Handbook of Multilingualism and Multilingual Communication
HAL 5

W
DE
G

Handbooks of Applied Linguistics

Communication Competence
Language and Communication Problems
Practical Solutions

H A L

Editors
Karlfried Knapp and Gerd Antos

Volume 5

Handbook of Multilingualism and Multilingual Communication

Edited by
Peter Auer and Li Wei

Introduction to the handbook series
Linguistics for problem solving

Karlfried Knapp and Gerd Antos

1. Science and application at the turn of the millennium

The distinction between "pure" and "applied" sciences is an old one. According to Meinel (2000), it was introduced by the Swedish chemist Wallerius in 1751, as part of the dispute of that time between the scholastic disciplines and the then emerging epistemic sciences. However, although the concept of "Applied Science" gained currency rapidly since that time, it has remained problematic.

Until recently, the distinction between "pure" and "applied" mirrored the distinction between "theory and "practice". The latter ran all the way through Western history of science since its beginnings in antique times. At first, it was only philosophy that was regarded as a scholarly and, hence, theoretical discipline. Later it was followed by other leading disciplines, as e.g., the sciences. However, as academic disciplines, all of them remained theoretical. In fact, the process of achieving independence of theory was essential for the academic disciplines to become independent from political, religious or other contingencies and to establish themselves at universities and academies. This also implied a process of emancipation from practical concerns – an at times painful development which manifested (and occasionally still manifests) itself in the discrediting of and disdain for practice and practitioners. To some, already the very meaning of the notion "applied" carries a negative connotation, as is suggested by the contrast between the widely used synonym for "theoretical", i.e. "pure" (as used, e.g. in the distinction between "Pure" and "Applied Mathematics") and its natural antonym "impure". On a different level, a lower academic status sometimes is attributed to applied disciplines because of their alleged lack of originality – they are perceived as simply and one-directionally applying insights gained in basic research and watering them down by neglecting the limiting conditions under which these insights were achieved.

Today, however, the academic system is confronted with a new understanding of science. In politics, in society and, above all, in economy a new concept of science has gained acceptance which questions traditional views. In recent philosophy of science, this is labelled as "science under the pressure to succeed" – i.e. as science whose theoretical structure and criteria of evaluation are increasingly conditioned by the pressure of application (Carrier, Stöltzner, and Wette 2004):

> Whenever the public is interested in a particular subject, e.g. when a new disease develops that cannot be cured by conventional medication, the public requests science to provide new insights in this area as quickly as possible. In doing so, the public is less interested in whether these new insights fit seamlessly into an existing theoretical framework, but rather whether they make new methods of treatment and curing possible. (Institut für Wirtschafts- und Technikforschung 2004, our translation).

With most of the practical problems like these, sciences cannot rely on knowledge that is already available, simply because such knowledge does not yet exist. Very often, the problems at hand do not fit neatly into the theoretical framework of one particular "pure science", and there is competition among disciplines with respect to which one provides the best theoretical and methodological resources for potential solutions. And more often than not the problems can be tackled only by adopting an interdisciplinary approach.

As a result, the traditional "Cascade Model", where insights were applied top-down from basic research to practice, no longer works in many cases. Instead, a kind of "application oriented basic research" is needed, where disciplines – conditioned by the pressure of application – take up a certain still diffuse practical issue, define it as a problem against the background of their respective theoretical and methodological paradigms, study this problem and finally develop various application oriented suggestions for solutions. In this sense, applied science, on the one hand, has to be conceived of as a scientific strategy for problem solving – a strategy that starts from mundane practical problems and ultimately aims at solving them. On the other hand, despite the dominance of application that applied sciences are subjected to, as sciences they can do nothing but develop such solutions in a theoretically reflected and methodologically well founded manner. The latter, of course, may lead to the well known fact that even applied sciences often tend to concentrate on "application oriented basic research" only and thus appear to lose sight of the original practical problem. But despite such shifts in focus: Both the boundaries between disciplines and between pure and applied research are getting more and more blurred.

Today, after the turn of the millennium, it is obvious that sciences are requested to provide more and something different than just theory, basic research or pure knowledge. Rather, sciences are increasingly being regarded as partners in a more comprehensive social and economic context of problem solving and are evaluated against expectations to be practically relevant. This also implies that sciences are expected to be critical, reflecting their impact on society. This new "applied" type of science is confronted with the question: Which role can the sciences play in solving individual, interpersonal, social, intercultural, political or technical problems? This question is typical of a conception of science that was especially developed and propagated by the influential philosopher Sir Karl Popper – a conception that also this handbook series is based on.

2.   "Applied Linguistics": Concepts and controversies

The concept of "Applied Linguistics" is not as old as the notion of "Applied Science", but it has also been problematical in its relation to theoretical linguistics since its beginning. There seems to be a widespread consensus that the notion "Applied Linguistics" emerged in 1948 with the first issue of the journal *Language Learning* which used this compound in its subtitle *A Quarterly Journal of Applied Linguistics*. This history of its origin certainly explains why even today "Applied Linguistics" still tends to be predominantly associated with foreign language teaching and learning in the Anglophone literature in particular, as can bee seen e.g. from Johnson and Johnson (1998), whose *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Applied Linguistics* is explicitly subtitled *A Handbook for Language Teaching*. However, this theory of origin is historically wrong. As is pointed out by Back (1970), the concept of applying linguistics can be traced back to the early 19th century in Europe, and the very notion "Applied Linguistics" was used in the early 20th already.

2.1.   Theoretically Applied vs. Practically Applied Linguistics

As with the relation between "Pure" and "Applied" sciences pointed out above, also with "Applied Linguistics" the first question to be asked is what makes it different from "Pure" or "Theoretical Linguistics". It is not surprising, then, that the terminologist Back takes this difference as the point of departure for his discussion of what constitutes "Applied Linguistics". In the light of recent controversies about this concept it is no doubt useful to remind us of his terminological distinctions.

