01

Introduction

01

Introduction

Klaudia Dombrowsky-Hahn & Sabine Littig

Language is at the heart of this issue of *The Mouth* and central to the triad *migration – language – integration*. All of the contributions to this issue focus on language and its intersection with migration and/or integration, and language also lies at the core of our own research. This introduction serves to define some concepts and ideas relevant to the nexus language and migration, on the one hand, and language and integration, on the other. We also describe how these concepts and ideas are interwoven in the contributions to this issue. Although the three parts of the triad are closely connected, they are discussed separately. We begin by introducing the concept of migration and its link with language, then moving on to elaborate on language and integration, before finally presenting the contributions to this issue.

1. Language and migration

In this section, the following aspects of the nexus language and migration are discussed: the redefinition of linguistic repertoires through migration and their dependence on language ideologies; the emergence of new cultural forms in the course or as a result of migration, and the importance of the indexical and the performative functions of language in the context of migration.

1.1 Redefined linguistic repertoires and language ideologies

Migration – or to use a more neutral and inclusive term – mobility is considered to be the most decisive factor influencing life in the 21st century in a world characterized by cultural superdiversity (Blackledge & Creese 2017). We have chosen to adopt a rather broad sense of the term migration, which we define as the "move[ment] within or across the boundary of an areal unit" (Boyle et al. 1998: 34), or "the movement of people […] in relation to the processes that generate that movement (e.g. colonization, globalization, and temporary or permanent labor […])" (Baquedano-López & Mangual Figueroa 2011: 537).[1] There are many possible migration types (i.e. chain migration, circular migration) and itineraries. For example, rural dwellers move from a village or a small town to a bigger town or a city (rural-urban migration). Alternatively, inhabitants from a country in the southern hemisphere move to another country on the same or another continent in the south (south-south migration), to a country in the northern hemisphere (south-north migration), or the other way round (north-south migration; cp. Tovares & Kamwangamalu (2017), Auer et al. (2013)).

Whatever type of migration and migration itinerary a person pursues, has pursued or intends on pursuing, the process of learning of a new language or language variety, new registers, styles, and sociolinguistic patterns, is almost inevitable. These different forms augment, restructure and redefine mobile people's linguistic repertoires, which, among all else, reflect their migration itineraries and can be read as migrants' biographies (Blommaert & Dong 2010: 370; Blommaert & Backus 2013; Tovares & Kamwangamalu 2017). This learning process may sometimes even start prior to an individual setting off (Juffermans & Tavares 2016, Diallo, this issue). Furthermore, members of transnational families who have not experienced important moves across areal boundaries themselves or comparatively less mobile people can still find themselves learning new languages and/or (mixed) linguistic practices, thereby expanding their linguistic resources as a result of family members, colleagues, classmates, friends and other peers who have migrated. This is also true of transnational mobile couples who learn each other's languages, as exemplified in Littig's contribution in which Modeste, a Cameroonian, understands Twi, a Ghanaian language spoken by his wife.

However, language learning[2], or, in a broader sense, language socialization, which includes the learner's development of social and cultural knowledge and sensibilities (Ochs & Schieffelin 2012: 1), for which language is an essential medium, does not take place in a neutral or unbiased manner. Language learning depends on language ideologies which can be defined as "the cultural system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests" (Irvine 1989: 255). In the context of mobility, and south-

[1] Or, in an even broader sense, as "movement from one place to another" (Deumert 2013: 57).

[2] We deliberately use *language learning* even for contexts where *language acquisition* is more common (e.g. *second language acquisition*) for "the broad range of tactics, technologies and mechanisms by means of which specific language resources become part of someone's repertoires" (Blommaert & Backus 2013: 14). We follow these authors' argumentation, strengthened by our own experience, that a learned language can be unlearned or forgotten, in contrast to acquisition which suggests a lasting result.

north migration in particular, conflict between different culturally and historically entrenched language ideologies is not uncommon. In the most extreme case, a mobile person whose principal, long-lasting language socialization values multilingualism and/or hybrid linguistic practices, tolerating or even acknowledging speech practices that deviate from those of the majority group, find themselves in a society governed by the *one nation one language* ideology. Following Piller (2015), the monolingual ideology corresponds to the conviction that the use of one single language by all citizens is a precondition for the country's inner cohesion. Closely intertwined with questions of power, the monolingual ideology prevailing in many societies in European countries is linked with another, namely the standard language ideology. The standard language ideology sets forth the belief that a recognized and institutionally established linguistic norm is not only the sole correct and useful variety of a language; it prescribes the standard language also as the most valuable, aesthetically pleasing and most desirable.

Migrants who reside in one of these countries are expected to acquire at least a certain level of proficiency in the standard variety. As an *idealized* and artificial construct, and spoken by hardly anyone, it follows that the standard can only be learned in the framework of formal education, such as through language classes as part of integration courses, as is the case in Germany. While the requirement to learn the standard language can be attained more easily by migrants who meet certain criteria (young; in a psychological state conducive to learning a new language; well acquainted with formal learning settings and foreign language learning in particular, etc.), for many other migrants for whom these criteria do not apply, having to learn a standard language becomes a difficult if not impossible task.

In such cases, language quickly becomes an instrument of exclusion. This is visible wherever language is used as an official means of regulating residence status and citizenship (Stevenson & Schanze 2009) and where access to a desired professional activity is tied to a certain language proficiency (Dombrowsky-Hahn et al. forthcoming) or a particular variety (cf. Roussel 2018). It also manifests in direct interactions when migrants' language skills are perceived by their interlocutors as insufficient. This can even lead to verbal aggression and violence (Jansen & Romero Gibu, this issue).

A main aim of this issue is therefore to raise awareness of the fact that expectations placed on the language skills of mobile people are shaped by and reflect ideologies underlying different ways of language learning and usage. As such, the issue contributes to an understanding of different – and sometimes conflicting – concepts of language and linguistic practices.

