

10 Sedentarism and nomadism in the sociolinguistics of dialect

David Britain

Introduction

Perhaps one sign of a maturing discipline is a willingness on the part of its practitioners to introspect, self-critique and reflect upon what the field has taken for granted in its quest for progress.¹ As Eckert (2003: 392) has argued, ‘we have to take a look at the givens and consider their implications for what we’ve done, and for what we will do in the future’. There comes a point, she says, when theoretical and methodological assumptions that have previously been swept under the carpet ‘have done their work and it is now time to pull them out and examine what they have helped us take for granted’ (2003: 396). One particular ‘elephant in the room’ that has come in for considerable unpacking in recent years is the concept of the ‘authentic speaker’ (in addition to Eckert 2003, see Bucholtz 2003; Coupland 2010), the ‘ideal’ informant with all of the ‘right’ social characteristics that suit the analysis to be conducted. In dialectological theory and practice, the ‘authentic speaker’ has been a particularly large elephant.

In this spirit, I turn the attention to another elephant and present an account of the ways in which differing stances towards *mobility* have permeated theory and practice in dialectology, from the early nineteenth-century studies through to the present. In assessing how ideologies of mobility have shaped dialectological practice, I draw heavily from contemporary debates in cultural geography that have explored ‘the way the geographical imagination . . . provides an underlying metaphysics that influences and informs thought and action’ (Cresswell 2006: 25). I begin, therefore, by outlining recent discussions about one particularly powerful underlying metaphysics that concerns ‘imaginings of mobility’, discussions which examine ‘the mobilization of mobility as a root metaphor for contemporary understandings of the world of culture and society’

¹ The work presented in this chapter has been conducted with the help of funding from the Swiss National Science Foundation (“Contact, mobility and authenticity: language ideologies in koineisation and creolisation”: 100015_146240). I am extremely grateful to Nik Coupland for his sensitive and detailed close reading and commentary of an earlier draft of this chapter. The final product has improved immeasurably thanks to his critique.

(Cresswell 2006: 25–26). I highlight, first, the ongoing geographical critique of how mobility is imagined, conceptualised and ‘managed’ at two opposing poles – at one end ‘the propensity to see the world in fixed and bounded ways’, at the other ‘a way of seeing that takes movement as its starting point’ (Adey 2010: 40) – pointing to contemporary mobility theorists’ attempts to carve out a more nuanced middle path between the two, sensitive to the concerns of each. Second, I will suggest that some of the methodological and theoretical assumptions that underlie sociolinguistic approaches to the study of dialect can productively be explored through the ways in which they align with these powerful ideological ways of ‘seeing’ mobility. In earlier research (Britain 2010), I compared the perhaps unsurprisingly parallel, but somewhat later development of theoretical conceptualisations of *space* in social dialectology with those in its ‘home’ discipline of human geography. The ways that dialectologists were imagining space were following the same epistemological trajectory as that of the human geographers and were, with a slight delay, entirely typical of their time. In many ways I am performing the same task here, attempting to demonstrate that the ways in which social dialectologists have engaged with mobility suggest a parallel alignment to that in the other social sciences. Like Eckert (2003: 396) in relation to the authentic speaker, however, I agree that we must accept when long-held ideological assumptions ‘have done their work and it is now time to pull them out and examine what they have helped us take for granted’.

Imaginations of mobility

Cresswell’s (2006) book *On the Move: Mobility in the Modern Western World* has become an extremely influential text in the articulation of what has come to be known as the ‘new mobilities’ paradigm in the social sciences, an attempt both to challenge what it sees as the a-mobile focus of much social science research and to present a new sociology that engages with and attempts to understand, *whilst not fetishizing*, mobility (also Urry 2000; 2007; Adey 2010). In this book he presents two ways of seeing the world, in relation to mobility, that have been especially dominant – what he and others (e.g. Malkki 1992: 26) have labelled a *sedentarist* in contrast to a *nomadic* metaphysics.

Sedentarism has been especially influential. It ‘sees mobility through the lens of place, rootedness, spatial order and belonging . . . conceptualized through the lens of fixity as an ideal’ (Cresswell 2006: 26, 28; also Sheller and Urry 2006: 208, Hall 2009: 575). It is one of the fundamental claims of the new mobilities paradigm that mainstream sociology has largely theorised society from a sedentarist perspective. Sedentarist approaches see place as the ‘phenomenological starting point for geography’, as a ‘moral world, as an insurer of authentic existence and center of meaning for people . . . mobility

is often the assumed threat to the rooted, moral, authentic existence of place' ... playing 'second fiddle to the overriding concern with place' (Cresswell 2006: 30–31), 'the often implicit underbelly of the place' (Cresswell 1997: 361).