Back (1970) distinguishes between "Theoretical Linguistics" – which aims at achieving knowledge for its own sake, without considering any other value –, "Practice" – i.e. any kind of activity that serves to achieve any purpose in life in the widest sense, apart from the striving for knowledge for its own sake – and "Applied Linguistics", as a being based on "Theoretical Linguistics" on the one hand and as aiming at usability in "Practice" on the other. In addition, he makes a difference between "Theoretical Applied Linguistics" and "Practical Applied Linguistics", which is of particular interest here. The former is defined as the use of insights and methods of "Theoretical Linguistics" for gaining knowledge in another, non-linguistic discipline, such as ethnology, sociology, law or literary studies, the latter as the application of insights from linguistics in a practical field related to language, such as language teaching, translation, and the like. For Back, the contribution of applied linguistics is to be seen in the planning of practical action. Language teaching, for example, is practical action done by practitioners, and what applied linguistics can contribute to this is, e.g., to provide contrastive descriptions of the languages involved as a foundation for

teaching methods. These contrastive descriptions in turn have to be based on the descriptive methods developed in theoretical linguistics.

However, in the light of the recent epistemological developments outlined above, it may be useful to reinterpret Back's notion of "Theoretically Applied Linguistics". As he himself points out, dealing with practical problems can have repercussions on the development of the theoretical field. Often new approaches, new theoretical concepts and new methods are a prerequisite for dealing with a particular type of practical problems, which may lead to an – at least in the beginning – "application oriented basic research" in applied linguistics itself, which with some justification could also be labeled "theoretically applied", as many such problems require the transgression of disciplinary boundaries. It is not rare that a domain of "Theoretically Applied Linguistics" or "application oriented basic research" takes on a life of its own, and that also something which is labeled as "Applied Linguistics" might in fact be rather remote from the mundane practical problems that originally initiated the respective subject area. But as long as a relation to the original practical problem can be established, it may be justified to count a particular field or discussion as belonging to applied linguistics, even if only "theoretically applied".

2.2.   Applied linguistics as a response to structuralism and generativism

As mentioned before, in the Anglophone world in particular the view still appears to be widespread that the primary concerns of the subject area of applied linguistics should be restricted to second language acquisition and language instruction in the first place (see, e.g., Davies 1999 or Schmitt and Celce-Murcia 2002). However, in other parts of the world, and above all in Europe, there has been a development away from aspects of language learning to a wider focus on more general issues of language and communication.

This broadening of scope was in part a reaction to the narrowing down the focus in linguistics that resulted from self-imposed methodological constraints which, as Ehlich (1999) points out, began with Saussurean structuralism and culminated in generative linguistics. For almost three decades since the late 1950s, these developments made "language" in a comprehensive sense, as related to the everyday experience of its users, vanish in favour of an idealised and basically artificial entity. This lead in "Core" or theoretical linguistics to a neglect of almost all everyday problems with language and communication encountered by individuals and societies and made it necessary for those interested in socially accountable research into language and communication to draw on a wider range of disciplines, thus giving rise to a flourishing of interdisciplinary areas that have come to be referred to as hyphenated variants of linguistics, such as sociolinguistics, ethnolinguistics, psycholinguistics, conversation analysis, pragmatics, and so on (Davies and Elder 2004).

That these hyphenated variants of linguistics can be said to have originated from dealing with problems may lead to the impression that they fall completely into the scope of applied linguistics. This the more so as their original thematic focus is in line with a frequently quoted definition of applied linguistics as "the theoretical and empirical investigation of real world problems in which language is a central issue" (Brumfit 1997: 93). However, in the recent past much of the work done in these fields has itself been rather "theoretically applied" in the sense introduced above and ultimately even become mainstream in linguistics. Also, in view of the current epistemological developments that see all sciences under the pressure of application, one might even wonder if there is anything distinctive about applied linguistics at all.

Indeed it would be difficult if not impossible to delimit applied linguistics with respect to the practical problems studied and the disciplinary approaches used: Real-world problems with language (and to which, for greater clarity, should be added: "with communication") are unlimited in principle. Also, many problems of this kind are unique and require quite different approaches. Some might be tackled successfully by applying already available linguistic theories and methods. Others might require for their solution the development of new methods and even new theories. Following a frequently used distinction first proposed by Widdowson (1980), one might label these approaches as "Linguistics Applied" or "Applied Linguistics". In addition, language is a trans-disciplinary subject par excellence, with the result that problems do not come labelled and may require for their solution the cooperation of various disciplines.

2.3.   Conceptualisations and communities

The questions of what should be its reference discipline and which themes, areas of research and sub-disciplines it should deal with, have been discussed constantly and were also the subject of an intensive debate (e.g. Seidlhofer 2003). In the recent past, a number of edited volumes on applied linguistics have appeared which in their respective introductory chapters attempt at giving a definition of "Applied Linguistics". As can be seen from the existence of the Association Internationale de Linguistique Appliquée (AILA) and its numerous national affiliates, from the number of congresses held or books and journals published with the label "Applied Linguistics", applied linguistics appears to be a well-established and flourishing enterprise. Therefore, the collective need felt by authors and editors to introduce their publication with a definition of the subject area it is supposed to be about is astonishing at first sight. Quite obviously, what Ehlich (2006) has termed "the struggle for the object of inquiry" appears to be characteristic of linguistics – both of linguistics at large and applied linguistics. Its seems then, that the meaning and scope of "Applied Linguistics"

cannot be taken for granted, and this is why a wide variety of controversial conceptualisations exist.

For example, in addition to the dichotomy mentioned above with respect to whether approaches to applied linguistics should in their theoretical foundations and methods be autonomous from theoretical linguistics or not, and apart from other controversies, there are diverging views on whether applied linguistics is an independent academic discipline (e.g. Kaplan and Grabe 2000) or not (e.g. Davies and Elder 2004), whether its scope should be mainly restricted to language teaching related topics (e.g. Schmitt and Celce-Murcia 2002) or not (e.g. Knapp 2006), or whether applied linguistics is a field of interdisciplinary synthesis where theories with their own integrity develop in close interaction with language users and professionals (e.g. Rampton 1997/2003) or whether this view should be rejected, as a true interdisciplinary approach is ultimately impossible (e.g. Widdowson 2005).