Language ideologies also contribute to the fate of heritage languages under the conditions of migration. The belief that a language is or is not worthy of being maintained in the diaspora, whether or not it should be abandoned in favor of the dominant language of the receiving society, is determined by language ideologies. However, ideas about languages and their relation to society, about which language(s) are socially, economically, and morally adequate, and which political interests they serve, are not the only factors involved in the decision to maintain or to abandon a language. People's repertoires change over time and as one enters different phases of one's life

(Blommaert & Backus 2013). Such repertoires may include varieties close to a standard and are restructured with every stage of the migratory itinerary. Thus, language repertoires display changing resources which can be used according to the respective needs, contexts, domains, and addressees. However, it is generally impossible to foresee how mobile people's linguistic repertoires will be restructured given the diversity of individual migration itineraries and other experiences related to language. Whether the host society's dominant language is learned and how often it is used depends on many factors. These factors include: age, language(s) used within the family, and factors that Barkhuizen (2013) summarizes under the labels of social inclusion, economic inclusion, emotional inclusion, and political inclusion. Similar factors play a role in the decision whether a heritage language will be maintained or not: reason for migration, duration of residence in the new region or country, and contact (direct or digital) with the people in the region or country of origin or with members of the same diaspora. There is another factor that plays a decisive role for the maintenance of a language in the diaspora, namely the sociolinguistic situation of the individual's place of origin. It is discussed by Siebetcheu (this issue) who provides evidence that languages spoken by only a few people and which are not valued in any public domain, such as the educational sector in the country of origin, are rarely passed on to the next generation in the diaspora. This is confirmed in Littig's contribution on language practices of migrant families from Africa living now in the Rhine-Main region in Germany. Parents sooner teach African lingua francas or the former colonial languages to their children than African languages spoken by small groups of people in their place of origin, even when this includes their own language of socialization from their childhood. Further to this, Brizić, Şimşek & Bulut (this issue) conclude that speakers of varieties which are excluded from the education system in the migrants' place of origin – such as Kurdish language varieties in Turkey – find themselves at a disadvantage when it comes to learning the standard language variety of their host country.

In addition to observing how mobility can add and remove languages to linguistic repertoires, it is also worthwhile examining how the usage of these languages change. This topic is addressed in the next subsection.

1.2 Emergence of new cultural forms

Attempts have been made to attribute certain linguistic outcomes to particular types of migration. Tovares & Kamwangamalu (2017: 210-211) have shown that what they refer to as *internal displacement* can force the displaced people to acquire an ancestral vernacular. Such was the case in the 1990s in the Democratic Republic of Congo when ethnic Baluba living in the Swahili-speaking Katanga Province and who thus did not speak their ancestors' language Ciluba were forcibly returned to the Kasai Province in the south where Ciluba is the lingua franca. Another type of migration, rural-urban migration, has been shown to bring about the emergence of mixed varieties such as Surzhyk in Ukraine, Tsotsitaal in South Africa, and Sheng in Kenya (Tovares & Kamwangamalu 2017: 210, 212).

Such mixed varieties or hybrid linguistic practices have been studied under the labels of youth languages (cp. for instance, Kießling

& Mous 2004; Nassenstein & Hollington 2015) or youth language practices[3] (Nassenstein et al. 2018), contemporary urban vernaculars (Rampton 2011), multiethnolects (Nortier & Doreleijn 2013), and metrolingualism (Pennycook & Otsuji 2015). They are also described under such terms as translanguaging (García & Wei 2014), polylingual languaging (cp. overview in Pennycook 2016), or heteroglossia (Bailey 2012)[4]. Further to rural-urban migration, mixed languages also result from other patterns of mobility such as south-north migration, as is shown in the contributions by Kossmann and by Siebetcheu in this issue. Kossmann discusses a style based on Dutch which is interspersed with elements of the Moroccan heritage languages Arabic and Berber that is used by Moroccan-heritage youth in the Netherlands and Flanders. Siebetcheu illustrates the hybrid varieties Camfranglais and Camfranglitalian used by Cameroonians in Italy.

We consider these and similar practices as new cultural forms that emerge as a consequence of migration and that display speaker creativity in a particular way. We shall illustrate this by describing some of them: youth language practices, contemporary urban vernaculars, and translanguaging.

According to Kießling & Mous (2004), youth languages are sociolects emerging foremostly in urban centers that are spoken by young people, in particular by young males. The African youth languages developed in the context of strong rural-urban migration in African cities, for instance Camfranglais in Douala, Nouchi in Abidjan, Sheng in Nariobi, Yanké in Kinshasa or Randuk in Khartoum. They are often based on former colonial languages or other standard languages which emerged in the colonial context, e.g. Lingala in the DR Congo, and lexicon changes through the input of other languages brought in by migrants from rural areas are important. The following manipulations are common: morphological blending, phonological truncation, insertion of dummy affixes, metathesis, semantic extensions by means of metaphor, metonymy, and dysphemism. The lexicon of these varieties becomes changed to such an extent as to be considered independent languages. On the one hand, youth languages have been interpreted as anti-languages or a kind of "non-conformity in language" (Nassenstein et al. 2018: 13) because of the disrespect their speakers show to the languages upon which they are based, on the other hand, the potential of youth languages to overcome ethnic barriers has been stressed as a positive force (Kießling & Mous 2004: 333). However, this is not universally so, as youth language practices can also "be subject to ethnic negotiations, or "competing identities"" (Nassenstein et al. 2018: 16). While the playful creative way of speaking is underlined in most publications on youth languages, they can occasionally also "alter power relations between speakers and listeners", as illustrated by Nassenstein et al. (2018: 21). Starting out as secret languages meant to be understood only by in-group members, youth languages are used by increasing numbers of speakers and are partly even represented in newspapers in the places of emergence (e.g. Mugaddam 2015). Some youth language practices have become icons of identity in the destinations of south-south migration. An example is provided by the

[3] In a recent critical account on youth language studies Nassenstein et al. (2018) propose to consider youth language practices as a process rather than fixed varieties, suggested under the title of youth languages.