As a result, mobility more generally from this perspective 'is seen as morally and ideologically suspect, a by-product of a world arranged through place and spatial order ... a threat, a disorder in the system, a thing to control ... as suspicious, as threatening and as a problem ... as anachoristic'² (Cresswell 2006: 26, 55). Cresswell and others (e.g. Adey 2010) have demonstrated that this mobility-as-threat pervades public discourses and points to the way that 'modern states have preoccupied themselves with the ordering and disciplining of mobile peoples. Think of the role of the outsider in modern life ... the drifter, the shiftless, the refugee and the asylum seeker have been inscribed with immoral intent ... These have all been portrayed as figures of mobile threat in need of straightening out and discipline' (2006: 26). Kabachnik (2010: 95, 102–103) talks of an 'unquestioned privileging of fixed abodes' and a 'hegemonic sedentary norm', according to which 'nomads and others without a fixed place are particularly terrifying and disruptive ... nomads – be they capitalists, refugees or migrant workers – threaten the stability of places by crossing borders and disrupt the normative order'.

Ignoring the mobile is another manifestation of sedentarism. Mobility theorists have highlighted how societies depend on an ever more complex and interconnected series of 'mobility systems' that enable, regulate and bring together flows of people, goods, capital, ideas, communications and waste. Sedentarist approaches have downplayed the critical role of these systems, yet Cresswell and Martin highlight how 'the often invisible networks of mobility' are made visible when the 'smooth laminar flow' (2012: 516) of societal systems of mobility falters. Cresswell (2014: 712) labels such events "'critical mobilities" – (im)mobilities which interrupt the taken-for-granted world of flows and force us to question how things move and the meanings given to those movements'.

One such event was the disruption caused by the ash cloud from Iceland's Eyjafjallajökull volcano in 2010. The eruption of the volcano triggered an eruption of academic papers pointing to how it revealed not only the taken-for-granted nature of international movement – of people, goods, and services – but also the knock-on effects of when the smooth laminar flow is suddenly disrupted. With fewer than 20 percent of normal flights operating in European airspace in mid-April 2010 (Budd et al. 2011: 32), business people were stranded, tourists forced to spend another week in

² Anachorism is the spatial equivalent of anachronism – a term for denoting something that is in the wrong place (rather than at the wrong time).

Majorca, and perishable goods rotted in warehouses, with Tanzanian green beans and Peruvian blackberries unable to reach Western dinner tables. Kenyan factory workers lost their jobs as tonnes of flowers they were preparing for European vases had to be dumped.³ The panic that followed the eruption, according to Budd et al. (2011: 35), ‘owed much to the strategic contribution of air transportation to capital accumulation in the contemporary post-Fordist economy’. Furthermore, the media presentation of the volcano’s effects as unprecedented also foregrounded the eurocentricity of reaction to the event. Jensen notes that ‘hitting the trans-Atlantic nerve system made these nature-aeromobility systems’ vulnerabilities specific to Europe and America as if this was the first time that flights were ever grounded due to volcanic activities’ (2011: 71). The volcano also, at least temporarily, changed mobilities within Iceland’s own tourism industry, not only limiting arrivals in the immediate aftermath of the eruption, but also triggering changes in tourist activity on the island – with many wanting to watch the volcano in action and drive through the ash – with risk-seeking acting ‘as inspiration for travel and a deepening of the travel experience’ and enabling Iceland’s tourism industry to recruit the eruption as a branding opportunity (Benediktsson et al. 2011: 78). It also caused ‘stranded’ travellers to suddenly feel *emotionally* vulnerable, even in perfectly hospitable surroundings. Drawing upon Heidegger’s idea (1962: 102) that only when a tool is damaged does its functioning become conspicuous, Jensen argued that ‘the “breakdown” triggered by the volcanic activity illustrates vulnerabilities at a very practical level, but equally that emotions are tied to our relationship to global mobility and finally that such abnormalities are windows into technology and the ontology of mobilities’ (Jensen 2011: 68). These authors (and many others) all agree that it is often only when the system breaks down that the network is suddenly revealed (Adey and Anderson 2011: 11).

The primary goal of the new mobilities paradigm has been to overturn this sedentarist perspective, to question the ‘perceived prioritization of more rooted and bounded notions of place as the locus of identity’, and to persuade us ‘not to start from a point of view that takes certain kinds of fixity and boundedness for granted’ (Cresswell 2011: 551). Place should not be seen as an ‘arena of static rootedness but as an achievement of dwelling, constructed through the intricate, repeated and habitual movements of people . . . the collective effect of

³ Even those not directly affected by this temporary immobility noticed its consequences. Jeffries (2010: 9, cited by Budd et al. 2011: 37) talks about being able, in central London, to be able to “savour the birdsong [and other] . . . restful sounds, so long obliterated by Virgin Atlantics laden with victims of global Disneyfication and Lufthansas packed with businessmen who could just as well conduct their fatuous meetings via Skype from Munich”.

individual bodies moving through space' (Cresswell 2006: 45–46). Later, I argue that sedentarist approaches have been overwhelmingly predominant in dialectological theory and practice, from the early traditional dialectological accounts of the nineteenth century, right through to the present.