In contrast to such controversies Candlin and Sarangi (2004) point out that applied linguistics should be defined in the first place by the actions of those who practically *do* applied linguistics:

> […] we see no especial purpose in reopening what has become a somewhat sterile debate on what applied linguistics is, or whether it is a distinctive and coherent discipline. […] we see applied linguistics as a many centered and interdisciplinary endeavour whose coherence is achieved in purposeful, mediated action by its practitioners. […]
> What we want to ask of applied linguistics is less what it is and more what it does, or rather what its practitioners do. (Candlin/Sarangi 2004:1–2)

Against this background, they see applied linguistics as less characterised by its thematic scope – which indeed is hard to delimit – but rather by the two aspects of "relevance" and "reflexivity". Relevance refers to the purpose applied linguistic activities have for the targeted audience and to the degree that these activities in their collaborative practices meet the background and needs of those addressed – which, as matter of comprehensibility, also includes taking their conceptual and language level into account. Reflexivity means the contextualisation of the intellectual principles and practices, which is at the core of what characterises a professional community, and which is achieved by asking leading questions like "What kinds of purposes underlie what is done?", "Who is involved in their determination?" "By whom, and in what ways, is their achievement appraised?", "Who owns the outcomes?"

We agree with these authors that applied linguistics in dealing with real world problems is determined by disciplinary givens – such as e.g. theories, methods or standards of linguistics or any other discipline – but that it is determined at least as much by the social and situational givens of the practices of life. These do not only include the concrete practical problems themselves but

also the theoretical and methodological standards of cooperating experts from other disciplines, as well as the conceptual and practical standards of the practitioners who are confronted with the practical problems in the first place. Thus, as Sarangi and van Leeuwen (2003) point out, applied linguists have to become part of the respective "community of practice".

If, however, applied linguists have to regard themselves as part of a community of practice, it is obvious that it is the entire community which determines what the respective subject matter is that the applied linguist deals with and how. In particular, it is the respective community of practice which determines which problems of the practitioners have to be considered. The consequence of this is that applied linguistics can be understood from very comprehensive to very specific, depending on what kind of problems are considered relevant by the respective community. Of course, following this participative understanding of applied linguistics also has consequences for the Handbooks of Applied Linguistics both with respect to the subjects covered and the way they are theoretically and practically treated.

3.   Applied linguistics for problem solving

Against this background, it seems reasonable not to define applied linguistics as an autonomous discipline or even only to delimit it by specifying a set of subjects it is supposed to study and typical disciplinary approaches it should use. Rather, in line with the collaborative and participatory perspective of the communities of practice applied linguists are involved in, this handbook series is based on the assumption that applied linguistics is a specific, problem-oriented way of "doing linguistics" related to the real-life world. In other words: applied linguistics is conceived of here as "linguistics for problem solving".

To outline what we think is distinctive about this area of inquiry: Entirely in line with Popper's conception of science, we take it that applied linguistics starts from the assumption of an imperfect world in the areas of language and communication. This means, firstly, that linguistic and communicative competence in individuals, like other forms of human knowledge, is fragmentary and defective – if it exists at all. To express it more pointedly: Human linguistic and communicative behaviour is not "perfect". And on a different level, this imperfection also applies to the use and status of language and communication in and among groups or societies.

Secondly, we take it that applied linguists are convinced that the imperfection both of individual linguistic and communicative behaviour and language based relations between groups and societies can be clarified, understood and to some extent resolved by their intervention, e.g. by means of education, training or consultancy.

Thirdly, we take it that applied linguistics proceeds by a specific mode of enquiry in that it mediates between the way language and communication is expertly studied in the linguistic disciplines and the way it is directly experienced in different domains of use. This implies that applied linguists are able to demonstrate that their findings – be they of a "Linguistics Applied" or "Applied Linguistics"-nature – are not just "application oriented basic research" but can be made relevant to the real-life world.

Fourthly, we take it that applied linguistics is socially accountable. To the extent that the imperfections initiating applied linguistic activity involve both social actors and social structures, we take it that applied linguistics has to be critical and reflexive with respect to the results of its suggestions and solutions.

These assumptions yield the following questions which at the same time define objectives for applied linguistics:

1. Which linguistic problems are typical of what areas of language competence and language use?
2. How can linguistics define and describe these problems?
3. How can linguistics suggest, develop, or achieve solutions of these problems?
4. Which solutions result in what improvements in speakers' linguistic and communicative abilities or in the use and status of languages in and between groups?
5. What are additional effects of the linguistic intervention?

4.   Objectives of this handbook series

These questions also determine the objectives of this book series. However, in view of the present boom in handbooks of linguistics and applied Linguistics, one should ask what is specific about this series of nine thematically different volumes.

To begin with, it is important to emphasise what it is not aiming at:

– The handbook series does not want to take a snapshot view or even a "hit list" of fashionable topics, theories, debates or fields of study.
– Nor does it aim at a comprehensive coverage of linguistics because some selectivity with regard to the subject areas is both inevitable in a book series of this kind and part of its specific profile.
   Instead, the book series will try
– to show that applied linguistics can offer a comprehensive, trustworthy and scientifically well-founded understanding of a wide range of problems,
– to show that applied linguistics can provide or develop instruments to for solving new, still unpredictable problems,

–   to show that applied linguistics is not confined to a restricted number of topics such as, e.g. foreign language learning, but that it successfully deals with a wide range of both everyday problems and areas of linguistics,
–   to provide a state-of-the-art description of applied linguistics against the background of the ability of this area of academic inquiry to provide descriptions, analyses, explanations and, if possible, solutions of everyday problems. On the one hand, this criterion is the link to trans-disciplinary co-operation. On the other, it is crucial in assessing to what extent linguistics can in fact be made relevant.

