Linguistic and Social Justice: Towards a Debate of Intersections and Disjuncture

Avineri, Netta; Graham R. Laura; Johnson, Eric J., Riner, Robin Conley, and Jonathan Rosa (eds.). 2019. *Language and Social Justice in Practice*. Routledge: New York.

Gazzola, Michele, Templin, Torsten, and Wickström, Bengt-Arne (eds.). 2019. *Language Policy and Linguistic Justice - Economic, Philosophical and Sociolinguistic approaches*. Heidelberg: Springer.

Introduction

A concern with a fairer distribution of resources has gained scholarly traction in times of accelerated globalization, post-nationalism, post-colonialism, migration and (super)diversity. Language (policy) matters are social justice matters. All people should have access to the same rights, opportunities and resources. Yet, we know that this principle of full parity is elusive, related to the fact that mundane ways of thinking, speaking and often being are dichotomous, hierarchized, ideological, racialized, gendered and compartmentalized.

To address these intricacies, language policy and linguistic anthropology are proliferating, interdisciplinary fields of research that tackle questions over the ways language is invested in the creation of linguistic and social inequalities. Anthropologists in particular have been concerned with social justice matters and forms of political activism to achieve equality for many decades. Recently, critical applied, educational, socio-linguistic and language policy scholarship has turned its attention to studying multilingualism from a social and linguistic justice perspective.

In this article, I review and compare two edited volumes that broadly deal with issues of social and linguistic justice in linguistically diverse societies. What constitutes linguistic and social justice is, however, approached quite differently by the contributors, with each book pointing towards different methodological and conceptual paths. So one challenge for me in writing this

review article lies indeed in drawing meaningful comparisons and deconstructing two fundamentally different approaches: one, grounded in linguistic and cultural anthropology, takes conceptualizations of language as social practice as a basis, and mainly draws on ethnographic approaches (Avineri et al.); the other is grounded in the economics of language, language policy, language philosophy, and political science, and is mainly concerned with the resource allocation (or efficiency) and distribution (fairness) of language policy from an economic perspective (Gazzola et al.). In this sense, these two volumes fulfil different roles and purposes in the type of academic knowledge they produce. Although we may treat the edited collections as complementary, they are radically distinct in their genre, too, and thus need to be understood in their entirety first, before they can be appraised and connected. For this reason, I am going review and comment on the contents of each edited volume first, and then proceed with attempting to weigh up their congruities and dissimilarities. As I was reviewing the books, I considered the following key questions: What are the two volumes about and what aims do they pursue? What ontologies and epistemologies do they use in approaching and analysing language (policy) and social/linguistic justice? In what ways do the genres of the two volumes differ and what impact does this have on the scholarly knowledge production and dissemination? What are ways forward to continue the scholarly conversation?

The books

Language and Social Justice in Practice is a unique collaborative project that showcases a collection of case studies of emerging and established scholars, mainly linguistic and sociocultural anthropologists who work on the interstices of language and social justice in diverse global contexts. The edited volume stems from the leadership and work of the joint Society for Linguistic Anthropology (SLA)/ American Anthropological Association (AAA) Task Group on Language and Social Justice. The volume consists of a co-authored introduction by the five editors, and five major thematic parts (language and race, language and education, language and health, language and social activism, and language, law, and policy), which bring together 24 unique 'essays' (as the editors label them). Each thematic block is introduced by a short one-page introduction and three key critical questions the reader is invited to consider as they read the cases.

In the introduction, Avineri, Graham, Johnson, Conley Riner and Rosa detail the motivation for this joint project and give thorough consideration to the concept of social justice that lies at the heart of this volume. They centre the discussion of language and social justice on five key issues: access, equity, power, privilege, and marginalization. Issues of access involve the ways resources are distributed in more or less equitable ways in society. Efforts towards ensuring access for all are, however, not limited to notions of inclusion. Rather, they also entail the 'fundamental transformation of structures' (p. 6) that have led to privileges for some social groups and marginalization of others. Hierarchies of power are another key element in the discussion of social justice and the ways (in)equities are systemic phenomena rather than contemporary facets of life. The essays in the edited volume are all short, thus making space for many different topics, debates and approaches, and a wide-ranging coverage of data to be included. Essentially, they detail the relationships among language, social action, and broader social changes in various geographical locations, ranging from the US, to Central and South America, to Africa. Notably, European perspectives are missing.