[4] Further concepts of hybrid linguistic practices and the terms referring to them are discussed by Blommaert & Rampton (2011).

Lingala-based Kindoubil, used by Congolese students in Kampala, Uganda, to index Congoleseness (Nassenstein & Tchokothe 2017). Youth language practices become emblems of identity in the process of south-north migration, too, as can be illustrated by Camfranglais indexing Cameroonian identity in France, Italy and in Germany (Telep 2016, 2018; Machetti & Siebetcheu 2013; Nassenstein & Tchokhote 2017), or Nouchi indexing Ivorianness in Germany (cp. Kouadio 2018).

The terms "multiethnolect" (Nortier & Doreleijn 2013)[5], "polylingual languaging" or "contemporary urban vernacular" (Rampton 2011) have been proposed for hybrid linguistic practices that emerge in ethnically mixed neighborhoods shaped by immigration and which are restricted to use by young people. Contemporary urban vernaculars extend to language varieties spoken by the host society as well as local varieties of diasporic groups or heritage languages, all of which are subject to variation depending on individual situation (i.e. migration itinerary). Processes of enregisterment, including reflexive metapragmatic/metalinguistic practices, such as accounts of usage (explicit description or implicit evaluation), naming, crossing, and stylization, can help identify and recognize a language variety as an urban contemporary vernacular. Some of these practices are mentioned in the contributions in the present volume, even if the authors do not categorize these practices or the outcoming language varieties as contemporary urban vernaculars. Thus, Siebetcheu demonstrates how a new linguistic resource (Italian) acquired in the course of migration diversifies and expands the speakers' linguistic repertoires from which speakers then draw for the language practice they name Camfranglitalien, which is itself based on a hybrid practice known as Camfranglais. Metalinguistic comments and crossing discussed in Kossmann's paper make important contribution to acknowledging the practice described by the author as a style in its own right.

The concept of language is often rejected as a self-contained system of structures, when the abovementioned practices are discussed. Therefore, we briefly mention the alternative concept of translanguaging proposed by García & Wei (2014) and García & Lin (2017). Arisen in the educational context of language learning, translanguaging is based on the concept of *languaging*, defined as an ongoing process during which individuals "[…] enter another history of interactions and cultural practices and […] learn 'a new way of being in the world'" (Becker 1995: 227 cited in García & Wei 2014: 8). Translanguaging emphasizes the fluid language practices of bilingual individuals, eventually leading to the development of new identities (García & Lin 2017). It was originally employed to refer to a pedagogical practice whereby students are asked to use different languages to produce texts. It designates a process of meaning-making, understanding and gaining knowledge by using two languages. Elaborating on the ideas of the anthropologist Ortiz, García & Wei (2014) compare the process of translanguaging to Bach's polyphonic (or counterpoint) music, in which the interaction of two or more melodically and rhythmically independent voices produces something new, original, and complex. The translanguaging approach claims not to

[5] In their definition of slang-like linguistic styles or varieties emerging in multi-ethnic groups of young speakers and which they call ethnolects, Nortier & Dorleijn (2013) stress the optionally ephemeral character of multiethnolects, which are stigmatized linguistic styles and involve "migrant languages from socially stigmatized communities" (Nortier & Dorleijn 2013: 266).

be centered on languages but rather on multiple discursive practices for which the speakers draw on the resources of their linguistic (or, more generally, semiotic) repertoires.

However, Pennycook (2016), in his critical account of the recent proliferation of sociolinguistic terms, points to a terminological dilemma: although the proponents of the translanguaging approach claim that linguistic practices go between and beyond linguistic systems and structures, transforming current structures and practices and employing transdisciplinary perspectives on society and cognition, they depend on the concept of language for the linguistic analysis. Contrary to the critics of the term *language* as static and fixed, Pennycook advocates that "there is nothing intrinsic to the ideas of language, codeswitching, or bilingualism that render them static and fixed, nor is there anything about translanguaging that will guarantee its more transgressive meanings" (Pennycook 2016: 210). According to Pennycook, the term of code-switching is not to be banished, for it is open-ended and includes the alternation of registers, genres, styles, dialects, and other varieties. In his contribution to this issue, Kossmann adopts the latter view, considering the insertion of a special group of morphemes from Moroccan languages as instances of a process situated on the continuum between codeswitching and borrowing.

1.3 Social and performative functions of language

Language has many functions next to the referential function, among others social and performative functions. The social and performative functions of language play an important role in the study of the nexus of language and migration in some of the contributions to this issue.

Mobile multilingual speakers use the manifold linguistic practices and the resources of their repertoires to create the speakers' particular identities. Identity is understood as "the social positioning of self and other" (Bucholtz & Hall 2005), and identities emerge either on a macro-level, a local scale, or temporarily and during single interactions.

The study of speakers' identities, or, more globally, of social meaning of linguistic signs is, following Johnstone (2010), based on the concepts of indexicality, metapragmatics and enregisterment. The first of these concepts, indexicality, is understood as the semiotic process whereby particular linguistic forms are associated with the speakers who use them. Thus, a particular pronunciation, the choice of lexemes, special morphological forms and patterns of discourse, are associated with the speakers who use them by virtue of their cooccurrence with these persons. The linguistic forms contribute to the emergence of speakers' identities in addition to their style or dress. Metapragmatic linking can be summarized in Johnstone's (2010: 32-33) words as the "talk about talk" and the juxtaposition of ways of speaking and non-linguistic features such as modes of dress and gestures. Indexically linked linguistic forms are stabilized during the process of enregisterment, defined by Agha (2005: 38) as a process "whereby distinct forms of speech come to be socially recognized (or enregistered) as indexical of speaker attributes by a population of language users".