In short, it is by no means the intention of this series to duplicate the present state of knowledge about linguistics as represented in other publications with the supposed aim of providing a comprehensive survey. Rather, the intention is to present the knowledge available in applied linguistics today firstly from an explicitly problem solving perspective and secondly, in a non-technical, easily comprehensible way. Also it is intended with this publication to build bridges to neighbouring disciplines and to critically discuss which impact the solutions discussed do in fact have on practice. This is particularly necessary in areas like language teaching and learning – where for years there has been a tendency to fashionable solutions without sufficient consideration of their actual impact on the reality in schools.

5.   Criteria for the selection of topics

Based on the arguments outlined above, the handbook series has the following structure: Findings and applications of linguistics will be presented in concentric circles, as it were, starting out from the communication competence of the individual, proceeding via aspects of interpersonal and inter-group communication to technical communication and, ultimately, to the more general level of society. Thus, the topics of the nine volumes are as follows:

1. Handbook of Individual Communication Competence
2. Handbook of Interpersonal Communication
3. Handbook of Communication in Organisations and Professions
4. Handbook of Communication in the Public Sphere
5. Handbook of Multilingualism and Multilingual Communication
6. Handbook of Foreign Language Communication and Learning
7. Handbook of Intercultural Communication
8. Handbook of Technical Communication
9. Handbook of Language and Communication: Diversity and Change.

This thematic structure can be said to follow the sequence of experience with problems related to language and communication a human passes through in the

course of his or her personal biographical development. This is why the topic areas of applied linguistics are structured here in ever increasing concentric circles: in line with biographical development, the first circle starts with the communicative competence of the individual and also includes interpersonal communication as belonging to a person's private sphere. The second circle proceeds to the everyday environment and includes the professional and public sphere. The third circle extends to the experience of foreign languages and cultures, which at least in officially monolingual societies, is not made by everybody and if so, only later in life. Technical communication as the fourth circle is even more exclusive and restricted to a more special professional clientele. The final volume extends this process to focus on more general, supra-individual national and international issues.

For almost all of these topics, there already exist introductions, handbooks or other types of survey literature. However, what makes the present volumes unique is their explicit claim to focus on topics in language and communication as areas of everyday problems and their emphasis on pointing out the relevance of applied linguistics in dealing with them.

Bibliography

Back, Otto
   1970   „Was bedeutet und was bezeichnet der Begriff 'angewandte Sprachwissenschaft'?". *Die Sprache* 16: 21–53.

Brumfit, Christopher
   1997   How applied linguistics is the same as any other science. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7.1: 86–94.

Candlin, Chris N. and Srikant Sarangi
   2004   Making applied linguistics matter. *Journal of Applied Linguistics* 1.1: 1–8.

Carrier, Michael, Martin Stöltzner, and Jeanette Wette
   2004   *Theorienstruktur und Beurteilungsmaßstäbe unter den Bedingungen der Anwendungsdominanz.* Universität Bielefeld: Institut für Wissenschafts- und Technikforschung [http://www.uni-bielefeld.de/iwt/projekte/wissen/anwendungsdominanz.html, last time accessed 05. 01. 2007].

Davies, Alan
   1999   *Introduction to Applied Linguistics. From Practice to Theory.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Davies, Alan and Catherine Elder
   2004   General introduction – Applied linguistics: subject to discipline? In: Alan Davies and Catherine Elder (eds.) *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*, 1–16. Malden etc.: Blackwell.

Ehlich, Konrad
   1999   Vom Nutzen der „Funktionalen Pragmatik" für die angewandte Linguistik. In: Michael Becker-Mrotzek und Christine Doppler (Hrsg.) *Medium Sprache im Beruf. Eine Aufgabe für* die *Linguistik*, 23–36. Tübingen: Narr.

Ehlich, Konrad
　　2006　　Mehrsprachigkeit für Europa – öffentliches Schweigen, linguistische Distanzen. In: Sergio Cigada, Jean-Francois de Pietro, Daniel Elmiger und Markus Nussbaumer (Hrsg.) *Öffentliche Sprachdebatten – linguistische Positionen. Bulletin Suisse de Linguistique Appliquée/VALS-ASLA-Bulletin* 83/1: 11–28.

Grabe, William
　　2002　　Applied linguistics: an emerging discipline for the twenty-first century. In: Robert B. Kaplan (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics*, 3–12. Oxford: OUP.

Johnson, Keith and Helen Johnson (eds.)
　　1998　　*Encyclopedic Dictionary of Applied Linguistics. A Handbook for Language Teaching.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Kaplan, Robert B. and William Grabe
　　2000　　Applied linguistics and the Annual Review if Applied Linguistics. In: W. Grabe (ed.) *Applied Linguistics as an Emerging Discipline. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 20: 3–17.

Knapp, Karlfried
　　2006　　Vorwort. In: Karlfried Knapp, Gerd Antos, Michael Becker-Mrotzek, Arnulf Deppermann, Susanne Göpferich, Joachim Gabowski, Michael Klemm und Claudia Villiger (Hrsg.) *Angewandte Linguistik. Ein Lehrbuch.* 2. Auflage, XIX–XXIII. Tübingen: Francke – UTB.

Meinel, Christoph
　　(2000)　　Reine und angewandte Wissenschaft. In: *Das Magazin*. Hrsg. vom Wissenschaftszentrum Nordrhein-Westfalen 11/1: 10–11.

Rampton, Ben
　　1997/2003　　Retuning in applied linguistics. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7 (1): 3–25, quoted from Seidlhofer (2003), 273–295.

Sarangi, Srikant and Theo van Leeuwen
　　2003　　Applied linguistics and communities of practice: gaining communality or losing disciplinary autonomy? In: Srikant Sarangi and Theo van Leeuwen (eds.) *Applied Linguistics and Communities of Practice*, 1–8. London: Continuum.

Schmitt, Norbert and Marianne Celce-Murcia
　　2002　　An overview of applied linguistics. In: N. Schmitt (ed.) *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics.* London: Arnold.