In Part I, the empirical case studies trace the role of language in reproducing racial injustice and disrupting inequities across multiple contexts such as education, media representations and popular discourses. In Chapter 1, Daniels problematizes the nexus of race, language ideologies, and harm reduction in secondary school classrooms in England. The author offers an auto-ethnographic account of a White high school teacher of students of Colour. She critically reflects on her own language pedagogy of code-switching into a Standardised English as a means of reproducing linguistic and racial marginalisation of students. Through the concept of harm production, Daniels problematizes the consequences of her own Whiteness on language pedagogy and language learning and the ways the students mitigate the potential harm caused by it. She gives us a reflexive account of how she moved her own teaching practices, mainly centred on code-switching and ideologies of standardness, to a more student experience-led pedagogy that questions the raciolinguistic ideologies that perpetuate a White teaching force. In Chapter 2, Hodges examines the ways public media discourses focus too narrowly on cases of individual racism, thereby erasing the broader systemic and institutional racism that underpins racist events. He draws on the ideological and racialized media coverage of an alleged slur by American George Zimmerman who shot dead an unarmed African American high school student. Hodges aims to drive the conversation forward by dismantling mundane assumptions about racism that make the workings of that very system opaque. Rosa, in Chapter 3, explores the 'Drop the I-word Campaign', a linguistic and social justice initiative to eradicate

the use of the term 'illegal' when talking about immigration in mainstream public media outlets. Rosa traces various discourses and debates that tend to equate linguistic change with social change, and flags up the fallacy of such thinking as this ignores the broader structural disparities and those powerful subjects that appear authorised to talk about (im)migration in certain legitimised ways. In Chapter 4, Communicating and Contesting Islamophobia, Durrani explores processes of Othering Muslims by looking at instances of discriminatory linguistic profiling, and situating these in a larger sociohistorical frame to understand the formation of raciolinguistic ideologies about Muslims. Smalls (Chapter 5) traces digital discourses of Emphatic Blackness, performative racial schema as part of digital discourses, in the Black Lives Matter movement by discussing a variety of linguistic and discursive acts of protest, which give voice to Black public spaces over the historical Whiteness of public space.

In Part II, Language and Education, Henderson et al. (Chapter 6) problematise equities over access to dual language programs, parental involvement of high- and low-income parents, standardised language testing and teaching of language forms, taking Texas as case study. Touching upon similar issues, Viesca and Poza (Chapter 7) take us to Colorado to critically debate one central piece of language education policy as an example of social justice in action, the Colorado Read Act, a literacy law that tests students for reading deficiencies and may result in the removal from class of identified students for additional literacy support. The authors debate how the law affects emergent bilinguals in a school system that is biased towards English monolingualism, and show how collective expertise of researchers, educators and policymakers can steer policy discussions and political processes in favour of a fair assessment of bilingual students' literacy skills and to combat monolingual normativity. In Chapter 8, Lindholm-Leary et al. offer a case study of Dual Language Education (DLE) in Oregon. They pin down a range of meaningful ways that DLE and social justice are interconnected through the participation and integration of English learners and English native speakers into a shared community. Lauwo (Chapter 9) continues with a discussion of translanguaging as a means of agency for multilingual students in Tanzania and interrogates a marked shift form bilingual to multilingual education in the light of colonisation. Johnson concludes Part II with 'The Language Gap' (Chapter 10) by zooming into the ways that scholarly research is often linguistically flawed in the ways it portrays the language of low-income communities through a deficit perspective, and influences media to publicly promote certain types of research. He elaborates on examples of socially just pedagogies through mobilising strategies of public

awareness, mentoring programs for students and teachers and teaching with a focus on students' strengths rather than deficits.

Part III focuses on Language and Health. In Briggs' contribution (Chapter 11), we learn more about health and communicative inequities in Venezuela's rain forest, in which indigenous populations died from a mysterious epidemic. He problematizes the hierarchical relationship between doctors, who speak the language of science and modernity (Spanish) speakers, and patients, who speak an indigenous language (Warao) that is associated with ignorance and superstition. Chapter 12, by Black, focuses on non-profit HIV/AIDS research in South Africa and specifically draws on 9-month ethnographic fieldwork with support groups and activist organizations. The study foregrounds the existing hierarchisation of communication between experts and laypeople, which brings about a dichotomization of inequities between rich and poor countries, advantaged and less privileged racial groups, and medical staff vs. patients. The next case study in Chapter 13 continues with the topic of HIV/AIDS through the lens of deaf communities. Byrd and Monaghan, through an auto-biographical account, deconstruct 'unequal communicative labour' during medical interactions among Deaf HIV/AIDS patients, medical staff, doctors and interpreters. What all these contributions share is the authors' argument on anthropology as key to understanding and remedying social justice in diverse health settings. Flood et al. (Chapter 14) conclude this section with a study on linguistic and health disparities in Guatemala, arguing for the integration of minority language planning within community-based health and social programs.