Mobility has not always, however, been seen in such a negative and threatening light – it has long also been presented as a sign of emancipation, freedom, and progress, and place and fixity seen as stifling, restrictive, far from ideal. Frequent (decontextualized) reports that the world is 'becoming more mobile' are usually presented in positive terms, as signs of advancement and civilisation, as liberating for the citizen (though not necessarily good for the planet). Cresswell has argued that 'ways of thinking that emphasise mobility and flow over stasis and attachment have come to the fore. As the world has appeared to become more mobile, so thinking about the world has become *nomad thought*' (2006: 43, emphasis in original), and he and others have pointed to the way in which 'scholars have increasingly turned to anti-essentialist and post-structuralist thinking, and there has been an emerging interdisciplinary interest in themes such as migration, diasporic cultures, cosmopolitanism[,] ... performance, globalisation and post-colonialism' (Merriman 2012: 4–5). Some mobility theorists, however, working within the new paradigm, warn against a descent into an opposing 'nomadic metaphysics'; a stance which sees mobility as 'unremittingly positive' and 'puts mobility first, has little time for various notions of attachment to place and revels in notions of flow, flux and dynamism. Place is portrayed as stuck in the past, overly confining and possibly reactionary' (Cresswell 2006: 25–26).

A number of criticisms have been levelled at such nomadism. One is that 'by critiquing one perspective of place and then ignoring place altogether, a nomadic metaphysics is throwing the baby out with the bathwater' (Kabachnik 2010: 95). A number of 'new mobilities' scholars have argued for a recognition of the interconnectedness of 'moorings' and 'mobilities', appreciating the centrality of mobility in social life but recognising that 'all mobilities entail specific often highly embedded and immobile infrastructures' (Sheller and Urry 2006: 210). For mobility in the car, for example, think of the petrol station; for air travel, think of the airport. Concepts of place survive in the mobilities paradigm but are theorised in a progressive sense (Massey 1993), which 'conceptualizes places as constructed, dynamic, relational, and interconnected with other places' (Kabachnik 2010: 91). Secondly, it has been argued that nomadic approaches have presented a *decontextualised* mobility, abstract, dehistoricised, generalised, homogenised, ungrounded, and unbounded (Cresswell 2006: 53; 1997), an approach that does not sufficiently recognise who is mobile (and who is not), who has the resources to be mobile (and who does not), who is moving out of free will (and who is not). Cresswell has charged that 'the postmodern nomad is a remarkably unsocial being – unmarked by the

traces of class, gender, ethnicity, sexuality, and geography . . . little attention has been paid to the historical conditions that have produced specific forms of movement' (2006: 53–54). Nomadism, it has also been suggested, runs the risk of 'romanticis[ing] the lives and transgressive movements of subjects such as the nomad or migrant . . . diverting our attention away from the task of identifying the complex politics underpinning the production and regulation of mobilities' (Merriman 2012: 5).

The new mobilities paradigm has positioned itself, therefore, by problematising 'both "sedentarist" approaches in the social science that treat place, stability and dwelling as a natural steady state, and deterritorialised approaches that posit a new grand narrative of mobility, with fluidity and liquidity as a pervasive condition of postmodernity or globalisation' (Han-nam et al. 2006: 5). My aim in what follows is to subject dialectology to such a critique, unpacking the largely sedentarist approaches of much work in the field and highlighting the potential for nomadism in an emergent dialectology of superdiversity. In considering how sedentarism and nomadism have shaped dialectological practice, I examine its underlying stance towards mobility.

It is at this point important to delimit what kinds of mobilities I will be addressing here. Recent sociological and geographical work on mobilities has recognised that a full appreciation of mobility necessitates an examination of the movement not just of people, but also of 'objects, images, information and wastes' (Urry 2000: 1). Given that research in dialectology, historically, has overwhelmingly relied on face-to-face interaction as the conduit of linguistic change, diffusion and transmission, I restrict my discussion here to physical human mobility. Very recently, relative to the historical depth of dialectology, some have argued for a greater sensitivity towards the potential for change to be transmitted via the media, though this potential remains controversial in the discipline (see Sayers 2014 and commentaries on this article published in the same journal issue). A dialectology of mobile communication, by which I mean non-co-present *voice* interaction (i.e. *not* entextualised computer- or phone-mediated communication), appears to be almost entirely absent. To make an initial evaluation of social dialectology's stances towards mobility, therefore, I restrict myself here to examining the kinds of mobilities with which it has theoretically engaged.

In doing so, I focus on a number of prominent themes and approaches within dialectology: the 'traditional' approach, Labovian variationism, the diffusion and transmission of linguistic features, contact dialectology and, finally, the dialectology of superdiversity. As we will see, until very recently, a strong sedentarism prevails: Mobility is either ignored, seen as peripheral to models of linguistic change, or positively shunned and treated as suspect.

Sedentarism in dialect data collection: the study of *Homo dormiens*?