Seidlhofer, Barbara (ed.)
　　2003　　*Controversies in Applied Linguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Widdowson, Henry
　　[1980] 1984　　Model and fictions. In: Henry Widdowson (1984) *Explorations in Applied Linguistics 2*, 21–27. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Widdowson, Henry
　　2005　　Applied linguistics, interdisciplinarity, and disparate realities. In: Paul Bruthiaux, Dwight Atkinson, William G. Egginton, William Grabe, and Vaidehi Ramanathan (eds.) *Directions in Applied Linguistics. Essays in Honor of Robert B. Kaplan*, 12–25. Clevendon etc: Multilingual Matters.

Preface

Peter Auer would like to thank Hanna Beier and Elin Arbin, who did a great job in helping to copy-edit and proof-read the manuscripts. Li Wei is grateful to Zhu Hua who read and commented on some of the chapters and helped with the proofreading. He did his part of the editing work while at Newcastle University. He would like to acknowledge the support his personal assistant Sam Taylor gave him.

<div style="text-align: right">

Peter Auer, Freiburg
Li Wei, London

</div>

Contents

III. Acting multilingual

IV. Living in a multilingual society

Introduction: Multilingualism as a problem? Monolingualism as a problem?

Peter Auer/Li Wei

Applied Linguistics is often conceived as that part of linguistics which deals with practical problems of everyday life concerning language or communication. It deals with issues in language and verbal interaction that arise not out of an academic interest, but out of the needs of language users. Language impairment, reading and writing disabilities, lack of competence in higher stylistic registers which is required in the upper strata of society, inadequate rhetorical skills, misunderstandings in intercultural communication, the struggles of learning a foreign language, communication in high-stress situations or under difficult conditions – there is a long list of potential problems in language and communication. But why should multilingualism be a problem? We estimate that most of the human language users in the world speak more than one language, i.e. they are at least bilingual. In quantitative terms, then, monolingualism may be the exception and multilingualism the norm. Would it not make more sense to look at monolingualism as a problem that is real and consequential, but which can be "cured"? Isn't the very presupposition of a handbook of applied linguistics on multilingualism prejudiced by monolingual thinking in a world which is de facto multilingual? Aren't we turning something into a problem which is the most natural thing in the world? And isn't the only reason for *not* editing a handbook on monolingualism linguists' remarkable lack of interest in the most natural thing in the world?

Indeed, it is a reasonable assumption that the marginal role research on multilingualism has played within linguistics until some decades ago is a result of the monolingual bias of (particularly) European thinking about language which came into being during a phase of European history in which the nation states defined themselves not in the least by the one (standard) language which was chosen to be the symbolic expression of their unity. By and large, the study of linguistics was equal to analysing single languages (even though these were compared, classified, and typified). The fact that languages influence each other through language contact ("borrowing") was acknowledged of course from the very start of linguistics, but this contact was not seen in the context of multilingualism, and it was taken to be a secondary phenomenon which presupposed the existence and stability of the language systems in contact. The European (standard) languages were seen to 'naturally' belong to and justify the existence of the European nations in a one-to-one relationship, such that the establishment of a new nation state almost inevitably entailed the 'invention' of a new stan-

dard language. Being part of a nation was equated with being a native speaker of 'its' language. Seen from this perspective, multilingualism deviated from the norm.

Given the intrinsic link between linguistics as a discipline and the nation states, it is, then, not surprising that by and large, there are no multilingual grammars. (There are some exceptions though; for instance, Turkish language books and practical grammars for second language learners written before 1924 sometimes included a grammar of Osmanic and a grammar of Arabic and/or Persian. This reflects the fact that before the Turkish language reform (itself based on the European nation state ideology), educated Turkish was in some ways amalgamated from these three languages, of which the elites had a good knowledge.) The languages described and analysed were regarded as self-contained systems. Multilingualism was considered to be the consequence of some kind of disturbance in the 'language order', such as migration or conquest, which brought language systems into some kind of unexpected and 'unnatural' contact with one another, often leading to structural simplification (which, in the language ideology of the 19th century, usually implied degeneration). Even today, the ease with which the à la mode parlance of hybridity, borrowed from so-called cultural studies, has been taken on in sociolinguistic and multilingualism research, particularly on second and third generation bilinguals and multilinguals with an immigration background, shows that the idea of multilingualism as a derivative fact is still lingering on: what falls between the codified grammars of 'the languages' is fragile, unstable and can only be understood with reference to these languages. Indeed, there is some truth to this conviction in the present language situation in Europe: the large standard languages have been codified over many centuries, their norms are enforced by effective institutions, particularly the school system, and their stability is guaranteed by the fact that they are backed up by a large corpus of written documents which are easily accessible to everybody since the respective societies are literate to a very high degree.

But this does not mean that the European nation states such as the United Kingdom or France were completely monolingual from the very start, or have ever been, for that matter. It took hundreds of years for them to marginalise languages other than 'English' or 'French' in their territories (such as the Celtic languages or Basque), let alone to homogenise their standard varieties at the cost of the structurally related regional languages spoken in the area. However, they succeeded to a remarkable degree, such that only small groups of minority-language speakers remained 50 years ago. Plurilingual states such as the Austrian (Habsburg) Empire did not survive (with the exception of Switzerland with its polyglossic ideology). Immigrant groups (such as the Hugenots in many Protestant countries, or the Poles in industrialising Germany) quickly adapted (or were forced to adapt) to the monolingual majority's language norms. Elite

code-switching, which had been widespread until the 18th and in some places until the 19th century, with Latin and French as the two most important languages used in addition to the local vernacular, disappeared in favour of monolingual speech in the (now standardised, and therefore 'tamed') vernacular. At this point, a different view on second language acquisition took over: it was now seen as a means to communicate with foreigners, not with people of one's own (bilingual) community.

