1. Opening remarks

Many articles and several volumes of *Sociolinguistica* have been devoted to issues related to communication in a multilingual Europe. The papers in 'English only' (Vol. 8), 'Monolingualism is curable' (Vol. 11), and 'European identity and linguistic diversity' (Vol. 9) are in the area of language policy and sociology of language. In addition to the celebration of diversity, there is a widespread underlying fear that practical problems in managing communication in the international public domain could detract from linguistic diversity and result in a single lingua franca. This is often discussed in the context of the large number of national languages in an ever-expanding European Union and the almost infinite number of pairs of languages to be translated and interpreted.

In this paper, an attempt will be made to bring two partly overlapping phenomena, Lingua Franca in inter-cultural communication and ethnolects, into a sociolinguistic/language contract framework, considering the need, use and potential of lingua franca and ethnolects. Although inter-cultural communication has been taking place throughout human history, the need for it is likely to intensify in the 21st century. The study of lingua francas and ethnolects as an expression of linguistic convergence and divergence are worthwhile topics for international collaborative research.

2. Lingua Franca (LF)

A Lingua Franca is used in inter-cultural communication between two or more people who have different L1s other than the lingua franca. It is therefore intended as an intermediary code. LFs have long been the basis on which people of different linguistic and cultural backgrounds have been able to communicate.

A number of types of LFs need to be differentiated, for instance:

1. **National language of immigrant country as LF for internal, inter-group communication**, e.g. Swedish in Sweden:
   Immigrants of different ethnolinguistic backgrounds (e.g. Kurds, Croats, Finns) communicate with each other (as well as with the dominant group) in this language.

2. **Allochtonic language for external communication**, e.g. German in Central Europe:
   People from different countries and language backgrounds, meeting in a third country, or in their own countries, or in correspondence. Typical interactants in this group are those from countries that were once part of Austria-Hungary – Hungarians, Czechs, Slovaks and Slovenians communicating in German.

3. **People from an officially multilingual country employing an allochtonic language as a LF**, e.g. English in Belgium or Switzerland. Increasingly, some people (especially...
young people) from multilingual countries use English in preference to one of the official languages (French/Dutch/German in Belgium, German/French/Italian in Switzerland) to communicate across ethnic groups. This may vary according to domain. (For Switzerland, see Lüdi et al 1997, Durmüller 1991, Watts et al).

(4) Domain-specific LF

There are certain domains (e.g. academia, aircraft, multinational companies, rock scene) where one language, in this case English, is the international LF and is employed in some cases even by people with a limited general proficiency in the language. The discourse rules of English as a national language are often imposed as norms on English as a LF (For academic texts, see e.g. Clyne 1987).

English as a lingua franca has effected the internal use of English in speaking and especially in reading and writing in higher education, business, and other domains such as Denmark, Sweden and the Netherlands (For Denmark, see e.g. Preisler 1999).

2.2. Agents of choice:

Multilingual companies, the foreign service and scholarly organizations all make decisions on the choice of LF. It should be remembered, however, that the choice of a LF is usually not an official decision but an informal dyadic one taken by individuals on the basis of their experience, assumptions and language proficiency.

2.2.1. A relevant anecdote:

Let me relate one of my favourite anecdotes: I was sitting on a train between Cologne and Bonn some years ago when a young Turkish man entered the compartment nervously waving a piece of paper with an address on it. A number of people tried to explain to him in ever louder and slower German where to get off, but he did not quite understand. Several people tried in English but to no avail, and the man sitting opposite me attempted to communicate with the Turk in French, but that did not succeed either. Almost as a joke, I tried Dutch and it worked wonders, for he had been employed in the Netherlands for over a decade. At that point, a triangular conversation developed between us and the person opposite who had spoken French, a French-Canadian who had taken his doctorate in Utrecht. So the only means of communication between an Australian, a Turk and a French Canadian turned out to be Dutch! What this demonstrates is the dyadic or triadic and ad hoc nature of the decision to use a particular lingua franca which does not always have to be an international language of wider communication.

