

EDITORIAL: DECIPHERING THE DOUBLE CODE OF *SUSTAINABLE MULTILINGUALISM*

I wish to express my thanks to the editors of *Sustainable Multilingualism* for the opportunity to write this editorial in the eighth year of the journal celebrating its inclusion in the SCOPUS database. This milestone in the journal's development confirms the global recognition of the scholarship of our authors and offers more efficient citation indexing and access of our papers to a wider international readership. This editorial celebrates this eight-year milestone in the continued academic development of our journal. This first issue of 2020 is an opportune time to trail over its development, remembering the promise of its inauguration, analysing its first eight years of successful scholarly development and to look towards the future vision of *Sustainable Multilingualism*.

Sustainable Multilingualism – Its inauguration

Birth and vision of the journal (2012 issue 1). *Sustainable Multilingualism* was the fruit of a team of dedicated scholars led by prof. dr. Nemira Mačianskienė from Vytautas Magnus University (VMU), Lithuania, who together with prof. dr. Manuel Célio Conceição from Algarve University, Portugal were concerned with sharing communications from the successful 2011 international conference on 'Multilingualism in Higher Education' held in celebration of the 10th anniversary of the then 'Centre of Foreign Languages', now called the 'Institute of Foreign Languages'. Rather than publishing a one-off proceedings, VMU scholars, in a spirit of collegiality and in an attempt to monitor language policies aimed to strengthen the rich European linguistic capital and enhance the unique European cultural diversity demonstrated by the conference, decided to initiate our bi-annual *Sustainable Multilingualism*. Its highly pertinent name, *Sustainable Multilingualism*, suggested by assoc. prof. Servet Çelik from Trabzon University, Turkey, reflects the intentionality of this vision and the challenges of maintaining multilingualism in a growing global economy. Under the auspices of VMU, the international editorial board, the expert editorial team of prof. dr. Nemira Mačianskienė, assoc. prof. Vilma Bijeikienė, assoc. prof. Servet Çelik and the energetic editorial assistant Jurgita Šerniūtė assisted by IT specialist Martynas Prūsaitis, *Sustainable Multilingualism* has now earned deserved international recognition for promoting research in European multilingual issues.

'Sustainability' requires growing in response to the changing environment, whether it is the sustainability of 'multilingualism' or the sustainability of the journal of *Sustainable Multilingualism*. This editorial for the first issue of 2020 evidences the Journal's sustainability by giving a close commentary on the changing environment of *Sustainable Multilingualism*, particularly in Europe, in conjunction with an analysis of the Journal's response to, and prediction of those changes.

***Sustainable Multilingualism* (SM) - Its first eight years**

In this section, we note the main changes to the multilingual environment; then we show how the journal responded to and sometimes predicted these changes.

SM principles of change: Understanding the double-code to unlocking the meaning, motivation, and future of *Sustainable Multilingualism*.

Sustainable Multilingualism in the context of the growing global economy, is a double code. 'Multilingualism' means 'many languages' and language is the living indicator of the cultural identity of its speakers. When you see 'language' in the context of 'changing economy' think 'changing cultural identity'. 'Sustainable' means 'resources to maintain'. So, the double code *Sustainable Multilingualism* means 'Resources to maintain many cultural identities'. One of the major threats to *Sustainable Multilingualism* is the universal *lingua franca* of economic necessity in the growing global economy. Later I will deconstruct this threat so as to suggest a future *Sustainable Multilingualism*. First, we look at how the threat has developed and its intimate relationship with the development of our journal.

Minority languages suffering in the shadows of Economic expansions.

Economic expansions promising excess wealth to social leaders and subsistence wealth to relatively poor multilingual populations require a *lingua franca*. That *lingua franca* is English. It is economical for social leaders to fund education in only one language, for increased wealth, that language is English. Relatively poor non-English speakers prioritize English over their mother tongues for survival and for the promise of sharing in excess wealth. This tripartite of wealth and of need and of culture is simply visualized by Maslow's Pyramid of needs (Maslow, 1943). Figure 1 shows our model linking Resource needs, Language needs and Cultural identity needs to Maslow's three levels of Human needs. The lower needs must usually be met before we can rise to the higher levels.