Part IV, Language and Social Activism, consists of contributions from scholarly activists interested in rendering political or social change the status quo. In Chapter 15, Avineri and Perley engage with naturalized forms of racism in the US through sports team mascots, name calling and racial slurs. They introduce a coalition program for practical action against such persevering banal white racism against Native Americans, with the aim to turn hitherto passive audiences as recipients of language and culture into active participants and engaged networks of social justice through diverse texts and genres. Abas and Damico, in Chapter 16, contribute a linguistic landscape study in a public university space in Argentina and specifically focus on the language of activism on a range of signs about social justice findings. In Chapter 17, Bucholtz et al. demonstrate the social agency and bottom-up research activism of youth participants in an academic partnership programme, which takes up issues of linguistic, socioeconomic, educational and racial inequities in California. In Chapter 18, Zimman focuses

on transgender language activism the US and the challenges for developing trans-inclusive language, especially gendered labels and pronouns. The author presents a compelling case for why trans language reforms are crucial for trans people's wellbeing and the affirmation and celebration of their identities. Alim (Chapter 19) concludes Part IV by discussing cases of (de)occupying language, a broader anti-capitalist, anti-imperial, social and linguistic movement., The author details the ways the Occupy activist movement of 2011 occupied language in the sense of transforming public discourse and turning oppressive into more emancipatory language and shows ways of working against normalizing linguistic discrimination and violence.

Part V takes 'Language, Law, and Policy' as its entry point to illuminate cases where social justice is not met by legal and political institutions, including their law and policies. Graham (Chapter 20) examines how indigenous activists in Brazil use bilingual road signage as a means to achieve recognition of their language by the government and the local non-indigenous population. In Chapter 21, Milambiling examines the language-as-right and language-as-resource orientation of the Universal Declaration of Linguistic Rights. This text, whilst not a binding law, acts as a key policy catalyst for working towards the inclusive and socially just recognition of language communities. In Zentella's (Chapter 22) contribution, we learn more about the impact of misleading formulations of US Census categories for English language competency, which lead to the marginalization of people who spoke a language other than English at home. The author details how scholarly activism and concerted efforts can challenge the limits of census questions and, long-term, hopefully lead to more inclusive and equitable understandings of language and treatments of speakers. In Chapter 23, Baran and Holmquist present case studies from North Carolina, which show how immigrants' access to judicial processes is compromised because of linguistic differences that are not catered for in the courtroom. Similarly, the final Chapter 24, by Conley, Riner and Vartkessian, focuses on discursive processes in legal practice and narratives as a form of client advocacy and building empathy in US criminal trials. The authors show that through integrating narratives, complex legal discourses, which often dehumanize and essentialize defendants, can be improved to make the system of law more humane and just.

Now, what do we find in *Language Policy and Linguistic Justice*? In contrast to Avineri et al.'s volume, the book takes language policy as a major entry point. The book is an edited volume of considerable scope that examines and brings together linkages between several lines of work

on language policy, language economics and what the authors and editors coherently term 'linguistic justice'. They engage with the concept through a positive and normative lens and define it more narrowly in relation to language policy as 'the distributive implications of language policies' (p. 4) in multilingual settings. In their view, linguistic justice considers fairness in language policy and planning, that is, 'the fair management of linguistic diversity' (p. 47) for individuals and groups, as well as engagements with the protection of rights for minority groups and with prejudices about multilingualism (p. 47).

The field of language policy has seen numerous directions and turns, from macro-analytic state language policy analyses to micro-analytic policy processes, discursive and ethnographic approaches (Author 2016; Johnson, 2013; Tollefson & Pérez-Milans, 2018). One now relatively established field within language policy research is that of language economics and the economics of language policy, pioneered by François Grin, economist and language policy scholar, and many contributors of *Language Policy and Linguistic Justice*. As suggested by the volume title, and as laid out in the introduction, at the heart of Gazzola et al.'s volume lies the promulgation of an approach to language policy and planning that builds on economic theory, political philosophy, and sociolinguistics. As such, it takes a rather specific approach to the evaluation of language policy and promulgates a specific approach towards achieving a more equitable multilingualism. The volume is divided into four major Parts and covers 17 chapters on theoretical, methodological and empirical aspects of language policy and linguistic justice, coherently framed by an economic approach to language policy.

Part I covers an introduction to an economics approach to language policy and linguistic justice and overview of literature informed by political science and economics. For those readers unfamiliar with language and economics, Wickström, Templin and Gazzola's introduction serves as in indispensable and useful read for scholars and students. Key issues from public economics and policy analysis, from the economic value of languages, human and social capital to the evaluation of the costs and benefits of language policy are covered in a thorough way, which lays the groundwork for the ensuing chapters. The 84-page literature review (Chapter 2) on linguistic justice and fairness in multilingual contexts, by Alcalde, provides an extensive bibliography of political philosophical orientations to linguistic justice and language rights in the context of minority and majority situations, from multiculturalism, equalitarian liberalism and linguistic diversity to hegemony and democracy. Language rights are broadly conceived as a sub-branch of human rights and linked to national or regional legal provisions and the way