Against this background of the rise and dominance of monolingual national standard ideologies, it can be argued that what we perceive as the problems surrounding multilingualism today are to a large degree a consequence of the monolingualism demanded, fostered and cherished by the nation states in Europe and their knock-offs around the world. The idea (which can still be found in the public debates about multilingualism today, and had respectable supporters within linguistics even 50 years ago) that multilingualism is detrimental to a person's cognitive and emotional development can be traced back to this ideology, as can the insistence on 'pure' language and 'pure', 'non-mixed' speech: it goes back to the purism debate which accompanied the emergence of the European standard languages, above all in the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries, and finds its offspring in present-day debates about the proper use of English in non-English speaking countries. Nobody scolded Martin Luther and his fellow humanist intellectuals for mixing German and Latin in their dinner table conversations, and nobody finds fault with the elite in Kenya who mix Swahili and English in their everyday speech. For both elites, mixing is prestigious and a matter of course, because the idea of a pure language as a value in itself is neither part of 16th century European culture, nor is it part of the language ideology in most of Africa. However, German fashion designers today are criticised by language purists for speaking or writing German interspersed with English words, Danish youngsters are criticised for inserting *shit* into their Danish, and German-Turkish immigrant adolescents are criticised for mixing Turkish and German. In all these cases, language purism is nothing but a symbolic battle field for social conflicts; but the fact that it is a powerful weapon, that it makes sense as an argument at all in public debate, shows that the normative pattern against which language is discussed continues to be that of 'pure', monolingual language.

If, then, this handbook is concerned with problems that arise through and surrounding multilingualism, it should be clear that these problems are not 'natural' problems which are inherent to multilingualism itself: rather, they arise out of a certain context in which this multilingualism is *seen* as a problem or, rather, creates problems. We address these problems in the four sections of this volume which represent four perspectives on multilingualism: multilingual language acquisition (*Becoming Multilingual*), multilingual language maintenance (*Staying Multilingual*), multilingual interaction (*Acting Multilingual*) and, finally, the

often problematic relationship between a multi- or monolingual society and a mono- or multilingual individual (*Living in a Multilingual Society*). We will briefly comment on these sections and indicate what kind of issues and problems are discussed in each of them.

Becoming multilingual

Although it is possible at a later stage in life to add another language to one's repertoire, and thus change from a monolingual to a bilingual or from a bi- to a trilingual speaker, for instance as a consequence of migration, many people are bilingual or multilingual already from birth. In genuinely multilingual societies, this is a matter of course, but in a more or less monolingual society (take, as an example, the U.S.A.), the value and importance attached to multilingual upbringing is a debated issue and depends on many factors. It is fair to say that a large part of the attention research on multilingualism has received in public is due to the fact that for more and more people living in monolingual societies, it is a pressing issue whether and how their children should be brought up multilingually. Although many multilingual parents want to maintain their children's knowledge in the 'other' language (i.e. in addition to the dominant, ambient language in the society) for reasons of identity (it may be their own mother tongue) and for practical reasons (ability to talk to the people 'back home') and professional (better job opportunities), they also fear that learning two languages may put extra stress on their child and might delay or even do irrevocable damage to his or her development and scholastic achievement. This is particularly the case when the acquisition of the two languages takes place simultaneously, and not sequentially. Ch. 1 therefore discusses questions of early multilingual language acquisition from a psycholinguistic point of view: does it make a difference whether the child is exposed to two languages at the same time or to one after the other? Under which circumstances will the first (minority) language be lost, or its acquisition process inhibited? Is there, in general, a difference between monolingual and bilingual acquisition of the same language? Ch. 2 takes up the same issue of bringing up a child multilingually from a more interactional perspective: How should the parents behave in order to provide the optimal environment for both languages to be acquired? Should they themselves code-mix when their child does not consistently use one language with them, although they try to follow the "one person – one language" rule? Becoming multilingual involves more than the acquisition of linguistic forms, but also the socialisation to the rules and expectations that accompany the use of those languages. Ch. 3 looks at multilingual acquisition from a language socialisation perspective and addresses questions such as: How do community structures and cultural values impact the process of multilingual acquisi-

tion? How are language ideologies developed through linguistic practices in families and communities? And how are identities shaped and reshaped by the language socialisation process? Whereas the first three chapters in this part deal with early multilingual acquisition, Chs. 4 and 5 examine multilingual acquisition in schools and in later life. Instead of focussing on the linguistic processes of second or third language acquisition, Ch. 4 seeks to answer questions such as: How do adult multilinguals feel about their languages? How do adult multilinguals perceive themselves? In what ways do adult multilinguals use emotional speech and react to emotional expressions? Ch. 5 discusses a variety of bilingual education programmes, and asks crucial questions such as: What are the key components of bilingual education? And what are the criteria for the effectiveness of bilingual education?

Staying multilingual

Becoming multilingual in early childhood is one issue – staying multilingual later in life is another. In monolingual social contexts, children who have grown up in a multilingual family often go through a critical phase when they start school. While the second (non-ambient) language is accepted and useful, perhaps even preferred in the family context, the schools are usually dominated by just one language, which is that of the majority – at least in the institutional interactions taking place, for instance in the classroom with the teacher. Certain 'foreign' languages are accepted in the curriculum, and a high amount of time and energy is spent on teaching them to monolingual children (predominantly English), but other languages have no prestige and do not play a role in the sociolinguistic 'market' of the monolingual school. As it happens, the languages of immigrant communities usually belong to the latter group. (And even though some of them may figure among the fairly prestigious languages, such as Italian, the variety of the language spoken in the child's family (the home language) may not be a standard variant, and therefore not valued by the school.) It is, however, not only the school as an institution and its monolingual habitus that puts considerable pressure on the child to shift from early childhood multilingualism (or minority language monolingualism) to majority language monolingualism; the peer group can have the same effect. The more the child is integrated into a peer network in which the majority language is dominant, the more s/he will adapt to this language in everyday language use. On the other hand, multilingual peer groups can play an important role in counteracting the monolingual pressure of the school and in maintaining some version of the minority language, at least in its oral form.