- Subsistence needs are: Physiological & Safety needs – food, water, warmth, rest, security & safety.
- Psychological needs are: Belongingness & Esteem needs – intimate relations, friends' prestige & feelings of accomplishment.
- Self-fulfilment needs are: Self-actualisation – achieving one's full potential, including creative activities.

Figure 1

Model linking Resource needs, Language needs and Cultural identity needs to Maslow's three levels of Human needs

Self-fulfilment needs	Wealthy	Plurilingual	Pluricultural identity
Psychological needs	Rich	L1 mother tongue	L1 cultural identity
Subsistence needs	Poor	<i>Lingua franca</i>	No cultural identity
Human needs	Resource needs	Language needs	Cultural identity needs

It is at this point apposite to distinguish multilingualism from plurilingualism. A brief distinction between prefixes multi- and pluri-: Multilingual/Multicultural refers to a group of people who each have at least one language/culture. They might not share their language/culture with others in the group, e.g., a nation of isolated

language/culture groups – ethnic ghettos. On the other hand, Pluricultural refers to individuals who each have two or more languages/cultures. Every person will have a language/culture in common with another language/culture group.

The main distinction is that 'multilingual' applies to nations where several languages are spoken, and an individual may be mono- or pluri-lingual. In contrast, 'plurilingual' applies more restrictively to individuals who speak two or more languages. Multilingualism engages social justice by recognising the language rights of each community attesting to the acceptance of minority groups within a nation state. Plurilingualism promotes translanguaging and foreign language learning and, through language exposure, an appreciation of in. In other words, multilingualism and plurilingualism support cultural diversity by valuing a multiplicity of culturally imbued languages. It would be dystopian to reify these humanistic worldviews without considering the economic realities of the global market and the basic needs for social welfare. Hence, an effective sustainable language policy needs to prudently reconcile the higher individual linguistic needs for self-fulfilment with the harsh economic demands for material well-being. It would be unreasonable to suggest language policies that would ignore social welfare and the fulfilment of basic material needs. In no way this means blindly sanctioning neoliberal policies geared to economic growth through de-regulated international trade, but under globalisation improved quality of life has become unmistakably dependent on sharing a common adaptable flexible language tool such as Globish.

European Union: Promise and disenchantment. Economic motives for expanding the European Economic Community (EEC 1957) to the European Union (EU 1992) were opposed by concerns for the recognition of language rights¹ and a fostering of an appreciation of distinctive European linguistic capital. To this end lightly veiled 'conciliatory' employment programmes were implemented by the EU and keenly supported, programmes such as ERASMUS for students and staff exchanges in universities. In the first decade of the 21st century there was a major EU emphasis on inter-communication, skills and knowledge-sharing for employment and improvement of language facilities throughout the EU to support this. The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) as a common assessment tool was systematically reviewed and its flexibility ensured its adaptation to the diverse European educational contexts. Political priorities were then given to building a more economically viable knowledge-based society with a 'nod' to European linguistic diversity while perversely promoting neoliberal 'Cultural Standardisation'² (Boufouy-Bastick, 2015). Again, the Europe 2020 strategy reiterated the unfulfilled objectives of the Lisbon strategy of the first decade to establish a robust sustainable European knowledge-based economy linked to skills.

Thus, the second decade of the 21st century was marked by changing language concerns, from promoting the teaching of regional languages as legitimate language rights to increasing English proficiency as the *lingua franca* for economic growth within Europe. As in Maslow's hierarchy of needs, learning English now serves to realise pressing physiological needs for economic well-being at the lower

¹ The European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (ECRML) came into force on March 1st, 1998 for the protection and promotion of such languages. However, the ECRML Celebrating its 20th anniversary in 2018, ECRML convention highlighted some of its failings, namely the low level of ratification (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 4). The French Senate rejected ECRML ratification as a threat to national unity in 2015 and urged for closer monitoring.