these justify language policy choices at the societal or individual level (p. 134-135). To exemplify the abundance of theories about linguistic justice, major contributions have been made by key liberal political theorists such as Kymlicka who have drawn on multiculturalism as part of their understanding of the notion of linguistic justice. Taking this angle, linguistic justice encompasses the protection of (linguistic) rights of minority groups (p. 70) so that people are able to use their language of choice and are afforded equality of opportunity in all aspects of life. Other scholars such as Van Parijs have drawn on equalitarian liberalism (p. 83), which explicitly links language to equality and global solidarity. From this perspective, linguistic justice means a fair cooperation (with language viewed as a public good), equality of opportunity (with language viewed as a skill and an asset), and equal dignity (with language viewed as having symbolic value). Building on these streams of work, critical scholars such as Peled link discussions of linguistic justice more with individual linguistic plurality and plurilingual theories of democracy that contribute to the fair distribution of wealth and dignity. Overall, Alcalde's overview chapter is comprehensive but somewhat selective in terms of ignoring the 'other' largely qualitative ethnographic and discourse-based sociolinguistic, linguistic anthropological and critical field of scholarship on language policy and the political economy of language that deals with social justice matters. I will come back to this point later.

Part II focuses on political, moral and philosophical perspectives on linguistic justice. The first two contributions are specifically concerned with questions of morality and ethics in achieving justice through the assessment of various linguistic environments (Shorten) and through an adaptive approach that considers the paradoxical nature of political life (Peled). Through normative analysis, Shorten debates various approaches to assess demographic and sociolinguistic features of the linguistic environment that impact on an individual's freedom and self-respect. Peled's contribution, situated within normative language policy, in particular foregrounds a linguistic justice approach that is critical, reflexive and historical and grounded in an understanding of language as a contested political issue (p. 187). Von Busekist and Boudou offer a compelling and critically motivated account of the coercive nature of language tests for immigration and postulate a rights-based perspective to language training, as opposed to language testing as a requirement in the context of migration, citizenship application processes and language tests. This perspective favours free language training for migrants and the provision of transitory services in order to achieve parity of esteem and respect the dignity of migrant populations (p. 204-205). Barbier concludes Part II by deconstructing the myth of English as the common language in the EU. The author offers various empirical insights from

existing language attitude and language competence surveys and discusses the findings in light of hostility to European integration and anti-European ethno-populism.

In Part III, the contributors specifically engage with economic approaches, many of them methodological, to the cost-benefit analysis of multilingual language policies in Europe, Canada and Africa, and the chapters indeed showcase what I would consider core work in the economics of language (policy), based on rational questions that are answered through formulae and calculations. Linguistic justice per se features more or less prominently across these chapters. In Vaillancourt's chapter, which is based on previous work, this is done through a methodological exploration of the costs and benefits of providing public services bilingually in Canada. Caminal and Di Paolo draw on statistical and multivariate analysis of the concept of linguistic preference as a basis for investigating endogamy in Spanish and Catalan-speaking individuals. In Buzasi and Foldvari, we find a quantitative exploration of income and human capital accumulation in multilingual sub-Saharan African contexts. Burckhardt's chapter discusses the effects of language policy and planning on transnational labour mobility in Europe. The author offers us a methodological account of the evaluation of the linguistic disenfranchisement indicator, which measures the proportion of people being excluded from the group of beneficiaries under a specific language regime, based on the presence or absence of specific language skills. Continuing with the European context, Voslamber discusses the choice of working languages in EU institutions and the underlying injustices, which he claims concern requirements for staff's specific language skills, a neglect of the linguistic demographics in the EU, and the economic advantages of countries whose languages is being used in institutions. He proposes a more equitable language regime to the current regime of EU institutions by choosing a limited number of working languages that correspond to their demographic weight and their practicability and usefulness.

Part IV deals with sociolinguistic views and applications of language policy and linguistic justice in multilingual settings, with sociolinguistics here singled out as a more qualitatively-inclined and case-study-based field. Iannàccaro, Gobbo and Dell'Aquila's chapter assesses sociolinguistic justice through a range of parameters in speech communities and through the concept of linguist unease. They add a specific sociolinguistic angle to previous discussions of linguistic justice by rooting the debate in linguistic communities of practice, the differing perceptions and evaluations of language varieties, and the existing power imbalance amongst speakers in different communicative situations. Linguistic unease, as a 'symptom of linguistic

injustice' (p. 367) means that speakers feel their own linguistic repertoire does not fit the collective communicative requirements of the speech community.

Minority language rights are investigated in the context of Hungarian-speaking minorities in Romania (Csata and Marácz) and from a service-based perspective in the bilingual regions of Slovenia (Limon, Medvešek and Lukanović). The next two contributions focus on migration, with Meylaerts examining turns to translation practices, beliefs and management in the superdiverse and linguistically complex city of Antwerp in Flanders in Belgium. The author presents a telling case of re-thinking notions of cohesion, unity, integration and belonging in multilingual cities by paying explicit attention to interpreting services and translation policies and practices that should assure language rights for minority communities. The second contribution, by Machetti, Barni, and Bagna discusses migrant language policies in Italy. The final contribution by Brosch and Fiedler responds to existing critiques of Esperanto, a planned language that should facilitate fair and democratic international communication. They counter arguments held by a range of sceptical scholars that downplay the neutrality and simplicity advantages of Esperanto by drawing on a case study of speakers' communicative behaviour and corpus-analytic research on the use of lingua franche, including Esperanto, in a variety of settings such as higher education, everyday communication and tourism.

