

European experiences of 'good' language, 'bad language', and (the) standard language ideology in multilingual communities, past and present

The conceptual frameworks that linguists have been using to discuss language standardization and standard languages in Europe have tended to work on a tacit assumption of monolingual speakers, albeit speakers often understood to be variously competent in a range of varieties (e.g. ranging from dialect to regional colloquial variety to standard). In such models, a standard language (often a national language) is viewed as an umbrella variety (German *Überdachungssprache*) under which other varieties sit, to which other varieties are oriented, and against which their particular features, or relative distance from the standard, are measured. Language that does not conform to the recognized monolingual standard may be stigmatized by lay speakers, e.g. as incorrect or 'impure'. Useful though such models are to experts and laypeople alike, they are simplifications, and have never captured the lived experience of a large proportion of Europe's speech communities, of those who live with two languages or more. This workshop will explore the language attitudes and behaviours – past and present – of those for whom the language of schooling and/or dominant national language is not simply a variety of their home language, but is another language altogether, whether as the speaker of heritage or minoritized indigenous languages, or as a result of colonization, or migration (in the UK context, often described as having “English as an Additional Language”; *EAL* used to refer to children with one or more home languages and who are learning much of their English in an educational setting; cf. Wardman 2012: 3).

Schooling, supported by appropriate authorities, is a key means of communicating standard language norms; mastery of the language rules bestows cultural capital that facilitates access to educational and career opportunities. At the same time, adherence to imposed norms and to a standard language ideology is also often underpinned by a sense of belonging and loyalty, e.g. of national or cultural-patriotic identity. For the monolingual, these two (may) mutually reinforce each other. For the speaker of two or more languages, the pressure to conform to a standard learnt in school may not be reinforced by such feelings of solidarity towards the language. Equally, a home language – which may be more powerfully linked to a personal identity – is often not under the immediate protective umbrella of the standard, nor subject to the pressures for minimal variation imposed by schooling or other formal institutions.

The workshop will address questions including the following:

- Do speakers whose home language is different to the national language or the language of schooling display different attitudes (and different behaviours) towards their respective languages? How do they differ?
- To what extent is the home language subject to the same controls that it would be in its own national context, e.g. do speakers of Russian in the UK have a sense of “good” or “correct” Russian, and is it the same as in Russia itself?
- Might a weaker standard language ideology for the home language go hand in hand with a weaker application of that ideology to the language of schooling / other language?
- Where the home language is learnt in supplementary schools, how important is the standard language ideology there?
- Who sets the standard for 'home' languages of whatever kind, and who decides who sets it?

- How important are standard language norms for learners of languages, e.g. for *learners* of Irish?
- What role do *teachers* and *testers* play in upholding norms and rules (e.g. Luxemburgish as a foreign / additional language)?
- To what extent do, e.g., migrant authors reflect on standard language ideology, –and how do they respond to it, e.g. through “non-standard” linguistic creativity?
- How much translanguaging takes place, and to what extent might it render irrelevant the construct of a hermetically sealed standard language?

The workshop also seeks to explore methods for addressing these research questions: sociolinguistic historical-sociolinguistic, ethnographic, discourse-analytic, historiographical and beyond. To what extent do existing methodologies enable us to address such questions, past and present? What new methodologies – or combinations of methods – might be needed to address these questions?