People who move from one space to another often face the task of having to position themselves socially. Language is but one means to do this. The concepts of indexicality,

metapragmatics, and enregisterment are useful tools to study the emergence of social identities performed through speech and the development of registers and styles that characterize diasporic or ethnically and linguistically diverse groups. Furthermore, these concepts allow the comprehension of language *crossing*. (Rampton 1999: 54) defines crossing as the "use of a language or variety that, in one way or another, feels anomalously "other"". Traversing social, ethnic, national or racialized boundaries has often a ludic character and evokes in the listeners the feeling that the speaker does not believe in the identity they are projecting. Crossing has the effect of either signaling a desired identity or evoking an alternative identity to the one typically ascribed to the speaker[6]. As such, crossing can be used both to affirm existing stratifications as well as "destabilize hegemonic biological and cultural essentialism and look for new solidarities" (Rampton 1999: 55). Issues of identity emerging through the use of the resources of migrants' repertoires are addressed in the present issue in the contributions by Kossmann, Siebetcheu and Littig.

The performative function of language refers to what language does or what words can do and which effect utterances have on the listener. The most obvious performative utterances are those which make explicit the act that is being performed, such as utterances of naming, accepting, apologizing, swearing, etc. However, utterances can also implicitly act on an interlocutor and have ensuing effects. Something uttered can make the addressee happy or sad, it can calm down or make insecure, it can cause satisfaction, anger, worry or distress. The achieved effect is not always intended by the speaker. The study of the effects of interactions is particularly important when it comes to intercultural communication between newcomers or members of diasporic communities and members of the host society. An exemplary study in this sense is provided by Jansen & Romero Gibu in their contribution on verbal violence experienced by migrants in the frame of interactions in institutional contexts. The authors focus on the migrants' perceptions and analyze the migrants' narratives thereof. The authors' main objective is to identify factors contributing to distress – overt intention to harm someone's idea of themselves or misunderstanding due to different knowledge.

2. Language and integration

A declared political aim of European countries and other countries in the global North is integration, inclusion and participation of immigrants permanently living in the country. In Germany, the Federal Ministry of the Interior, Building and Community (BMI), defines *integration* as follows:

> Integration means living together as one society, not in separate worlds. Our society should be characterized by respect, mutual trust, shared responsibility and a sense of community. Integration should ensure that immigrants have equal opportunities and the chance to participate in all areas, especially social, economic and cultural life. To do so, people who come to

[6] As an example, Higuera del Moral and Jansen (2017) present an interesting case study on Spanish speaking migrant groups in an ethnically and linguistically diverse parish in Nürnberg, which shows that crossing is used to spoof the type of speaker associated with the other language or variety. The authors describe it as an artificial style employed to enact social personae known to the community.

> Germany intending to stay must learn the German language and acquire basic knowledge of our history and our legal system […]. Integration means feeling part of a community and developing a common understanding of how to live together in society. Integration can work only as a two-way process. It requires acceptance by the majority population and the willingness of immigrants to learn and respect the rules of the host country and to take responsibility for their own integration.[7] (BMI 2020)

As mentioned by Stevenson & Schanze (2009: 90, citing Gould 1998), "the concept of Integration is frequently invoked but rarely defined". Ager & Strang (2008) note that the concept of integration is contested, not unified, and controversial. The BMI website does not give a more precise statement about the meaning of integration either, and in addition to *integration*, the definition displays other unspecified and contested concepts which call for discussion. The expression *one society* in the sentence "integration means living together as one society, not in separate worlds" suggests the existence of a homogenous society into which migrants (or immigrants in the BMI definition) can be incorporated to form an integral whole. This idea is based on the ideology of the nation state as a unit the members of which are essentially alike, i.e. having a common identity united in one territory and speaking one language. However, the suggested homogeneity is in fact imaginary, for several reasons. One of them is that 26% of the population in Germany has "migration background"[8]. The Federal Statistical Office defines someone as a German with migration background who himself/herself or whose parents did not both inherit German nationality at birth. The ratio is even more noticeable in cities, where the majority of inhabitants is made up of Germans with migratory backgrounds. For instance, in a city such as Frankfurt, 30% of the inhabitants were foreigners[9] in 2019, representing 178 of the world's 197 nationalities[10]; in the same year, foreigners and Germans with migration background together made up 53%, a proportion which leads Michael Rausch from the Neue Zürcher Zeitung (09.07.2019) to draw the conclusion that "in German cities, the majority society is facing its end". This trend can be observed in many European cities[11]. Considering the important diversity of the population living especially in towns and cities a common identity is illusory, and all integration efforts that are based on the idea of integration as homogenization will inevitably fail. Instead, where transnational identities and people who join experiences from different countries and places are the norm, new opportunities of a heterogeneous society have the possibility to arise, searching for new solutions to current problems (Hahn 2017).

---

[7] https://www.bmi.bund.de/EN/topics/community-and-integration/integration/integration-node.html, https://www.bmi.bund.de/EN/topics/community-and-integration/integration/integration-node.html for the German version, see https://www.bmi.bund.de/DE/themen/heimat-integration/integration/integration-bedeutung/integration-bedeutung.html (accessed 2020-08-05).

[8] https://www.destatis.de/DE/Themen/Gesellschaft-Umwelt/Bevoelkerung/Migration-Integration/_inhalt.html(accessed 2020-08-07).

[9] Rausch does not define the term "foreigner". However, the reader understands that a foreigner is a person living in Germany who does not have the German nationality. This category includes migrants seeking to get the German nationality and expatriates who don't.