Linguistic and social justice: searching for the common denominator

So, when we talk about 'linguistic' and 'social' justice, are we talking about the same things? Justice is, after all, a nebulous term that can be approached via different lenses, ontologies and epistemologies. Political theory, some streams in applied/sociolinguistics, linguistic anthropology and language economics seem to have different understandings of this concept, which mainly rest on differing conceptualisations of what 'language' is, how it is understood, and how it can be analysed. *Language and Social Justice in Practice* draws together rigorous anthropological research. In the main, all contributions view language as social action that operates to reduce social justice but can equally be used to create more equitable societies. Looking at language through various key angles, that is, race, bilingual education, discourse, health, social activism and law, the essays share a 'bottom-up' approach to the ways people use language to limit equitable participation in social life but also how it can be mobilized to bring about change. All of the essays owe much to the introduction of the volume. A central

argument, which recurs in various forms across the essays, is that language figures variably in the distribution of opportunities and resources in society. Language is broadly understood as a social practice that can effect change and can be observed, explained and critiqued through attending to 'societal, structural, systemic, institutional and interpersonal modes of participation' (p. 5) and a strong focus on agency.

In contrast, *Language Policy and Linguistic Justice* places the economics of language (policy) at the heart of its scholarly enquiries. As the subtitle suggests, the analytic approach taken lies in economic, philosophical and sociolinguistic orientations, although the vast number of contributions orient towards an economic approach to language. This particular field of inquiry 'rests on the paradigm of mainstream economics and uses the concepts and tools of economics in the study of relationships featuring linguistic variables' (Grin et al. 2010: 28). As we see across many chapters in the volume (specifically those in Part III), variables such as earnings, productivity, profits, costs, sales, and market share are analysed through largely quantitative and economic methods in relation to language across a range of European workplace, and public institution contexts. Language is thus understood as a variable and skill; a property of producers and consumers that can be measured, counted, compared and, ultimately, fed into the development of language policies. Such more structuralist understandings of language, and how it can be observed and analysed, are radically different to the language-as-practice orientation we find in Avineri et al.'s volume.

How, then, do the two volumes approach debates over justice? I would like to start from the premise that the term 'justice' and concerns over injustices are related to questions over truth, virtue and morality and an imagined standard against we evaluate experienced injustices. In Gazzola et al., justice is primarily conceived as anchored in the 'distribution of resources or access to resources, such as equal opportunities and/or allocative "efficiency" (such as correcting market failures) in a society' (p.10). Justice, in Wickström et al.'s conceptualisation, is further understood as a more normative benchmark principled by choice, i.e. a situation 'characterised by strict equality of all individuals' and who should have the right to express themselves in 'any language of their choice in any situation in society' (p. 45). Linguistic justice is understood more narrowly as the presence or absence of legal rights for individuals to be accommodated in certain languages in specific domains (p.44). Avineri et al., in turn, capture social justice as a 'contested concept and existential problem' (p.3) and treat it as both 'a process and a goal' (p. 4). So there are certainly broad commonalities here over language

and justice that both volumes discuss: how to account for questions over access, resources, and equity in linguistically diverse societies.

I want to digress briefly here and draw on Piller's line of argumentation (2016, p. 5); for Piller, linguistic diversity should form an explicit part of social justice debates. Underlying her argument is the claim that engagements with social justice encompass principal issues of 'disadvantage and discrimination related to gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, religion, and age'. Based on work by Nancy Fraser (1995; 2005), Piller's argument frames social justice as made of economic redistribution, cultural recognition and political representation. These are, in principle, key themes that resonate widely in Avineri et al.'s volume, which indeed positions itself explicitly as an extension of the claim of Piller to 'put linguistic diversity "on the map" of social justice debates' (p. 2). Fraser's (2005) critical theory of social justice is, however, notably missing here. Similarly, Gazzola et al.'s volume shares the concern with injustices experienced in the context of multilingualism. Yet, for epistemological and ontological reasons, there is unfortunately no thorough engagement with neither Piller's and nor Fraser's work (except for featuring in the literature review).

Where, then, does this leave the shared motivation to engage with linguistic and social justice? Both volumes are interested in understanding and flagging up linguistic disadvantage as part of a broader social justice agenda, to varyingly degrees. A key commonality of both volumes lies in the ways they put the Herderian dogma of 'one language-one-people-one-territory' back on the shelf and promulgate an approach to diversity that is grounded in a plurality of languages and speakers across multi-centred polities and communities as well as in their democratic participation. As such, they share the critique of nation state ideologies that treat language as a static entity and not as socially constructed dynamic media of communication. Another commonality is the shared topical concern over the state of minority and endangered languages, multilingual education and institutions as catalysts for social (in)justice. Claims for justice are inherently about claims people in majority and minority contexts make over access, resources and participation. Justice-based claims are also desiderata for equilibrium and balance in the ways languages and speakers are perceived and treated. In that sense, both volumes are concerned with addressing and solving human problems, though notably via different means.