Before examining the more theoretical sedentarism of dialectology, it is worth making the very practical, methodological point that almost the entire dialectological enterprise, in collecting data for analysis, has involved the recording of people who are kept as *still* as possible. Dialectological recordings are routinely conducted in informants' homes (TV turned off, parrot moved to another room) or in quiet classrooms, seated, literally face-to-face, rather than in the busy workplace, walking down the street, sitting on the train, or driving the car to the mall. We know little about the patterning of language variation when we are *literally* on the move, yet potentially, for example, the lack of (literal) face-to-face interaction that talk en route often entails could well have, for example, phonological implications for the marking of turn management (Britain 2013b). Occasionally, in some more ethnographically oriented work, researchers have recorded on the move (e.g. Mendoza-Denton's 2008: 66–73 car journey with some of her Latina informants) or recorded within relatively restricted spatial domains that enable some movement, for example within school playgrounds, but the overwhelming norm is for recording to take place seated in a quiet room (see, e.g. Schilling 2013: 239–243). The approach clearly represents a prioritisation of optimal recording conditions over capturing human interaction in all its different mobile forms. But if dialect variant choice itself is constitutive of and not simply reflective of identities and is used constructively in the ongoing management of talk, the sedentarism of recording norms in dialectology could be deemed problematic, preventing us from gaining insight into an informant's fuller repertoire of variant adoption.

Traditional dialectology

It is important to state here, at the start of an examination of dialectological imaginations of mobility (and since it remains true for most of the approaches to the study of dialect that are broached in this chapter), that sedentarism is not *unaware* of mobility – quite the contrary, it has a particularly heightened sense of consciousness about its impact on dialect. Its impulse, however, is to shun it, ignore it, or treat it as secondary, as we will see. The methodological approach of the first dialectologists has routinely come in for sharp critique, and it is clear that many scholars in this tradition took a strictly sedentarist approach to, for example, informant choice. For Ellis (1889), a pioneer of English dialectology, the very word 'dialect'⁴ implied a particular sort of speaker – uneducated, native

⁴ 'This is a treatise on the existing phonology of the English dialects, meaning simply peasant speech' (Ellis 1889: 7).

(1889: 1), ‘old and if possible illiterate’ (1889: 4). His analysis of the resulting data, especially in the areas surrounding London, showed that he felt mobility was antithetical to the very existence of ‘dialect’.⁵

the composite nature of a very shifting population in this district renders the growth of any dialect proper impossible (Ellis 1889: 129) . . . the enormous congeries of persons from different parts of the kingdom and from different countries, and the generality of school education, render dialect nearly impossible. (1889: 225)

Later, the sedentarist trope of ‘mobility as suspicious’ was explicitly raised in motivations of the sample for the Survey of English Dialects:

The kind of dialect chosen for study was that normally spoken by elderly speakers of sixty years of age or over belonging to the same social class in rural communities, and in particular by those who were, or had formerly been, employed in farming, for it is amongst the rural populations that the traditional types of vernacular English are best preserved to-day . . . *dialect speakers whose residence in the locality had been interrupted by significant absences were constantly regarded with suspicion.* (Orton and Dieth 1962: 14–16, emphasis added)

The tendency for the traditional dialectologists to focus on *rural* areas has also not infrequently been seen as a symptom of an avoidance of mobility. Cresswell has pointed out that, more generally, ‘the rural was theorised as a place of rest and rootedness – of community – the urban was a site of movement and alienation – a space of “society”’ (2006: 36; see also Woods 2011: chapter 2).

The idea that place is an *authenticating* aspect of language is also particularly salient in this early dialectological work. Both the rural geographical and linguistic authenticity literatures have noted how the rural is seen as untainted and traditional. Woods (2011: 27) argues that ‘the rural was portrayed as fragile, vulnerable to urban incursions, either physical . . . or socio-cultural’, whilst Bucholtz, for example, has argued ‘the authentic speaker as remote from urban modernity has remained a core element of much research on regional and social dialects’ (2003: 399).⁶ Concerns about mobility, furthermore, have contributed centrally to the framing of a critique of the authentic speaker. Eckert (2003: 392) points, for example, to the ideal ‘poster-child’ informants of dialectology being ‘locally located and oriented’, ‘untainted by the interference of . . . social agency’, and Bucholtz (2003: 404) posits ‘linguistic isolationism’ as another ideal in the hunt for ‘authentic’ data: ‘the most authentic language is removed from and unaffected by other influences, and thus the most authentic speaker belongs to a well-defined, static, and relatively

⁵ See Britain (2009) for further examples of Ellis’s sensitivity to mobility-triggered dialect levelling.

⁶ For a consideration of how ‘rural’ and ‘urban’ have been handled in dialectology, see Britain (2012a, forthcoming).

homogeneous social grouping that is closed to the outside. In the logic of this ideology, the effects of social and linguistic contact are problematic – hence, the normal state of linguistic affairs is often understood as a difficulty for sociolinguistic analysis’. While these authenticities are characteristic of most forms of dialectology, they are sharpest in focus amongst the earliest dialectologists. Traditional dialectology was unashamedly and overtly sedentarist; mobility was suspicious and made ‘dialect’ impossible.