[10] https://frankfurt.de/de-de/service-und-rathaus/zahlen-daten-fakten/publikationen/fsa, (accessed 2020-08-09).

[11] https://www.nzz.ch/international/in-deutschen-staedten-geht-die-mehrheitsgesellschaft-zu-ende-ld.1492568, (accessed 2020-08-09).

In the quote (BMI 2020), "learning the German language" is listed as a precondition for "participation in social, economic and cultural life". Learning the dominant language of the host country, which nowadays often takes place in formal language courses, is without a doubt useful and facilitates daily life and enables inclusion into activities in many domains. Nevertheless, as argued above, the German society is not homogenous, and Standard German is not the only language (variety) used in social, cultural, religious life and parts of the economic life. The requirement to learn the dominant language and real linguistic practices in concrete situations frequently create tensions. Roussel (2018: 88) for instance notes that concrete professional activities sometimes require competence in a language variety that is different to the one learned in language courses (see also Blommaert & Backus 2013). Furthermore, if we concede, as discussed in the sections above, that words and propositions are not only means to convey denotational meaning but that language has indexical meaning, too, it is likely that the entire linguistic repertoires, including heteroglossic practices, serve the construction of new identities. The prerequisites for a realistic and successful social integration (or *inclusion*, that Australia and other countries declare as the aim of their migration politics) comprises therefore, in Otsuji & Pennycook's (2011: 414) terms, "an appreciation of a diversity of languages other than [the dominant one], and the skills and capabilities of multilingual language users". In her contribution to this issue, Kolloch provides one example of how migrants draw a benefit from their multilingualism. They are often engaged as translators in institutional communication between agents and newcomers from the same region of origin who speak the same language but have not yet acquired German language skills.

Another indicator of integration, as defined by the BMI, is a feeling of belonging to a community, a topic that is rarely brought up in official discourses. Feelings refer to sensations or states that are perceived by the people who experience them. A feeling of belonging refers to the migrants' emotional well-being in addition to the measurable markers of integration, including housing, employment, education, and health. A feeling of belonging seems to be most critically related to the statement that integration is a two-way process which includes the acceptance from speakers of the dominant language or, more broadly, the acceptance from society as a whole.

With respect to language, the aspect of the host population's acceptance and the mobile persons' perception thereof have been little studied so far. In some studies, the following questions are suggested.

A. Does proficiency in the dominant language have "a crucial impact on their [the immigrants'] sense of self and their potential in their new environment" (Yates 2011: 457), does it favor the feeling of well-being and of being welcomed and accepted?

B. How do "native" speakers of the dominant language evaluate the migrants' efforts and proficiency in the dominant language? Are they willing to accommodate to speakers' level of proficiency? Do the interaction partners make them feel that they value their efforts?

C. How do speakers perceive the dominant language speakers' reactions if they are unable to express what is required or what they want to express?

Yates (2011) mentions difficulties of finding opportunities for interaction in English, the dominant language of her research site Australia, particularly for adult language learners for whom the process of learning is laborious and tedious. Since competence in the dominant language is not only important for practical integration but also for "emotional integration", difficulties for language learners arise when native speakers are "unused or unwilling to accommodate to their level of proficiency" (Yates 2011: 459). Jansen & Romero Gibu study migrants' perceptions of verbal violence they experienced in interactions. The narrated encounters can often be equated to the total absence of acceptance, even to discrimination and racism. The perceived estimations are not restricted to evaluations of the interviewed persons' linguistic skills, but the respective language proficiency is a constitutive part of their personality. The contribution offers a model how migrants' narrations of their perceptions can be analyzed (see below); a similar procedure is conceivable to study the full range of the host population's reactions in interaction, from total rejection to benevolent acceptance.

Studies taking into account migrants' perceptions (Ager & Strang 2008, Roussel 2018, and Jansen & Romero Gibu, this issue) correspond to giving a voice to those who are deprived of the power to speak or who are muted; it can contribute to a better understanding, detecting injustice, and to raising awareness of existing asymmetries, and eventually contribute to the creation of more just societies. There is hope that this can be done by enhancing "the quality of communication in institutions by developing recommendations that are empirically grounded and practicable according to intercultural competence criteria" (Jansen & Romero Gibu, this issue), among other things. Yates (2011) reports about small-scale initiatives aiming to improve communication between migrant language learners and "native speakers" at workplaces in Denmark. To help engage successfully in communication with colleagues who do not yet master Danish, easy tips are provided to the Danish-speaking employees. These tips start by recommending more empathy: "Imagine what it feels like to be in their shoes …. "(Yates 2011: 467). Whatever recommendations follow, this one seems worthy of being passed on.

3. About the contributions

The contributions in this issue on the broad topic of migration, language, and integration provide case studies based on original fieldwork or the authors' previous research. They critically address the points discussed in the previous sections. The essays can be grouped under the following themes:

1. *Changing repertoires* and *creative uses of linguistic resources* (Kossmann, Siebetcheu, Littig);

2. *Migrants' perceptions* and *communication with institutional agents and mediators* (Jansen & Romero Gibu, Kolloch, Brizić, Şimşek & Bulut).