² Boufouy-Bastick, B. (2015). Rescuing language education from the neoliberal disaster: Culturometric predictions and analyses of future policy. *Policy Futures in Education*, 13(4), 439–467.

level, one's national languages to guarantee social cohesion at the next level up and becoming plurilingual to appreciate cultures at the higher level. It would be futile to resist the spread of English as it buttresses European economy and as such developed as an evolving practical communication trade tool now commonly referred to as Globish. When denuded of its original Anglo culture, Globish is a low risk to European cultures as it enables nations to disconnect the culture from the economic language and insert their own language markers. For example, English culture requires this grammar "Why don't you understand" whereas Chinese Globish can unambiguously substitute the simpler "Why you no understand". The high hopes of the first decade of the 21st century celebrating cultural diversity soon gave way to disillusion towards Europe and the damaging effects of economic globalization associated with the competing neoliberal culture of the English *lingua franca*.

SM's relationship to the changing multilingual environment

The first public appearance of the *Sustainable Multilingualism* concept. The concept of language sustainability was initially discussed at the *Forum 2004 – Dialogue on Linguistic Diversity, Sustainability and Peace* in 2004 in Albert Bastardas-Boada's presentation *Towards a language Sustainability: Concepts, Principles and problems of Human Communicative Organisation in the Twenty-First Century*. Pointing out that 'sustainability' critically is related to economic development and its possible deleterious effects on the environment, this calls for a sustainable development which reconciles economic requirements without compromising the future. He first published the term 'sustainable multilingualism' on p. 8 of his presentation and detailed what it should entail in a section titled "III. What should a sustainable multilingualism be like?" on p. 12 of his address. His point addressed how to make it possible for people "who have been bilingualized or polyglottised" to continue using their L1 (Mother tongue). He refers to them as "effective self-destroyers ... suffering political subordination ... in the framework of acute techno-economical change, which often leads to the destruction of the culture's traditional economic organisation ..." (pp. 19–20). Above we deconstructed this with reference to Maslow's pyramid of needs in order to suggest 'The Pluri-cultural Globish solution' below.

The first eight years of the *Sustainable Multilingualism* (SM) journal - reflecting and predicting change

(i) *Analysis of Sustainable Multilingualism contributors' selected Section topics: Emphases and changes over time*

From the time of the 2012 conference, SM research was structured for contributors to the journal as a flexible framework of 20 section titles to which SM researchers could choose to contribute their research. The framework was made non-restricting by allowing a great deal of overlap between Section Titles. Here I have used the patterns of contributions to these topics as an indicator of emphasis and change of research topics over time.

Results (i): *The most and least represented topics.* The three least represented topics, accounting for only 4% of all published papers, were 'Language Rights', 'Linguistics of Pop-culture' and 'Mobility and Multilingual Encounters'. Research interest in these topics was of short duration (concentrated dispersion),

having appeared in only two issues, Nos 6 and 12. In contrast, the three most populated and enduring section titles were 'Language Policy' (9%), 'Issues in Language Didactics' (10%) and 'Society. Identity. Languages' (22%), amounting to 41% of all papers published. In terms of endurance, at least one of these section titles has been published in 94% of all issues (wide dispersion). So, we consider these three titles as most indicative of the journal content and interests emphasised in the field of sustainable multilingualism. However, emphasis on these three topics has changed over time. The first three issues published 27% of all papers on these three topics but the last three issues only published 8% of papers on these topics – a weighted dispersion showing a significant change ($p < 0.001$) in the issue content defining the SM research over the 8 years. This raises important questions for us as to (i) what were these changes in SM research, (ii) what were their likely causes and (iii) can we look into these "seeds of time and tell which will grow and which will not"? (Macbeth).

