.



László Marác has defended his PhD dissertation in General Linguistics at the University of Groningen in 1989. Since 1992, he is affiliated as a Senior Lecturer to the Department of European Studies of the University of Amsterdam. In 2015, László Marác has been awarded the title of Honorary Professor at the L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University in Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan. He has been Vice-Coordinator of the MIME-consortium that won the European FP7-tender in 2013 on the “Multilingual Challenge for the European Citizen.”

Social Inclusion (ISSN: 2183-2803)

Social Inclusion is a peer-reviewed open access journal which provides academics and policy-makers with a forum to discuss and promote a more socially inclusive society.

The journal encourages researchers to publish their results on topics concerning social and cultural cohesiveness, marginalized social groups, social stratification, minority-majority interaction, cultural diversity, national identity, and core-periphery relations, while making significant contributions to the understanding and enhancement of social inclusion worldwide.

www.cogitatiopress.com/socialinclusion