Language and Social Justice in Practice is an exemplary collection of language activism, stemming from the joint committee work of the contributors. The central ambitions of the

scholars involved lie in increasing awareness within the scholarly field and the general public of how language serves as a tool of discrimination and social injustices for people on the ground. And yet, one weakness that emerges across the empirical cases is a lack of attention to the agency-structure dynamic. On the one hand, we learn a lot about the different formations and experiences of social injustices by different social actors in different public and private spheres, institutions and media (as the focus of the book on 'practice' clearly suggests). We also learn about ways of combatting such injustices to transform the status quo. On the other hand, it is unfortunate that less thought is given to the social structures that orchestrate the unequal distribution of resources and how people's actions mutually shape the structural organization of social life (but see Rosa's and Johnson's chapters as notable exceptions here)

The guiding principle of activism and the concerted effort on agency lies in stark contrast to *Language Policy and Linguistic Justice*, which is not activist and more concerned with examining socio-economic effects of language policies on justice and inequality at more macro national and international scales and how liberal and democratic values are undermined by policy. Such concerns are broadly addressed through more rational analysis and with a core concern of how a higher level of welfare and a fairer linguistic environment can be achieved through policy and planning processes. Many of the empirically robust studies engage with tangible linguistic inequalities for and prejudices faced by people, for example, in the context of labour mobility, social segmentation and the knowledge of certain languages over others.. A range of chapters, albeit limited, offer the reader the more critical facets of linguistic justice and raise important moral and philosophical questions of language (policy) and linguistic justice. To exemplify, such contributions are offered by Peled's nuanced account of the bundling of communication and morality, Busekist and Boudou's chapter on immigration and citizenship tests that interrogates language as tools for democratic participation, Csata and Marácz' concerns over linguistic stratification in Romania, and Iannàccaro et al.'s concept of linguistic unease and power dynamics. For the more statistically and economically oriented chapters, it would have been equally illuminating to keep spinning the social justice debate by taking the inquiry one step further and ask: what does this empirically evidenced inequality do, to whom, when, where and how? And how can it be remedied or counter-acted? Through which policy formulations? Or stakeholder conversations?

How to write about linguistic and social justice: scholarly conversations at a crossroad

The essay genre privileged in *Language and Social Justice in Practice* allows for a wide variety of topics, notably from non-European contexts, to be covered, and makes it an accessible read for a mainly undergraduate, if not broader, non-academic audience. At the same time, it also limits the amount of detail provided for methodology, which is unfortunate, and more thorough conceptual engagements with social justice and the way language is fabricated in it across all chapters. In comparison, a key strength of Gazzola et al.'s volume is indeed its methodological precision across many of the empirical chapters.

In addition, some of the chapters in Avineri et al. have clear structures, while others lack headings or sub-headings, which would guide the user through the essays. More consistency here could improve the readability of the essays. Furthermore, some authors inevitably do a better job at articulating what social justice means in their respective case studies (e.g. Rosa and Bucholtz et al.), whilst others tend to gloss over the concept or flag it up merely in the conclusion (e.g. Smalls and Durrani). This is as much to do with author preferences, prioritizations and the limited nature of the essay genre as much as anything else, but it feels a little unfortunate that the justice matter is less pronounced in certain contributions.

Gazzola et al.'s volume also covers a variety of topics, mostly Eurocentric in nature, but is written for a more specified and academically versed audience, which is already demonstrated in the sheer length of the chapters. For example, Alcalde's chapter is impressive but reminds me more of a handbook entry, that is, a comprehensive and detailed reference work. There are, however, considerable infelicities present in the style and genre of the volume. Some chapters follow a foot-note based reference scheme whilst others use in-text citations. Chapter 2 in particular is inconsistent in integrating in-text citations; there are also a range of punctuation issues present. These are minor infelicities that could certainly be improved in a second edition of the volume.

These issues bring me to the more substantial point of scholarly conversations that appear to be at a crossroad. Any edited volume, and in particular introductory and literature chapters that aim to review the field or set the scene, are inherently sketchy and partial, with lines of research

being neglected. Given the distinct disciplines of the two volumes, it is not surprising to find highly distinct bibliographies and references that are barely in conversation with each other. This review does not offer me the space to elaborate on what can and cannot be gained from a mutual conversation between the distinct disciplines. I would argue, however, that more critical debate is warranted here to provide potential answers to the existing lack of communication between different scholarly traditions.