3. Diallo's contribution offers a *historical perspective* and shows several overlapping points with both groups.

In their respective articles, Kossmann and Siebetcheu exemplify migrant languages which play a decisive role in the emergence of new registers and styles. **Kossmann** studies fluid linguistic practices that display resources of Dutch and the Moroccan languages Arabic and Berber. They are mainly spoken and written by Moroccan-heritage speakers who grew up in the Netherlands and in Flanders (Belgium), but their use is not restricted to these groups. The speakers of this *way of speaking Dutch*, which is sometimes categorized as a particular style, sometimes as an ethnolect, introduce diverse elements of their Moroccan heritage languages Arabic and Berber into otherwise Dutch discourse. The author focuses on Dutch discourses bearing Arabic and Moroccan morphemes that mark indefiniteness. The research is based on data from different sources including written examples from computer-mediated communication from several internet forums dedicated to the Moroccan community. These are complemented by spoken language data, principally in the form of YouTube material and data extracted from a corpus of recorded oral texts. Kossmann studies the function and the distribution of items labelled indefinite markers in all three contact languages and then identifies several functions of the insertion of these elements from the Moroccan languages into Dutch. For example, the insertion of the indefinite morphemes adds a creative, playful note to the utterance. When used in crossing by speakers who are not heritage speakers of the Moroccan languages, the inserted morphemes function as intensifiers or markers of expressivity.

Siebetcheu studies the linguistic repertoires of about 500 Cameroonians living in Italy using questionnaires, interviews and participant observation. He states that the languages of Cameroon as well as from other countries contribute to the diversification and enrichment of the linguistic space in Italy. Although around 275 languages are spoken in Cameroon, the overwhelming majority of Cameroonian migrants living in Italy speak one of the eight Bamileke languages, in addition to French and to varying extends English (the official languages of Cameroon), and the hybrid language Camfranglais. The majority of Cameroonians in Italy also belong to the Bamileke ethnic group whose members have been engaged in inner and international (including south-north) migration movements for a long time. Although the majority of the study's participants do not use their heritage Bamileke languages on a daily basis in Italy, and decide not to pass them on to the next generation, these languages make important contributions to the hybrid language variety the speakers call Camfranglitalien. The fluid linguistic practice known under this name includes Italian in addition to French, English, Bamileke and other Cameroonian languages which make up the youth language Camfranglais. The latter is spoken not only in Cameroon but also in the diasporas, including in France and in Germany (cf. i.a. Nassenstein & Tchokhote 2017, Telep 2017). Camfranglitalien indexes the speakers' migrant identity of the Cameroonian diaspora in Italy. Romanticizing the knowledge of the ethnic heritage languages, Siebetcheu advocates official measures that encourage the acquisition and promotion of the Cameroonian languages in the Italian diaspora.

Recent research has demonstrated the immense value of programs which empower languages (as Siebetcheu points out for Cameroonian languages) for language competences and language use. Stereotypical attitudes

and ideologies towards immigrants may be strengthened by immigrant laws and bureaucratic rules that emphasize language integration as a prerequisite. Multilingual practices, as discussed in this volume, create new social networks and practical communities across borders and boundaries. People develop new identities as negotiated in situational social practices. In her sociolinguistic approach, **Littig** focuses on parents in multilingual families and their language choice, referred to by Littig as a parent's language policy. She discusses language practices in relation to society. Societal expectations (e.g. family, friends, and institutions) and social stratification influence personal ideologies on language. Based on an extended case study and interviews Littig explores the parents' language use and family language choice outlining the ideologies that influenced their choices. The families all have in common that they currently live in the Rhine-Main area and emigrated from a sub-Saharan African country. Littig describes how languages are managed, learned, and negotiated within these families. The participants exhibit distinct family language policy profiles for different reasons. These reasons include personal ideologies, linguistic biographies, and family composition. The paper concludes with reflections on the uniqueness of multilingual language use within families.

Three contributions focus on communication between migrants and institutional agents and the migrants' perceptions thereof. Due to the power asymmetries prevalent in all communication within institutional contexts, language is discussed as an instrument of power and dominance and as a subject of sovereignty of interpretation in these case studies. The point of departure of **Jansen & Romero Gibu**'s study is the theoretical assumption that, beyond referential function, language has also performative function. The authors give a first account of a multidisciplinary research project on verbal violence experienced by migrants from Latin America during interactions with institutional agents in Bavaria, Germany. Verbal violence is defined as intentional use of language strategies to harm the interlocutor's face. In this sense, verbal violence resembles discrimination. The choice to study verbal violence in institutional contexts is not random. Rather verbal violence is likely to occur in this context, for communication in institutions is based on power asymmetry between the interlocutors manifested in the interlocutors' fixed roles and the formalized type and order of interaction. Speech Act Theory (SAT) forms the theoretical frame of Jansen & Romero Gibu's research project. According to SAT, an utterance can be more than a propositional act related to something existing in the world: it can simultaneously be an illocutionary act with a specific intention and/or a perlocutionary act that can cause an effect, such as emotional distress. The authors concentrate on the migrants' reports of verbal exchanges experienced as harmful to their positive self-identity. To gather data, Jansen and Romero Gibu and the project's team ask their interview partners to report on their experiences of verbal violence. This subjective procedure is intentional because it reveals to what extent the the victims perceived the interaction as harmful. This procedure further helps to understand the origins of miscommunication, which can be rooted in the unequal linguistic resources, divergent expectations, and false assumptions about shared knowledge. The authors illustrate their method with one case applying Labov & Waletzky's (1967) model of narrative analysis.

The perception of communication in institutional contexts in Germany in a wider sense is also the focus of **Kolloch's** contribution. The author draws attention to a group of migrants who play the role of language and cultural mediators in interactions between institutional agents and newly arrived migrants. In contrast to the latter who do not know German, the mediators show proficiency in both their heritage language and German as well as the necessary social and cultural knowledge enabling them for the mediator's and translator's activity. To cope with the need for translations that arose in the course of increasing migration movements, the state and the organizations involved not only rely on academically trained translators and interpreters but also on people whose own experience, including the migration experience and rudimentary training qualify them for the activity. Kolloch's research, based on interviews and participant observation, gives an account of the ways these agents access the mediators' activity and their working conditions and explores their own perception of their role in the mediating processes. They consider themselves as specialists with cultural skills who are able to prevent miscommunication due to different knowledge or experience and can mediate between the parties involved. Discussing their concept of culture, Kolloch characterizes the mediators as brokers and para-ethologists.