(ii) Analysis of SM contributors' research constructs: Emphases, changes and continuity over time

Methodology: To answer these questions we compared the frequencies of constructs used in the abstracts of first three issues (corpus 2012), representing the epoch of 2012, with the frequencies of constructs used in the abstracts of the last three issues (corpus 2020), representing the 2020 epoch. The constructs were indicated by n-grams and the corpuses compared by calculating the differences in the frequency of n-grams they had in common. The corpuses were different sizes. Corpus 2012 has 2,313 Word Types -unique words- and 11,707 Word Tokens – words including repeats. Whereas, Corpus 2020 has 2,095 Word Types and 8,632 Word Tokens. These different corpus sizes were allowed for in calculating the statistical significance of each difference by using the significance of the log-likelihood of the difference. This is the usual method, which our corpus linguists will recognize as the 'Keyness' (Goźdz-Roszkowski, 2011).

Results (ii) SM research interests characterising the 2012 Epoch: There was an enormous collocation of Teaching, Foreign language, and Knowledge for Europe, in the 2012 epoch that is almost or completely absent in our current 2020 epoch ($p < 0.0001$). These are some of the concepts related to Teaching that only occurred in the 2012 corpus: Concepts - Foreign language competence, Language competence, Language acquisition, Language teaching and learning and Higher Education that was referred to 23 times in 2012 and not once in 2020. The concept of Foreign language* (the '*' signifying any other letters) occurred with a difference significant at $p < 0.00000005$: Concepts relating to 'Knowledge' (Keyness = 26.57, sig $p < 0.0001$) were abundant in 2012. Examples from the 2012 corpus include Background knowledge, General Knowledge, Vocabulary knowledge, Knowledge of the world, and Knowledge linked to skills. Whereas the word 'knowledge' was only used twice in the 2020 corpus. To emphasise the significance of this results we note that out of the 8,632 words describing SM concepts in the abstracts of the last three issues, the concept word 'knowledge' occurred only twice.

Perhaps the most stunning result is the changing importance of the word 'Europe' to SM research, as evidenced by comments on, in and about the present and future of 'Europe' (Keyness = 18.79, sig $p < 0.0001$). Examples from the 2012 epoch are shown in Figure 2. However, in all the abstracts of the last three issues, the word 'Europe' was used exactly ZERO times!

Figure 2

Europe concordance (sorted left)

ie policy for higher education across Europe, and to offer some sug
 raction foreseen within and beyond Europe, begs at least one cruc
 MULTILINGUALISM IN A COMMON EUROPE Michael L'xF6nz Ruh
 'LANGUAGE FOR CONTEMPORARY EUROPE Andrea Bernini Univ
 a period of far-reaching changes in Europe, and language prograr
 NECESSARY, ABSENT COMPONENT IN EUROPE 2020? Karen M. Laur
 '6 a necessary, absent component in Europe 2020? \x96 with a que
 ia and possibly in other countries in Europe. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/>
 ng Spanish as a foreign language in Europe; the reasons of popula
 nfluenced by an altering situation in Europe as well as positive poli
 uality; Latin, which has been used in Europe for centuries as langu
 modern world, especially, in modern Europe, to defend finally the p
) in language. But in the multilingual Europe multilingualism is thre
 nnovation, and in the digital society (Europe 2020). And the increas
 leg, Germany Abstract It seems that Europe has had its best times.
 egrate the state of Lithuania into the Europe of those days in the cl
 n, Germany Abstract To understand Europe means to understand

(iii) SM research interests characterising the 2020 Epoch

Results (iii): SM research interests characterising the 2020 Epoch. A major difference is that the 2020 corpus is characterized by the construct grouping of minorities, minority and minoritized ($p < 0.05$). This is similar to the construct grouping of migration, migrants, migrant which do not appear in the 2012 corpus ($p < 0.001$, actually $p = 0.000061$). Whereas 'knowledge' Keyness = -26.57, $p < 0.0001$) and 'foreign' (Keyness = -19.43, $p < 0.0001$) are very much underrepresented in corpus 2020 compared with the 2012 corpus, 'Translation' is represented much more in the 2020 corpus, (Keyness = 31.5, sig $p < 0.0001$, $p = 0.000015$). The most important collocates of translation in the 2020 corpus are 'research' and 'translators' 'Understanding' rather than 'knowledge' is mentioned more in the 2020 corpus, but it would require another 6 mentions to reach a $p < 0.05$ significance.