Undoubtedly, *Language Policy and Linguistic Justice* stands out as an interdisciplinary collection of work. Gazzola et al. have edited an engaging volume on the distributive socioeconomic effects of language policy, a topic that has certainly made the jump from the periphery to the centre in terms of key approaches in language policy and planning, next to historical, discursive and ethnographic approaches. The book manages to add theoretical depth and analytical precision to current debates about linguistic justice and language policy. Moreover, the volume shows why there can be no full understanding of language and justice without attending to interdisciplinary work, here anchored in political, philosophical, economic and sociolinguistic scholarship. Gazzola et al.'s tangible and robust linguistic-economic research certainly also appeals to policy makers and government bodies, who are keen on evidence-based results, quantitative research and statistical data to inform policy and planning decisions.

This leads me, however, to the main flaws this book poses for scholars concerned with social justice. The economic input to address questions over linguistic justice has its boundaries, which are well acknowledged in the introductory chapter of *Language Policy and Linguistic Justice*. Various other authors, such as Vaillancourt, even go as far as suggesting that 'economists do not have the tools to answer this [social justice] question' (p. 257). This, then, leaves me wondering what toolbox would allow researchers to provide answers to social justice matters? The reflexivity about the limitations of one's research approach, which is laudable, still leaves the reader wondering whether we can really, and ought to, view engagements over linguistic justice through three different lenses: economic, political and sociolinguistic; or whether a more inter-connected approach would provide more satisfactory answers.

The concern over linguistic justice taken in this volume also somehow lacks a sustained social embedding and discussion of inequality and power in social relationships – inherent concepts in any discussion of language policy. It is surprising to see that language policy is defined

rather narrowly from a rights-based and domain-based perspective, as the authors also concede, as a 'specification of language rules applied to a set of relevant domains and a set of languages' (p. 32) and a 'set of rights to use certain languages in certain public domains' (p. 53). Language policy, we can argue, is more than public policy and sets of rules. No attempts are made, however, in the chapters, to get up to speed with more present-day language policy scholarship that foregrounds the ideological nature of language policy beyond rights and domains and its imbued power dimension (see e.g. Shohamy (2006), Tollefson & Pérez-Milans (2018), Hult (2010)). As such, the book leaves unexplored some crucial connections that could have broadened its appeal.

As in any edited volume of this scale and format, one way of expanding the scope and breadth of *Language Policy and Linguistic Justice* would be to consider more applied linguistic, critical sociolinguistic and linguistic anthropological scholarship on social justice and language policy issues in the economic field. As it stands, this type of scholarship has been largely ignored, except for occasional references to Hornberger and Johnston's seminal work on the ethnography of language policy, Spolsky's classic language policy model and language management theory, Ricento's critically oriented work on language policy and the political economy of global English as well as key works of Ives, who bridges language policy and political theory, and May, who examines minority language rights and nationalism. Critical discursive and sociolinguistic ethnographic work would certainly enrich the predominantly quantitative angle towards examining linguistic (in)justice, fairness, and democratic participation via models of economic activity and interaction. Such a move could contribute to challenge the idea that multilingualism is the sum of separate, co-existing languages and the notion of measurable language skills per se, which are deceptively reductionist. Some chapters of the volume lean in this direction, especially in the sociolinguistic Part IV of the book.

However, as Coupland notes: 'Sociolinguistics is, as they say, a broad church' (2007, p. 4). The sociolinguistic approaches adopted in Part IV seem to largely rest on orthodox inquiries into multilingualism as separate bounded languages. Nonetheless, it is in this section that most parallels can be drawn to the social-justice orientations we find in Avineri et al. For example, Machetti et al. argue for a more context-based conception of language planning as something not confined to top-down institutional decisions but something that is highly localized, and individualized. Likewise, Iannàccaro et al. touch upon central issues of power and inclusion and introduce the concept of 'sociolinguistic' justice – a concept also used by Bucholtz et al.,

but without any touching points here. Iannàccaro talk about sociolinguistic justice from a more structural perspective to detail how issues of mobility, immigration and societal multilingualism have changed and impacted on the speech repertoires of communities and their linguistic unease. In contrast, Bucholtz et al. link sociolinguistic justice with agency and the ways marginalised communities seek self-determination in their struggles over language and discrimination in social life. In terms of social justice engagements, Voslamer's contribution also stands out as he flags up various core injustices of the existing language regime of the EU and proposes explicit remedies. Likewise, Peled's conceptual work on the ethics of language and the politics of multilingualism espouses critical political and linguistic agency. These contributions resemble the more critical and activist approach we find in Avineri et al.

What Gazzola et al.'s volume also demonstrates is that scholars active in the field of language economics have largely ignored the bulk of research, mostly qualitative, discursive and ethnographic in nature, on the role and value of multilingualism in global knowledge economies and the treatment of language as an economic resource. One notable exception is Limon et al.'s contribution on the economic value of languages in ethnically mixed areas in Slovenia. In their study, they draw on Bourdieu's (e.g. 1991) work to argue that language is a social practice and is entangled in the circulation of resources. The interested reader may wish to explore Heller and Duchêne's (2016) response to various critiques of their treatment of language as commodity in critical sociolinguistics. So in this regard, I tend to agree with Block who observes a mismatch of scholarly dialogue here between two fields of inquiry (language economics and critical sociolinguistics), which are rooted in the differing epistemological and ontological takes on (researching) language (Block, 2018).