The crucial role of the school in maintaining the weaker language(s) of a multilingual person in a monolingual society is of course generally acknowl-

edged. Together with language maintenance in the family, it is the school which guarantees intergenerational transmission. While the 'old' minorities in Europe today by and large enjoy multilingual (or minority language) schooling and have access to a good educational infrastructure which may be used or not (cf. the situation of Welsh, Irish, Sorbian or Bretonic), the situation of the immigrant languages and their speakers is different. Part II of the handbook deals with school-related problems particularly with regards to these children. The two introductory chapters (6 and 7) look at multilingual children with an immigrant background in monolingual schools from two different angles. Ch. 6 focuses on the situation in Scandinavia but also includes the United States of America; Ch. 7 focuses on the situation in Germany (North Rhine-Westphalia) but includes an outlook to Australia (Victoria State). Both chapters give an overview of existing programmes for immigrant children and how minority languages are treated in monolingual schools. The options range from complete neglect ('sink or swim' submersion) to reception classes which help pupils from a minority language background to acquire sufficient knowledge in the majority language in order to follow a monolingual class in the language, to additional schooling in the minority language, to bilingual programmes for first graders and to monolingual schooling for children from a minority background in the minority language, at least in the first years. The crucial question here is whether schooling in the minority (mother) language only will enable the children to transfer the literacy skills acquired during this period to the majority language in which they are needed to be successful in the monolingual school system in the long run, and whether schooling in the majority language only will lead to 'semilingualism' in the minority language, which in turn will also negatively influence L2 skills (as predicted, among others, by J. Cummins). The counter-position – more popular in some Western discussions about immigrant multilingualism at the moment – claims that minority language teaching leads to the segregation of minority language speakers from the majority school and ultimately to their scholastic failure.

It is often observed that many multilinguals can speak the various languages in their linguistic repertoire but cannot read or write in them. Bi- and multiliteracy has been an issue of concern for many professionals. Ch. 8 deals with this issue. But instead of seeing it as a singular, primarily cognitive knowledge and skill set, the authors demonstrate how literacy practices are enmeshed within and influenced by social, cultural, political, and economic factors, and that literacy learning and use by multilingual speakers varies according to situation and entails complex social interactions. They argue that despite the global flows of people, goods and ideas across national borders in the 21st century, schools around the world still work towards academic monolingualism and national ideologies. Linguistic hierarchies are being created, with some languages having more power and prestige than others. Literacy is symbolic of the new hier-

archies, with some languages receiving more institutional and practical support than others as written languages. They point out that educators have the potential to transform values, as well as literacy practices, by giving room to multimodal and plurilingual literacy practices. The authors call for more research into the role of the media and other institutionalised resources in the development of multiliteracies.

Multilingual language acquisition can proceed as fast as monolingual acquisition in the two languages. However, it is also normal for the acquisition of one language to lag somewhat behind the other, and even for the acquisition of both languages to proceed somewhat more slowly than in monolinguals. Since parents and teachers of multilingual children often find it difficult to decide if a child's competence in one of the languages lags behind that of monolingual children in a way which is entirely normal, or whether there are indications of a pathological delay, this part of the handbook also includes chapters on language proficiency testing and language impairment. Ch. 9 looks at the (rare) cases of Special Language Impairment (SLI) in multilingual children and diagnostic options – a delicate issue, since for many of the relevant languages no testing materials are available. Although the chapter argues that SLI in multilingual children may be overlooked more often than in monolingual children, it also shows that SLI is not a *consequence* of multilingualism but entirely independent of it in its pathogenesis.

One of the critical issues in the study of multilingualism is measurement: How do we measure the extent of bilingualism and multilingualism in a country or a community? How do we measure the level of bilingualism and multilingualism in an individual? Ch. 10 deals with the measurement of individual multilingualism, focussing on three key components: linguistic proficiency, linguistic competence and developmental trajectories. As the authors point out, there is no single standard for the measure of individual bilingualism. Instead, a number of different disciplines have developed a whole range of measures that focus on very different aspects of multilingualism. Many of these have never been tested for their compatibility because they are based on rather different concepts. Where the compatibility of different measures has been tested empirically, the results are often difficult to interpret. The authors present a tentative solution to the problem with a cross-linguistic comparative measurement which is based on linguistic profiling, which in turn is based on Processability Theory. However, the authors point out that their proposal is unlikely to answer all the questions at this moment in time. Much more empirical research on a larger scale is needed. They raise a number of questions for a future research agenda.

Acting Multilingual

The third part of the handbook looks at adult multilinguals and how they use their two or more languages in everyday interaction. Chs. 11 and 12 deal with the most obvious manifestation of multilingualism, i.e. the use of more than one language within a conversation, within a speaker's contribution ('turn') or even within a syntactic unit ('sentence'). These forms of switching and mixing may have a bad reputation in some multilingual (and monolingual) communities, and may be looked upon as a 'debased' form of speaking, a sign of laziness, or simply a lack of competence. But it is obvious that this low prestige of mixing and switching is in itself a consequence of a monolingual ideology which pre-scribes 'pure' language use and sanctions 'hybrid' ways of speaking. There are many arguments against such a negative view, one of which is put forward in detail in Ch. 11, where it is shown that code-switching can be highly functional, and does not take place in a random fashion. In an overview of research in this field from the 1960s onwards, the chapter demonstrates how code-switching as a conversational strategy shows a high degree of structuring and can frame (contextualise) utterances in the same way in which monolinguals use prosody or gesture to contextualise what they say. The two or more languages of bi- or multilingual speakers provide an additional resource for meaning-construction in interaction which monolinguals do not have at their disposal. Using the ana-lytic framework provided by Conversation Analysis, the chapter illustrates how code-switching can be used not only to organise face-to-face interaction, but also to construct interpersonal relationships and social identities.

Ch. 12 investigates a more intricate but also more stable way of mixing two languages, i.e. "mixed codes". In this chapter, mixed codes refer to ways of speaking in which substantial amounts of lexical material from at least two lan-guages are combined on the level of the basic syntactic units ('sentences'). The chapter provides a typology of mixed codes which are found in many parts of the world and thereby at the same time sketches a large number of social situ-ations under which such mixing occurs.