(iv) SM research interests that have remained constant across the eight years

Results (iv): SM research interests enduring over the eight years. The strongest common thread, having a maximum dispersion across the corpuses, consists of concepts clustered by 'communicat*' i.e. communicate, communicating, communication, communicational, communicative and communicatively. These are independent of the major enduring characteristics of both corpuses. That is 'communicat*' has no collocates within 50 characters left or right, of the characteristic concept clusters of learn* and teach* in corpus 2012 and has no collocates within 50 characters left or right of the characteristic concept clusters of minorit* and migrant*, in corpus 2012.

(v) Does publishing SM research in English promote English over the Minority Languages?

All SM journal articles have been published in one of 10 languages. Almost 90% of the articles were published in one of three languages – French 5.0%, Lithuanian 13.8% or English 70.6%. One aim of the journal is to help sustain multilingualism. So, a question that might be asked is 'Is it contradictory to privilege articles in English to the extent of publishing over 70% of our articles in English?'

We tested this conjecture by comparing the number of times each language has been mentioned from 2012 to 2020 with the number of articles we have published in each language during this time. Results show there is a small non-significant correlation ($r = 0.385$, $p = 0.29$) between the number of articles published in a language and the number of mentions of the language in the corpus of article abstracts.

Results (v): Promoting a language by publishing language papers in the language. Results show that the number of mentions of a language in the corpus of abstracts is many times greater than the number of articles in that language for all languages (from twice as many mentions of Russian, through 5½ times for Lithuanian to 23 times more mentions for Polish) except for English. The result is reversed for English. The number of mentions of English is only ½ of the number of articles published in English. So, privileging publications in English does not privilege references to the English language in the SM journal. Hence, it does not contradict the aim of the journal to privilege articles in English. The reason for this is that most of the articles in minority languages are about minority languages. Whereas, as alluded to above, few articles in English are about the English language, but rather about policy, migration, second language teaching, etc., etc. And further, contrarily to the conjecture, many articles in English also mention minority languages.

(vi) How do different languages privilege different SM research topics

Results (vi): Socio-cultural influence of language on its SM content. It is not surprising that we also found different languages privileged different SM research topics, which supports the greater content validity of SM’s multilingual publishing. For example, comparing the corpus of papers published by Lithuanian lecturers of French written in French, with that of Lithuanian lecturers written in Lithuanian, the papers in Lithuanian were significantly more focused on student learning than those written in French. The dispersion chart in Figure 3 shows occurrences in both language corpuses of the concept root ‘learn*’ where the wildcard ‘*’ represents any other letters.

Figure 3

Dispersion chart for root concept ‘learn’ which is represented significantly more in papers published in Lithuanian (bottom) than in papers published in French (top)*



Similarly, the Lithuanian language papers privileged the concept root ‘student*’ 53 to 6, Keyness = 16.61, $p < 0.0001$; and ‘language’ 158 to 35, Keyness = 20.67, $p < 0.0001$; and Translating 75 to 5, Keyness = 33.87, $p < 0.0001$. In contrast, the following concepts were more represented in the French language publications: ‘Identity’ Keyness 26.1, $p < 0.0001$; ‘Customs’ Keyness 20.32, $p < 0.0001$; and ‘Professional’ Keyness 16.59, $p < 0.0001$. Whereas both languages were consistent

in using the concept root 'Multilingual*' Keyness = 2.00, ns. Generally there was no match in the choice of section topics between French and English (Spearman correlation $s = 0.000$); a slight agreement between Lithuanian and English ($s = 0.118$) and a disagreement in section topic interests between Lithuanian and French ($s = -0.426$).