Variationist sociolinguistics

Dialectology’s shift to the city in the 1960s went hand in hand with a number of methodological and theoretical developments in the discipline (Labov 1966/2006; Weinreich et al. 1968). A broader sweep of speech community members was sampled, and the capturing of continuous speech enabled analysis that entailed a closer inspection of the constraints on variability. Despite this expansion of who was an ‘acceptable’ informant, however, community nativeness remained a central and core criterion for selection. The young, the female and the urban were now acceptable, but mobile people were (still) not. Labov’s pioneering study of New York (1966/2006: 110–111) excluded those who had arrived after the age of eight, and most surveys of a similar kind since continue to incorporate such eligibility benchmarks. But calculations by Kerswill (1993: 35) have suggested that Labov’s exclusion of mobile individuals meant that ‘well over 50 percent of the original sample are excluded by various nativeness related criteria’.

That this is problematic for our understanding of linguistic change has become especially evident, however, since the publication of work demonstrating that nonlocal mobile members of the community can be at the vanguard of language changes that affect longer-term members of the same communities. Horvath’s (1985) work in Sydney that took into account the immigrant Italian and Greek populations found that ‘the inclusion of migrants in the study proved to be rewarding in a number of ways ... the study ... can be seen as a description of how migrants enter into a speech community; the formation of a peripheral community by the first generation and then the movement into the core speech community by the second generation. *The attendant effects on the speech community in general cannot be fully comprehended unless the peripheral community is included in the study*’ (1985: 174–175, emphasis added). Fox’s (2007; 2015; Britain and Fox 2009) ethnographic work in an East London youth club, too, has demonstrated how linguistic innovations generated within the migrant Bangladeshi community spread through network connections to local ‘Anglos’. Observing social network ties contracted within the club, she was able to analyse the transmission of linguistic changes via network ties within the club. One such development is

the variable loss of allomorphy in the definite article *the*, shifting from a system sensitive to whether the sound following the article was a vowel or a consonant (i.e. *the melon* [ðə mɛlən] versus *the apple* [ði æpəl]) to one which lacked such sensitivity (*the melon* [ðə mɛlən] versus *the apple* [ðə'æpəl], with a glottal stop functioning to break the hiatus between the two vowels). In analysing (see Fox 2015) the network transmission of this lack of allomorphy across different friendship groups within the club, she finds its use highest amongst the older Bangladeshi males, and ever lower use with greater social distance from this network group in the club. Such work is the exception, rather than the rule, however.⁷ The continued exclusion of the mobile from much place-based variationist work has had, as we will see, ongoing sedentarist consequences for theory development.

Geographical diffusion

One area of the variationist enterprise where one might expect to find a more robust and central role for mobility is the examination of the intergenerational transmission and spatial spread of linguistic innovations. I examine two aspects of diffusion here – firstly, approaches to the spread of innovations and, secondly, Labov's (2007) differentiation between community-internal 'transmission' and community-external 'diffusion'. The most influential model in accounting for geolinguistic innovation diffusion has been the urban hierarchy model, which suggests that innovations spread down an urban hierarchy from metropolis to city to town to village to countryside. The rationale for this model is that transportation networks tend to link urban with urban, and the socioeconomic and consumer infrastructure tends to be based in and oriented towards urban centres, so that while distance plays some role, interaction between urban centres is likely to be greater, and therefore a more frequent and effective channel for innovation transmission, than between urban and rural (see Britain 2012b,c for a critique of work on innovation diffusion in dialectology). Quantitative gravity models were piggybacked onto the urban hierarchy model, leading some dialectologists to attempt to mathematically calculate the likely linguistic influence of Place A on Place B by examining solely the populations of the two and the distance between the two (see, e.g. Trudgill 1974; 1983; Larmouth 1981; Hernández Campoy 2003; Inoue 2010). Note here, however, how 'the line that connects A to B is explained by A and B' (Cresswell 2006: 29, emphasis in original), and the mobilities between the two are, actually, factored out of the explanations of diffusion. Two places

⁷ For example, in the extensive recent surveys of 'Multicultural London English' (e.g. Cheshire et al. 2011) all the children who formed the core informant sample in the two surveys either were born in London or arrived as preschoolers.

exist, they are connected (or not) by potential channels of communication, and population and distance are deemed to account for interaction between the two. Gravity model approaches assume that everyone in A has an equal chance of transmitting an innovation and that everyone in B has an equal chance of adopting it. Gravity models, then, ‘continued to relegate movement to something curiously inhuman, empty of social and cultural content and logically secondary to the arrangements of space and place’ (Cresswell 2012: 573–574; Gregory 1985; Britain 2012b,c). Gravity models have generally been accused of more generally being insensitive to social structure, leading Gregory (1985: 304) to argue that there had been ‘no serious discussion of the structures of social relations and systems of social practices through which innovations filter’. This critique applies equally to linguistic work on innovation diffusion, which has tended to foreground the geographical and the places that donate and receive and often ignore the social and the mobilities that enable the transmission.