While chapters 11 and 12 are more concerned with the structural orderliness of alternating between or combining two languages, Ch. 13 gives another reason why these phenomena occur: their identity-related function. Displaying and ascribing (social) identities (personae) to oneself and others is important for the members of modern and post-modern societies in which social roles are flex-ible and social categorisation is open to negotiation and re-negotiation. This process takes place in interaction, and language is a powerful resource for it. Ch. 13 shows that beyond simple and misleading equations of multilingual talk with ambivalent (hybrid) identities, the situated use of one language or the other can be used in complex and context-dependent ways in order to construe social identities in discourse. These constructions may be subject to negotiation and

must therefore be regarded as interactionally based, indexical (context-dependent) and contingent on the unfolding of the interaction.

Ch. 14 takes the issue of identity-construction one step further by looking into one particular case of code-switching which had not been studied extensively until recently: the use of a language by speakers who are not 'entitled' to use this language but who 'transgress' into another social group's linguistic 'territory'. This type of code-switching, often termed "crossing", has recently been noticed and studied, particularly with reference to the use of immigrant languages by adolescent majority speakers, but it can equally be found outside of immigration contexts, e.g. when Afro-American English features are used by white speakers. Closely related but not identical is the use of mock varieties of another language or variety. In both cases, identity is central: speakers play with other identities than their own, with such diverse purposes as accommodation to the group of 'owners' of that variety, or, on the contrary, antagonistic stance-taking towards them.

The last three chapters of this part of the handbook are devoted to more specific domains of multilingual practices. Chs. 15 and 16 look into professional contexts. In Ch. 15, the multilingual speakers belong to the social and economic elites, and their multilingualism is the result of the increasing international mobility of highly skilled labour. Managers, sport professionals, engineers, etc. are drawn to other countries because of their specific skills. They may stay on permanently or travel on to other countries, and they may use second languages (those of the receiving countries or *lingue franche*) in connection with their profession. Ch. 16 gives an insight into the opposite end of work migration: the influx of largely unskilled or semiskilled labour into middle and northern Europe (in this case, England) over the last 50 years, and the concomitant transformation of the workplace from a largely monolingual setting to a multilingual one. Both domains reflect important changes in Europe which have deeply affected and indeed shaken the monolingual identities of the European nation states. Many institutions, from hospitals to supermarkets, from soccer teams to universities, are confronted with new challenges since their employees and their clients increasingly come from different linguistic backgrounds. Their competence in the dominant language of the society may be far from perfect, but they may bring along linguistic resources which the labour market can make use of. Examples range from multilingual personnel in hospitals where the clients are sometimes not able to express themselves in the dominant (majority) language, to management meetings in large international companies in which language proficiency and professional competence become more and more intertwined.

Ch. 17 addresses questions of multilingualism and commerce. In some sense, globalisation offers increased opportunities for language contact and multilingualism. But the reality is very complex. As some of the other chapters in this volume show, many countries in Africa and Asia are in fact losing their

multilingualism in favour of global languages such as English. In the meantime, some languages, such as Japanese, Chinese and Spanish, have attracted significantly more learners because of the commercial opportunities they are seen to be able to offer. The chapter discusses the impact of a globalised economy on societal multilingualism. It examines the role of language in a multilingual business environment. The author seeks to address questions such as: How do people from different language backgrounds with varying levels of multilingual proficiencies cope with language-related problems when engaged in commercial activities? What are the costs and benefits of translation in international business transactions? How does the emergence of English as a world lingua franca impact the global market and multilingual individuals in the workplace?

Living in a Multilingual Society

While part three of the handbook is more centred on the individual multilingual speaker and his or her verbal behaviour, the fourth and final part moves on to societal questions and problems. It starts with an overview of the world's most important language constellations on the state, national and societal levels; Ch. 18 discusses diverse issues such as language legislation and language rights, linguistic ecology and language management. The author offers a typological framework of minority language situations based on the distinctions between unique versus non-unique, cohesive versus non-cohesive and adjoining and non-adjoining. The following two chapters (19 and 20) cover the two most important types of multilingual groups in the context of the (European) monolingual nation states, i.e. 'old' (autochthonous) and 'new' (immigrant) minorities. Both were discussed in previous chapters of the handbook as well, but in different contexts. From the societal point of view, matters of linguistic rights, language planning, standardisation and politics enter into the picture.

'Old' or 'autochthonous' regions are those which at one point had their own language(s) and were partly politically independent, but which later joined or were forced to join a nation state which had a different national standard variety. As a consequence, the autochthonous language of the area came under the control of an exoglossic standard which symbolised the power of that nation state. Since the knowledge and use of the majority language was a prerequisite for social and economic success in such an area, the speakers of the minority language had to become proficient in the majority language as well as in their own language; in many cases, strong social pressure against the minority language and its lack of prestige, certainly on the national level, has led to complete language shift, i.e. the disappearance of the minority language. A similar situation emerges when the minority language area is supported by the standard language of another nation state which is structurally related and which can optionally

With no book currently like this on the market, The Cambridge Handbook of Areal Linguistics will be welcomed by students and scholars working on the history of language families, documentation and classification, and will help readers to understand the key area of areal linguistics within a broader linguistic context.Â Finally, Part III focuses on typological profiles of the mainland South Asia area, Australia, Quechuan and Aymaran, Eskimo-Aleut, Iroquoian, the Kampa subgroup of Arawak, Omotic, Semitic, Dravidian, the Oceanic subgroup of Austronesian and the Awuyu-Ndumut family (in West Papua). Uniting the expertise of a stellar selection of scholars, this Handbook highlights linguistic typology as a major discipline within the field of linguistics. Handbooks of Applied Linguistics. Communication Competence Language and Communication Problems Practical Solutions. Editors. Karlfried Knapp and Gerd Antos Volume 1. Mouton de Gruyter Berlin New York. Handbook of Communication Competence. Edited by. Gert Rickheit and Hans Strohner. Mouton de Gruyter Berlin New York.Â