Brizić, Şimşek & Bulut offer another contribution that takes on a critical perspective on institutions. According to the authors, the children of migrants in German-speaking countries are excluded from the right to have a say and to participate in social and political life due to the education systems in these countries. The authors illustrate such complex inequalities with the example of Kurdish families from Turkey in Austria. In their analysis, the authors relate three different linguistic approaches: educational, interactional and discourse linguistics. Their findings illustrate three things: first, how societal macro-structures translate into serious individual disadvantages; second, how multilingual, socially disadvantaged students have particularly strong ambitions, and how their ambitions, in turn, fall victim to wrong interpretations by their teachers—and; third, how these misinterpretations may lead to the loss of common ground between teachers, parents, and others still. The authors also take a critical look at academic research and its impact on social inequalities.

Diallo's contribution touches upon diverse aspects discussed in the other papers and in the introduction. The article focuses on the spread of French in the Guinean capital Conakry since the French colonization of the country in 1887. However, the discussion goes beyond this topic and deals with changes in the linguistic repertoires of Conakry's inhabitants as the city continues to grow due to migration, repertoires which include the different local languages and the lingua francas of the country. Introduced during French colonization, the French language lost its primacy in public life ten years after the country achieved independence, when the socialist leader Sékou Touré broke off relations with France. At that time, Guinean African languages replaced French as means of education in schools. Since the end of the communist regime in 1984, the use of French has been intensifying and expanding again.

Discussing the varieties spoken during the first phase, Diallo notes that while the colonial administrators spoke the standardized variety of French, to the local population they taught the French Pidgin variety called *Petit*

Nègre. Petit Nègre, the name of which "indexes a state of subjection and the assumed inferiority of its racialized speakers" (Vigouroux 2017: 10), was considered sufficient to be taught to the colonized people, the objective being to form subordinated clerks, interpreters, and local militaries. The restriction of French during the second phase was concomitant to the strengthening importance of one local language, Soso, as a citywide lingua franca. However, growing immigration entailed increasing ethnic and cultural diversity. As a consequence, habitation patterns modified, as well. The abandonment of teaching of African languages in primary schools following the end of the socialist regime led to a rapid rise of use and popularity of French throughout Conakry. Diallo analyzes the different channels of learning French, a language that nowadays has become a language of displacement, learned by those who prepare for migration.

References

Ager, Alastair & Alison Strang. 2008. Understanding integration: a conceptual framework. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 21.2: 166-191.

Agha, Asif. 2005. Voice, footing, enregisterment. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15.1: 38-59.

Auer, Peter, Martin Hilpert, Anja Stukenbrock & Benedikt Szmrecsanyi (eds.). 2013. *Space in Language and Linguistics: Geographical, Interactional, and Cognitive Perspectives*. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.

Bailey, Benjamin. 2012. Heteroglossia. In Marilyn Martin-Jones, Adrian Blackledge & Angela Creese (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism*, pp. 499-507. London: Routledge.

Baquedano-López, Patricia & Ariana Mangual Figueroa. 2012. Language socialization and immigration. In Alessandro Duranti, Elinor Ochs & Bambi B. Schieffelin (eds.), *The Handbook of Language Socialization*, pp. 536-563. Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell.

Barkhuizen, Gary. 2013. Maintenance, identity and social inclusion narratives of an Afrikaans speaker living in New Zealand.*International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 222: 77-100.

Becker, Alton L. 1995. *Beyond Translation. Essays toward a Modern Philology.* Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press.

Blackledge, Adrian & Angela Creese. 2017. Translanguaging in mobility. In Suresh Canagarajah (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Migration and Language*, pp. 31-46. London: Routledge.

Blommaert, Jan & Ad Backus. 2013. Superdiverse repertoires and the individual. In Ingrid de Saint-Georges & Jean-Jacques Weber (eds.), *Multilingualism and Multimodality. Current Challenges for Educational Studies*, pp. 11-32. Rotterdam: Sense.

Blommaert, Jan & Jie Dong. 2010. Language and movement in space. In Nikolas Coupland (ed.), *The Handbook of Language and Globalization*, pp. 366-385. London: Wiley Blackwell.

Blommaert, Jan & Ben Rampton. 2011. Language and superdiversity. *Diversities* 13.2: 1-16.

Boyle, Paul, Keith H. Halfacree & Vaughan Robinson. 1998. *Exploring Contemporary Migration.* Harlow: Longman.

Bucholtz, Mary & Kira Hall. 2005. Identity and interaction: a sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies* 7.4-5: 585-614.

Deumert, Ana. 2013. Xhosa in town (revisited) – space, place and language. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 222: 51-75.

Dombrowsky-Hahn, Klaudia, Axel Fanego Palat, Sabine Littig & Nico Nassenstein. forthcoming. Jenseits des Referenzrahmens: Erfahrungen afrikanischer Migrant*innen mit sprachlicher Integration im Rhein-Main-Gebiet. In In Jürgen Erfurt & Peter Reimer (eds.), *Osnabrücker Beiträge zur Sprachtheorie (OBST) 98. Afrikanische Sprachen in Europa – Langues africaines en Europe.*

García, Ofelia & Li Wei. 2014. *Translanguaging. Language, Bilingualism and Education.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

García, Ofelia & Angel M.Y. Lin. 2017. Translanguaging in bilingual education. In Ofelia García, Angel M.Y. Lin & Stephen May (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education. Bilingual and Multilingual Education*, pp. 117-130. Berlin: Springer

Hahn, Hans P. 2017. Mobilität, Austausch und Zukunftsfähigkeit. In Ronald Grätz (ed.), *Kulturen des Wir*, pp. 1-3. Stuttgart: Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen e.V. (ifa).