As outlined in Britain (2012b,c), when one zooms in to the neighbourhood level, the picture of transmission becomes somewhat more socially rich, with social network-based (e.g. Milroy 1980; Milroy and Milroy 1985; Milroy 1992; Labov 2001) and community of practice-based techniques (Eckert 2000; Fox 2007; Mendoza-Denton 2008) demonstrating routes of intralocality or intracommunity transmission. The work of Lesley and James Milroy (especially 1985) has highlighted which sorts of social networks are especially vulnerable (weak networks) or resistant (strong networks) to outside linguistic influence. Furthermore, they have ‘projected up’ this finding to propose, for example, that the more mobile central social classes are likely to be both the most vulnerable to outside influence and the most likely to diffuse change and that communities with historically relative social equality and close social network ties – such as Iceland – are less likely to develop dialectal fragmentation and diversity than socially unequal countries with variable degrees of social and geographical mobility, such as Britain. The model is sensitive to the impact of mobility on local social network structure but has less to say about how linguistic features embedded in networks of different strength nevertheless are projected geographically across space. As a result of their work, we can better gauge what sorts of people in A are likely to be diffusers, and what sorts of people in B are likely to be willing recipients, but how the distance between them is overcome is less well developed.

Labov very explicitly sees variation in space as distinct from variation in society (Labov 1982: 20) and, robustly defending his conceptualisation of the speech community, argues that ‘the primary source of diversity is the transmission (and incrementation) of change within the speech community, and that *diffusion is a secondary process of a very different character*. Such a clear dichotomy between transmission and diffusion is dependent upon the concept

of a speech community with well-defined limits, a common structural base and a unified set of sociolinguistic norms' (Labov 2010: 309, emphasis added). He (2007, 2010) presents evidence from fine-grained differences in the pronunciation of /a/ in five U.S. cities – New York, North Plainfield, Albany, Cincinnati, and New Orleans – to demonstrate that whilst the system in the four latter locations has undergone various types of simplification and regularisation, changes of a different kind have taken place in New York as the system is, with some 'incrementation', transmitted 'faithfully' from one generation to the next through an 'unbroken sequence of native-language acquisition by children' (2010: 307). One might ask at this point who is and is not part of the New York speech community, and therefore who is indeed incrementing and transmitting. Labov states (2007: 369) that 'the speech communities described so far – New York, Albany, Cincinnati, New Orleans – are formed by the population defined in American society as the white mainstream . . . differentiated internally by social class, but separated sharply from the African American and Latino populations in the same cities.'

An exploration of the demographics of New York is rather informative. In 2010, the 'White-alone not Hispanic or Latino' category in the U.S. Census accounted for 33 percent of the population of New York City.⁸ Given that not all of this 33 percent are likely to be native to New York (indeed, 11.2 percent of the population were not even living in the same place a year before the census⁹), then the 'New York speech community' represents a clear minority of the population of New York. Clearly, sedentarism is a significant determiner of membership here, where authenticity is strongly related to white, multi-generational, stable residence. But this point has been made before (Kerswill 1993). What clearly nails home the sedentary metaphysics underlying this approach, however, is the idea that somehow the changes that have affected the other cities are secondary, of lesser theoretical importance to an account of change than the processes affecting a (shrinking) minority that has, apparently, not been subject to contact and diffusion. This approach, firstly, ignores the undoubtedly disruptive role of what Hall (2009: 574) calls 'the small and (seemingly) trivial practices and movements that constitute the urban everyday' (see also Britain 2013a). Subverting the concept of the city as a bounded site, a view that is nevertheless fairly overt in Labov's account (2001: 226–227), Hall (2009: 573–574) goes on to argue that

place as a primary container for social life and a basic unit of social research and analysis . . . is the domain and object of a sedentary social science . . . No longer a spatial clot – of place, power, people, dwelling and situated economy – the city is

⁸ <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/36/3651000.html> (accessed December 1, 2014).

⁹ *Ibid.*

opened up to fluidity and transitivity; thus cities may be reconsidered ‘as much spaces of flows as they are spaces of place’ (Yeoh, 2006: 150) . . . Routine urban undulations – mundane recurrences, people and objects making the rounds and doing the usual, practices started over and over again – are as much a part of the flow of the city as are translocal circuits of movement, and, as such, equally disruptive of a sedentarist social science.

Secondly, in presenting these types of linguistic development as ‘normative’ for ‘internal’ change in a community, this approach prevents the changes that are taking place from being interpreted in the full light of the sociodemographic developments of the city, where researchers would be cognisant of the ongoing flows that together create New York. How can we interpret these ‘community-internal’ changes socially, when the majority of New Yorkers are not implicated in them? Thirdly, when the linguistic consequences of mobility are relegated to a secondary position, mobility is treated again as disruptive of some static social realm in which ‘normal transmission’ can take place, and is therefore deemed to be of peripheral importance to our understanding of change.