One central claim we find in *Language and Social Justice in Practice* is that issues of language and social justice 'must take into consideration the existence of entrenched social hierarchies of power as well as the ideological assumptions that maintain them' (p. 7). Whilst concerns with power and ideology characterize many of the chapters, most of the linguistic anthropological studies we find in Avineri et al., albeit their critical-activist orientation, could benefit from tying their situated case studies more to philosophical engagements with morality and justice and the political-economic conditions of language in social life (see e.g. Del Percio, Flubacher, & Duchêne, 2016). This would allow better grasping and explaining of the construction, distribution and consumption of resources as well as hierarchies and ideologies across a spatio-temporal scale. It would also do better justice to examining the constant

dialectic of agency-structure in the creation and experience of injustice; as it stands, Avineri et al.'s volume is mainly concerned with agency and falls a little short of engaging with structural concerns over justice and language.

Going forward: the social life surrounding language (policy)

The two volumes reviewed here can certainly be recommended to researchers, students and other stakeholders interested in the linguistic, economic and social dimension of justice and language policy: both for the varying and vast empirical insights they provide and the different fashion in which they deal with issues of linguistic and social justice. Nevertheless, key questions remain: how can a justice-based approach to language be more meaningfully connected to the political economy of language? How can we ensure greater cross-perspective scholarly dialogue and methodical openness to address the linguistic *and* social facets of justice? Whilst this review doesn't allow me the space nor the purpose to respond to these questions, I put them up here for further scholarly reflection and for fruitful future avenues of research to be pursued.

Going forward, scholars may have to shift the centrality of language as a scholarly entry point towards looking at which agents, institutions, affects, discourses and ideologies shape the way language is vested in (re)producing justice. So as in the case of *Language Policy and Linguistic Justice*, the major concern with linguistic over social justice matters runs the risk of centralising language without paying enough attention to power issues, stratification, race, gender, class and ethnicity – in short, the social life surrounding language. There is nothing questionable about the compatibility of quantitative research and pursuing a social justice agenda, as Gazzola et al.'s volume demonstrates. But it is maybe a matter of coupling quantitative, economic approaches with more qualitative and critically motivated enquiries and slightly change the questions we ask. This would certainly be an exciting avenue to pursue and may produce stimulating, mutually beneficial scholarly conversations – in the genuine spirit of interdisciplinarity. Likewise, the contributors in Avineri et al. could have broadened their scope and considered more political-philosophical and political-economic orientations to language and social justice. In this regard, I would argue that Fraser's (2005) critical theory of social justice on redistribution, recognition and representation in the context of global capitalism, currently underrepresented in both volumes, could move the discussion of the field forward.

Finally, if we consider linguistic and social justice engagements a socially oriented pursuit, then I would also suggest a re-focus on the structure-agency dialectic and teasing out more the notion of power in the formation of inequalities. In the vein of Harvey, I question whether it is at all possible to talk about justice without attending more specifically to the power dynamics operating in specific places at specific times (1996, p. 329).

References

Author 2016.

Block, David. 2018. *Political Economy and Sociolinguistics: Neoliberalism, Inequality and Social Class*. London: Bloomsbury.

Coupland, Nikolas. 2007. *Style: Language Variation and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Del Percio, Alfonso, Mi-Cha Flubacher, and Alexandre Duchêne. 2016. Language and Political Economy. In García, Ofelia, Nelson Flores, and Massimiliano Spotti (eds.) *Oxford Handbook of Language in Society*. New York: Oxford University Press. 55-76.

Fraser, Nancy. 1995. From Redistribution to Recognition? Dilemmas of Justice in a 'Post-Socialist' Age. *New Left Review* 212: 68-93.

Fraser, Nancy. 2005. Reframing Justice in a Globalizing World. *New Left Review* 36: 1-19.

Harvey, David. 1996. *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Heller, Monica and Alexandre Duchêne. 2016. Treating Language as an Economic Resource: Discourse, Data, Debates. In Nikolas Coupland (ed.) *Sociolinguistics: Theoretical debates*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 139–156.

Hult, Francis. 2010. Analysis of Language Policy Discourses across the Scales of Space and Time. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 202: 7-24.

Johnson, David Cassels. 2013. *Language Policy*. Bastingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Piller, Ingrid. 2016. *Linguistic Diversity and Social Justice: An Introduction to Applied Sociolinguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Shohamy, Elana. 2006. *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches*. London: Routledge.

Tollefson, James W. and Miguel Pérez-Milans (eds.). 2018. *The Oxford Handbook of Language Policy and Planning*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.