Some conclusions from results i to vi

Interesting findings of our results *i* to *vi*, show significant differences between SM concepts researched in the 2012 and 2020 epochs. In particular, 'knowledge' and 'foreign' were major constructs researched in corpus 1, which matched the early EU concerns with building a knowledge society based on the exchange of skills. This is underrepresented in corpus 2. The emphasis on Communication is consistent across both corpora. In contrast, migration and translation are two major issues addressed in corpus 2. This reflects the promotion of English as the *lingua franca* for wealth which encouraged migration towards England and removing borders for employment migration which has exacerbated the immigration problems. While migration of skilled workers was initially encouraged at the outset for the exchange of skills and knowledge noted in our 2012 corpus, the financial and now the Coronavirus crisis earmark uncontrolled migration as a crucial destabilizing socio-economic problem. Regulating migration from Eastern to Western Europe, notably to the UK resulting in Brexit, led to prioritize reworked migratory policies to thwart employment migration due to disparity of national income as was foreshadowed by the SM research emphases in our 2020 Corpus.

The emphasis on 'Translation' in our 2020 corpus has foreshadowed the EU's heightened interest in translation and its Jan 2020, €63 million budget awarded to eighteen languages, tacitly renewable annually for up to five years. Translations into English and French are "from 23 and 21 source languages, respectively". Thus, increasing the hegemony of English and French at the expense of 23 and 21 source languages, respectively. Translations in these EU-funded directions are consistent with the EU's previously mentioned economic imperative and negative protection of minority languages³. Notably, in our 2020 corpus, translation collocates with research and translators. These unique results for our 2020 corpus could predict that this foreshadowed funding for translation will lead to funded projects that compare translators' strategies for communicating with minority groups. Thus, the changing research interests of our journal have indeed reflected changes in the European multilingual environment, and in some cases predicated them, auguring well for the sustainability and expanding readership of *Sustainable Multilingualism*.

Sustainable Multilingualism – Its future

The Pluri-cultural Globish solution. From my years of teaching language to impoverished and poor minority language speakers, and their families, it has been explicit that they are intentionally devaluing their own language, and with it their own culture, to emulate the English *lingua franca* as an economic passport to a more affluent life style. This is what Albert Bastardas-Boada was alluding to in his description of these language learners as "effective self-destroyers". It is also clear from our model linking Resource needs, Language needs and Cultural identity needs to Maslow's three levels of Human needs, that the solution is simply to uncouple

³ <https://slator.com/deal-wins/eu-awards-eur-63-million-in-translation-contracts-to-kick-off-2020/>

the Anglo culture, and its current invasive baggage of neoliberal beliefs, from Globish as the economic *lingua franca*. Having to learn Anglo culture is a block to the learning of Globish as an economic *lingua franca*. A recent example of this failure is the Japanese teaching of 'Olympic English' to obtain cohorts of English-speaking Japanese for the purpose of boosting tourism and ensuring visitors' welfare for the delayed 2021 Olympic games. Their teaching materials include video clips of the English cultural comedy TV series "Fawlty Towers". It requires the Japanese learners to master English cultural comedy on the way to proficient English. As Globish becomes denuded of its Anglo culture, the culture of its economic applications will take its place. Thus, we would expect a Globish course in oenology to include a substantial French lexical influence and expect a Globish course in fashion to have an Italian cultural and lexical influence. We might even augur a battle for brand names as referential using praised objects in generic terms to carry the culture of a country, say the French Champagne of... vs the English Rolls Royce of... as an indicator of high quality. Disconnecting Globish from its current Anglo culture is a low risk to other cultures; it is easier for other language speakers to learn it for economic applications and development. It also enables other language speakers to insert and globally popularise their own culture and register of internationally valued economic applications that they themselves can develop.

Recommendations

The different popular citation sources (e.g. Scopus, Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scite, DataCite) have different advantages for SM. For example, "Scopus and Google Scholar on average have a higher citation count than WoS (Anker, Hadzibegovic, Lena, & Haverkamp, 2019). So, to the benefit of our readers and authors, the journal continues to seek index listing in all databases.