Contact dialectology

Contact – ‘the effect of one system on another’ (Labov 2001: 20) – has been largely peripheral to Labov’s own work until very recently (see Labov 2001: 20), although it has been central to another strand of dialectology that gained momentum following the publication of Trudgill’s (1986) *Dialects in Contact*. Building upon the subtle linguistic changes that take place when speakers interact, and recognising the implicit mobility involved in interactional co-presence, this approach has placed the linguistic consequences of especially *geographical* mobility at its core, with some even suggesting it as a potential alternative to Labovian explanations of change (e.g. Milroy 2002). It has largely been the dialect outcomes of large-scale, long-distance and mixed-origin acts of migration, for example colonial settlement migrations (e.g. Trudgill 2004 for [mainly Southern Hemisphere] English, Mougeon and Beniak 1994 for Canadian French, Penny 2000 for Latin American Spanish, Matsumoto and Britain 2003 for Micronesian Japanese, etc.), indentured labour movements (Barz and Siegel 1988), urbanisation (Bortoni-Ricardo 1985; Kerswill and Williams 2000; etc.), and individual migration (e.g. Chambers 1992), that have provided the evidence for theory building in this approach. The model has also been applied to the outcomes of more mundane forms of mobility (e.g. Britain 2013a), such as commuting, local house moves, moves for education and training, consumption choices – short in distance, but massive in scale – which trigger a dialect-contact-inducing demographic churn that is leading to (socially differentiated) dialect supralocalisation and the

levelling of more conservative local nonstandard features. The dialect contact approach is, in some respects, impossible without mobility. It is not difficult to see, however, how, in a number of ways, this approach too has succumbed to sedentarism.¹⁰

- The model attempts to explain how acts of mass migration disrupt the continuity of a community's dialect, but how over time a new variety crystallises from the mixture of dialects that were brought with immigration. A focused new dialect eventually emerges. Stability and continuity are implicitly assumed to be the normative state that a community 'returns to' once the impact of the mobility event has been absorbed. Just as in the case of Labov's approach to transmission, mobility is seen as something external to the normal conditions under which dialects are transmitted through time.
- Similarly, the approach examines the acquisition of a 'second dialect' by individual migrants, measuring, for example, their success at adopting the traditional local patterns of variation as used by speakers born and bred (and often whose parents are born and bred) in the community. Note here how it is those with historical roots in the community whose varieties are deemed to be the target, and the success of the mobile is measured in terms of how well these people meet the linguistic norms of the static. The varieties of the long-term rooted are seen as the baseline against which others are measured – a textbook case of sedentarism.
- As in the case of innovation diffusion, contact dialectology has largely been asocial. There have been relatively few attempts to examine it through a social filter, in other words to address the social embedding problem (Weinreich et al. 1968) – how are linguistic changes embedded in and spread through social structure? This is partly, and understandably, because in many cases the outcomes of dialect contact have been observed post hoc. But even in those studies attempting to examine new dialect formation in progress, the research design has not been framed to address these questions.¹¹ This gap in the literature is all the more surprising given Trudgill's controversial deterministic approach to new dialect formation that shuns the role of 'identity' in explaining the genesis of new varieties (Trudgill 2004). Similarly, contact-induced changes at a more local level, such as supralocalisation, are not infrequently accounted for as a result of 'an increase in geographical mobility' without pointing to whose mobilities they are or where these mobilities are most evident (see Britain 2013a for a critical discussion).

¹⁰ I willingly accept, of course, that I have been guilty of this myself (e.g. Britain 1997).

¹¹ One exception is Woods's (1997) research on early New Zealand English, which suggested women led the process of koineisation.

Sedentarism, then, has reigned pretty much continually through the last century and a half of dialectology, even when, seemingly, mobility has played an important role in the genesis of the changes under investigation. Mobility has been seen as ‘external’, peripheral, even suspicious, and, often as a result, shunned, ignored, or factored out. Place, rootedness, stability, meanwhile, have played a central role as the internal, the core, the starting point, the norm, the determining factor in the direction of dialect change.

Mobility unleashed?

In work on the sociolinguistics of globalisation, Vertovec’s (2007) concept of ‘superdiversity’ has become especially influential, and although there has been relatively little dialectological analysis drawing explicitly upon this concept (though see Rampton 2013), there is nevertheless an emergent body of literature examining the apparent dialectological outcomes of such diversity in the shape of so-called multiethnolects that have apparently fused as a result of large-scale migration to the West. Superdiversity and multiethnolects share a good deal of theoretical baggage. Firstly, both are presented as new, as artefacts of both globalisation and a rapid increase in mobility, and emerging at some point in the late twentieth century. Second, both are presented as *urban*, as if there is some critical and specific characteristic of the urban condition that engenders them. Third, there is common cause against traditional (presumably Labovian) notions of the speech community – superdiversity undermines such approaches, and the sociolinguistic repertoires that underlie multiethnolects are claimed to better capture how linguistic variation works than traditional notions of a community, place-based dialect (e.g. Sharma 2011).