Higuera del Moral, Sonja & Silke Jansen. 2017. Inszenierung durch Stilisierung fremder Stimmen. Sprachliches Crossing am Beispiel einer hispanophonen Migrantengruppe in Nürnberg. In Antje Dresen & Florian Freitag (eds.), *Crossing. Über Inszenierungen kultureller Differenzen und Identitäten*, pp. 117-158. Bielefeld: transcript.

Irvine, Judith T. 1989. When talk isn't cheap. Language and political economy. *American Ethnologist* 16.2: 248-267.

Johnstone, Barbara. 2010. Locating language in identity. In Carmen Llamas & Dominic Watt (eds.), *Language and Identities*, pp. 29-38. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Juffermans, Kaspar & Bernardino Tavares. 2016. South-North trajectories and linguistic repertoires. In Caroline Kerfoot & Kenneth Hyltenstam (eds.), *Entangled Discourses: South-North Orders of Visibility*, pp. 99-114. New York: Routledge.

Kießling, Roland & Maarten Mous. 2004 . Urban youth languages in Africa. *Anthropological Linguistics* 46.3: 303-341.

Kouadio, Atobé. 2018. Les parlers jeunes africains en contexte migratoire. L'exemple du nouchi en Allemagne. *QVR* 51-52: 186-201.

Labov, William & Joshua Waletzky. 1967. Narrative analysis. Oral versions of personal experience. In June Helm (ed.), *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts. Proceedings of the 1966 Annual Spring Meeting of the American Ethnological Society*, pp. 12-44. Seattle: American Ethnological Society.

Machetti, Sabrina & Raymond Siebetcheu. 2013. The use of Camfranglais in the Italian migration context. *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies* 55: 1-13.

Mugaddam, Abdelrahim H. 2015. Identity construction and linguistic manipulation in Randuk. In Nico Nassenstein & Andrea Hollington (eds.), *Youth Language Practices in Africa and Beyond*, pp. 99-118. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.

Nassenstein, Nico & Andrea Hollington (eds.). 2015. *Youth Language Practices in Africa and Beyond*. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.

Nassenstein, Nico & Rémi A. Tchokothe. 2017. From home to home: African urban youth languages in the diaspora. In Kaji Shigeki (ed.), *Proceedings of the 8th World Congress of African Linguistics Kyoto 2015*, pp. 313-329. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.

Nassenstein, Nico, Andrea Hollington & Anne Storch. 2018. Disinventing and demystifying youth language. Critical perspectives. *The Mouth*. 3: 10-27.

Nortier, Jacomine & Margreet Dorleijn. 2013. Multi-ethnolects: Kebabnorsk, Perkerdansk, Verlan, Kanakensprache, Straattaal, etc. In Peter Bakker & Yaron Matras (eds.), *Contact Languages: A Comprehensive Guide*, pp. 229-271. Boston: de Gruyter Mouton.

Ochs, Elinor & Bambi B. Schieffelin. 2012. The theory of language socialization. In Alessandro Duranti, Elinor Ochs & Bambi B. Schieffelin (eds.), *The Handbook of Language Socialization*, pp. 1-22. Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell.

Otsuji, Emi & Alastair Pennycook. 2011. Social inclusion and metrolingual practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 14.4: 413.

Pennycook, Alastair. 2016. Mobile times, mobile terms: the trans-super-poly-metro movement. In Nicolas Coupland (ed.), *Sociolinguistics. Theoretical Debates*, pp. 201-216. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pennycook, Alastair & Emi Otsuji. 2015. *Metrolingualism. Language in the City.* London: Routledge.

Piller, Ingrid. 2015. Language ideologies. In Karen Tracy, Cornelia Ilie & Todd Sandel (eds.), *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction* (Vol. 2), pp. 917-927. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell.

Rampton, Ben. 1999. Crossing. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 9.1-2: 54-56.

Rampton, Ben. 2011. From 'multi-ethnic adolescent heteroglossia' to 'contemporary urban vernaculars'. *Language & Communication* 31: 276-294.

Roussel, Anne S. 2018. Qu'est-ce qu'être francisé? L'expérience d'immigrants dits allophones dans un bastion traditionnel du Québec. *Langage et société* 165: 75-93.

Stevenson, Patrick & Livia Schanze. 2009. Language, migration and citizenship in Germany: discourses on integration and belonging. In Guus Extra, Massimiliano Spotti & Piet van Avermaet (eds.), *Language Testing, Migration and Citizenship*, pp. 87-106. London: Continuum.

Telep, Suzie. 2016. Variation stylistique, mobilité sociale et positionnements épilingulistiques en contexte migratoire: le cas de migrants camerounais à Paris. In Michelle Auzanneau, Margaret Bento & Malroy Leclère (eds.), *Espaces, mobilités et éducation plurilingues. Éclairage d'Afrique ou d'ailleurs*, pp. 145-158. Paris: Édition des archives contemporains.

Telep, Suzie. 2017. Le 'parler jeune', une construction idéologique: le cas du francanglais au Cameroun. *Gottopol. Revue de sociolinguistique en ligne* 29: 27-51.

Telep, Suzie. 2018. "Slang is for thugs": stereotypes of Francanglais among Cameroonian immigrants in Paris. *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics* 19: 119-131.

Tovares, Alla V. & Nkonko M. Kamwangamalu. 2017. Migration trajectories. Implications for language proficiencies and identities. In Suresh Canagarajah (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Migration and Language*, pp. 207-227. London: Routledge.

Vigouroux, Cécile B. 2017. The discursive pathway of two centuries of raciolinguistic stereotyping: 'Africans as incapable of speaking French'. *Language in Society* 46: 5-21.

Yates, Lynda. 2011. Interaction, language learning and social inclusion in early settlement. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 14.4: 457-471.