Also, there is a rapidly increasing influence of social media, and of other highly interactive digital media, on language learning, language teaching, spread, change and preservation (de Graaf, van der Meer, & Jongbloed-Faber, 2015; Hassen, 2016; Nørgård, 2020; Shah, & Lohar, 2016). So, it is time for our current choice of 20 Section Topics to 'come of age' with the addition of Section topic 21 "Digital Media and Sustainable Multilingualism".

We thank the hundreds of researchers who have contributed to the successful development of the journal up to our 2020 Scopus milestone and invite the future generations of researchers to guide the sustainability of the journal to a wondrous vision of its next 2030 mile stone.

Prof. dr. Béatrice Boufoy-Bastick⁴
Member of the Editorial Board
Catholic University of Paris, France

⁴ **Bio pic.** Prof. Dr. Béatrice Boufoy-Bastick has been a contributor to the Journal since 2016 and one of the editorial team since 2017. She is a multi-lingual (French mother-tongue) ethnographer, who has lived, worked and researched on language and culture on 4 continents. She was the Professor of Language and Culture for the University of the West Indies up to 2018 and now lectures at the Catholic University of Paris.

References

- Anker, M. S., Hadzibegovic, S., Lena, A., & Haverkamp, W. (2019). The difference in referencing in Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar. *ESC Heart Failure*.
- Bastardas-Boada, A. (2004). Towards a 'Language Sustainability': Concepts, Principles and Problems of Human Communicative Organisation in the Twenty-First Century. Paper presented at the plenary conference for the X Linguapax Congress on *Linguistic diversity, sustainability and peace*, Barcelona.
- Boufof-Bastick, B. (2015). Rescuing language education from the neoliberal disaster: Culturometric predictions and analyses of future policy. *Policy Futures in Education*, 13(4), 439–467.
- Council of Europe (1992). *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages*. Strasbourg: Directorate of Legal Advice and Public International Law.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.
- de Graaf, T., van der Meer, C., & Jongbloed-Faber, L. (2015). The use of new technologies in the preservation of an endangered language: The case of Frisian. *Endangered languages and new technologies*, 141–149.
- Goźdz-Roszkowski, S. (2011). *Patterns of linguistic variation in American legal English: A corpus-based study*. Peter Lang.
- Hassen, R. (2016). Impact of electronic media discourse on indigenous languages in Ethiopia: The case of Amharic language. *Methodology*, 53.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370–396. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346>
- Nørgård, R. T. (2020). Talking tacitly: Activities and experiences in highly interactive media. *Nordicom Review*, 35(s1), 219–236.
- Shah, S., & Lohar, S. A. (2016). The Role of Interactive Media in the Spread of English Language in the World: A Language Policy Perspective. *Language in India*, 16(6).

Béatrice Boufof-Bastick

Catholic University of Paris, France; bboufofbastick@gmail.com

EDITORIAL: DECIPHERING THE DOUBLE CODE OF SUSTAINABLE MULTILINGUALISM

Summary. The eight-year span in the life of our journal is the time ripe for the in-depth analysis of its development, the results that have been achieved and the prospects that could be projected for the future. Such analysis appears to be even more meaningful in view of the journal's recent acceptance to *Scopus* database which opens the way to broader promotion of its scholarship in the matters of multilingualism, plurilingualism, linguistic human rights, language needs, cultural identities and other disputes. Thus, the *Editorial* of the 16th issue sets out to decipher the double code of 'sustainable multilingualism' encrypted in the title of the journal and the concept itself: from maintaining cultural identities to the global *lingua franca*, threatening minority languages, from the first steps of the concept in a conference paper of 2004 to the multifaceted approaches elaborated through the topics, research constructs and research interests in the articles published over different epochs of the journal. The *Editorial* is rounded up by recommendations that will enhance and ensure the further growth of *Sustainable Multilingualism*.

Keywords: sustainable multilingualism; plurilingualism; multilingual environment; pluri-cultural; socio-cultural.