3. Some issues concerning LF

The opportunities for LFs in inter-cultural communication have been the subject of much discussion (e.g. in some of the issues of this journal mentioned under 1), but there has been relatively little research on how they actually work. I would like to outline below some suggestions for such research:
(i) How LF communication takes place differently among proficient and non-proficient speakers of the language.

(ii) How and on what basis the LF is chosen. 
For instance, in Central Europe (e.g. Hungary), social, environmental and physical factors impinge on the choice of LF: Less educated people, women, older people, and those in rural areas are more likely to employ German (rather than English) as a LF while the more educated, men, young people, and those in large urban centres are more likely to use English (Clyne 1995: 12–13, based on information from Csaba Földes).

(iii) What negotiations might take place in the choice. What assumptions are there about the preference and competence of the interlocutor? (Cf. Földes 1998, who comments that many Germans assume that Hungarians will automatically use English as a lingua franca without first attempting to communicate in German with them).

(iv) Language mode: Grosjean (1995, 1999) has postulated the notion of a ‘language mode’ determining the extent to which more than one language is activated during speech (see also Lüdi 1998). A more monolingual or a more bilingual (or trilingual) mode may be preferred by speakers generally or according to setting, interlocutor, topic and input. It should be considered what is chosen as the ‘default mode’ for the lingua franca – To what extent is it bi- or multilingual? How is it adjusted in the course of the interaction by the two or more speakers, i.e. to what extent and how is the mode or even the lingua franca changed?

(v) Who accommodates to whom?

(vi) What are the lexical, morphosyntactic, phonological, pragmatic and discursive features of the LF? Are there pidginized grammatical features?

(vii) Do the pragmatic and discursive features persist longer than the others? To what extent are deep cultural values from the speakers’ cultures transferred into the discourse patterns in the LF? How do they lead to mis-communication and non-communication (Gumperz 1982) and how are these resolved (Clyne 1994)?

(viii) There is clearly a need to collect corpora where a lingua franca is employed, to facilitate comparison in the actual use of different lingua francas and some generalization. It would be useful to have as many descriptions as possible of actual LF use, including LF communication where there are wide cultural differences (e.g. Vietnamese, Poles and Maltese interacting in English (Clyne 1994) and smaller ones (e.g. Hungarians, Slovaks and Slovenians communicating in German).

Much existing data focuses on native speaker – non native speaker rather than LF communication. This includes the very rich data disseminating from the European Science Foundation project comparing naturalistic adult second language acquisition across five target languages (Perdue 1982).

(ix) How do English, German, French, etc. as LFs differ from those languages as native languages or acquired for communication with natives? In this respect, English is distinguished by the large proportion of LF users as compared to L1 users (About 1 billion: 350,000) and the global and therefore extreme cultural diversity of L1 and LF users. The discourse rules of LF are subject to wide culture-bound variation. Should the aims and curricula of language teaching for those intending mainly to communicate with native speakers be different from those wishing to use it mainly as a LF?
4. Methodology of data collection on LF

The same kinds of dilemma apply to LF research as to inter-language pragmatics studies. Authentic data has the great advantage of being real. The disadvantages are that data is difficult to collect and not always comparable, that the participants have fixed roles and status, the situation is domain-specific, ethical problems may occur, and the Observer's Paradox applies. In role-play and discourse completion tests too much correspondence between actual and (self-)assumed tends to be presupposed. In role-play, stereotypes may be reinforced (Cf. Kasper and Dahl 1991, Wolfsohn et al 1989, Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford 1992).

5. Some ethnolectal issues

5.1. Ethnolects

Ethnolects' are varieties of a language that mark speakers as members of ethnic groups who originally used another language or distinctive variety. Two types of ethnolects have gained prominence in multilingual and multicultural societies.

One type is characteristic of a specific group. It has been an object of interest in historical linguistics in connection with substrata, i.e. the influence of a language no longer spoken by a group on the way it uses its new language - on its lexicon, grammar, phonology and prosody. Of importance in language contact studies is that as the use of a minority language declines, in the second generation and beyond, its symbolic significance as an identity marker is transferred to a variety of the majority language, the variety which is employed by the minority group either generally or in in-group situations - e.g. Jewish American English (Gold 1981, Glinert 1992), previous German Australian English and current Greek and Yiddish Australian English (Clyne, Eisikovits and Tollfree fc), Jewish, Czech and Italian ethnolects of Imperial Austrian German (Jacobs 1996, Clyne 1999). Due to incomplete acquisition of the second language, it is not useful to base research on ethnolects on samples from first generation bilinguals. Within her Matrix Language Framework which focuses on the roles played by the two (or more) languages in codeswitching, Myers-Scotton (e.g. 1993) has postulated that, over time, a turnover occurs and the embedded language becomes the matrix language and vice versa, i.e. the other language provides the morphosyntactic frame for the code-switched utterances. However, many of the ethnolects are characterized by phonological and prosodic features.

Some of the questions that still require consideration are:

(i) Why are some ethnolects marked by morphosyntactic features, some more by lexical ones and still others phonologically or prosodically? Is this related to interaction with other groups?

(ii) What social factors are conducive to the development and maintenance of ethnolects? Geographical concentration leading to dense networks and a common specific religious affiliation seem to be candidates (Clyne, Eisikovits and Tollfree fc).

(iii) What is the role of social networks in ethnolects?

(iv) Is it the case (as has been suggested by Clyne 1999 for Austrian German) that ethno-
lects play a substantial role in the transference of lexical items into the ‘mainstream’ language? If so, what are the characteristics of the ‘minority’ group that are conducive to the process of transference (e.g. concentration in certain occupations, integration into the ‘mainstream’ with strong multiple identity, ethnolinguistic vitality – cf. Giles, Bourhis and Taylor 1977). The use of the ethnolects by some members of the majority group, e.g. youth, as in the case of mixed-code Italian ethnolect of Swiss-German (Franceschini 1998) is a case in point.

5.2. ‘Multiethnolects’.

The other type of ethnolect may be termed a ‘multi-ethnolect’ because several minority groups use it collectively to express their minority status and/or as a reaction to that status to upgrade it. In some cases, where members of the dominant (ethnic) group, especially young people, share it with the ethnic minorities in a ‘language crossing’ situation (Kotsinas 1992, Rampton 1995, 1998). It is the expression of a new kind of group identity.

Recent research on multi-ethnolects in Rinkeby (Stockholm) and Bradford and East London (Kotsinas 1992, Rampton 1995, 1998) is being complemented by a large project in the Lombok district of Utrecht and similar research in Germany and Norway. Warren (fc) in Melbourne is examining the stylized multi-ethnolect of “Wog theatre” groups of second generation Australians of Greek, Italian, Turkish and Serbian and Croatian backgrounds.

Some questions that need to be asked about the actual speech:
(i) What are the linguistic features of multi-ethnolects? Do they constitute common features of the source languages or salient features of one of them? Do they really extend beyond individual lexical items and shared phonological features that differentiate several base languages from the ‘mainstream’ language?
(ii) How consistent are multi-ethnolects in their features across speakers of different languages?
(iii) How do such varieties work at the discourse level?
(iv) What is the role of social networks in multi-ethnolects?

What ethnolects (of both types) have to do with LFs is that they are, in fact, ethnolects of the LF.

6. Non-European languages

The world does not end at the European borders, whether the present EU borders or projected ones. All Europeans have to communicate with people from beyond Europe (as is clear from the number of ‘non-European’ immigrants in Britain, Netherlands, and France). Some of the LFs may in future be languages from outside Europe (e.g. Arabic, Mandarin). If that is the case, some of the issues raised in relation to English may become relevant in reverse. In any case, the study of LFs and ethnolects will undoubtedly enhance our understanding of convergence and divergence between languages and contribute to inter-cultural communication.
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