Superdiversity, however, has not been uncontroversial, and much of the critique raises the spectre of a nomadic approach that revels in flow at the expense of place, that romanticises the mobile in ways that smack of orientalism, that presents mobility rather than the academic recognition of that mobility as new, and that fails to recognise the diversity of the mobile.

For Vertovec, superdiversity emerged after the Second World War; for Blommaert (2014), much later, at the point in the late twentieth century when the Cold War ended, the Soviet Communist Bloc collapsed and fragmented, and the geopolitical order of the previous forty years was reframed. One index of superdiversity is that ‘over the past twenty years globally more people have moved from more places to more places’¹² (see also Vertovec 2007: 1025). The phenomenon is, then, apparently, new and on a scale like

¹² www.mmg.mpg.de/research/all-projects/super-diversity/.

never before. Piller (2014) takes issue with these claims. She points to work on the diversity of nineteenth-century Uruguay as evidence that the phenomenon reaches further back in time than suggested. Even further back, Hellenistic Alexandria comes to mind as a city that qualifies for the label, two thousand years ago.

Although Vertovec recognises that the mobile peoples that have created superdiversity are not all alike, it is the ways in which host countries differentially *regulate, police* and *react to* migrants from different countries that represent his principal parameter to distinguish the mobile. He argues that

the proliferation and mutually conditioning effects of additional variables shows that it is not enough to see diversity only in terms of ethnicity . . . Such additional variables include differential immigration statuses and their concomitant entitlements and restrictions of rights, divergent labour market experiences, discrete gender and age profiles, patterns of spatial distribution, and mixed local area responses by service providers and residents . . . The interplay of these factors is what is meant here . . . by the notion of 'super-diversity'. (2007: 1025)

Vertovec's dating of superdiversity as a post-1945 phenomenon is motivated by the idea that this year was a turning point in terms of migration policy. This too is arguable. Certainly in Britain, the control of the migrant had been on the political agenda for many centuries before the twentieth and is evidenced by a raft of legislation to that effect: For example, the 1290 expulsion of Jews, the Egyptians Act of 1530, the Jewish Naturalization Act of 1753, and the British Nationality Act of 1772 are all early examples of the regulation and policing of immigrants of various kinds.

As Urry states (2007: 3), at the very start of his book-length articulation of the new mobilities paradigm, it sometimes seems as if all the world is on the move. He notes that, for example, by 2010 one billion legal international arrivals were expected (cf. 25 million in 1950), that 4 million passengers fly every day and at any one time 360,000 are in flight above the United States, that 31 million refugees roam the globe, and that in 1800 people in the United States travelled on average 50 metres per day and at the time of his writing they travelled 50 kilometres per day. Whilst recognising these quite amazing statistics, mobilities scholars have argued forcefully that we need to carefully deconstruct these figures and nuance our view of whether the *whole* world really is on the move. Urry points to evidence, for example, that people are not spending more time travelling than before or making more journeys (2007: 4), but are travelling further and faster. Mobilities scholars' caution about hyping mass global mobilisation appears to hinge around three main factors, and these all impact on how we can interpret the superdiversity literature's imaginations of mobility.

Firstly, and perhaps most importantly, they point to the fact that there is extreme social differentiation in terms of who is mobile. Urry (2007: 4) partly cites Schivelbusch (1986: 197) in arguing that for ‘the twentieth century tourist, the world has become one large department store of countrysides and cities, although of course most people in the world can only dream of voluntarily sampling that department store on a regular basis’. Not everyone is equally mobile.

Secondly, there is a question about perception. Is it true that more people have moved from more places to more places in recent years, or does it seem to be that way because ‘we’ have been disproportionately benefitting from it and affected by it? Zlotnik, back in 1999, showed that the percentage of people living outside their country of origin is ‘remarkably small and has been relatively stable for a long period’ (1999: 42). More recent evidence, cited in Piller (2014), comes from Czaika and De Haas (2014), who demonstrate that Vertovec’s claims about the scale of human movement need to be nuanced. They show that the percentage of the world’s population that is internationally on the move *fell* between 1960 and 2000 from 3.06 percent to 2.73 percent, and that, while international migrants do come from an increased array of countries,¹³ they are moving to ever *fewer* places: predominantly Western Europe, North America, Australia and the Gulf, with Europe receiving more of what Czaika and De Haas call ‘phenotypically and culturally distinct’ (2014: 32) migrants. Their work appears to show that we may be *perceiving* an increase in mobility because Western countries have been disproportionately affected by it.

Thirdly, we are reminded that most people, most of the time, are engaged in relatively short-distance mundane mobilities, ‘the taken-for-granted mobility of everyday life – a mobility seldom reflected upon, which plays a large role in the possibilities and potentials that individuals experience in creating the good life’ (Freudendal-Pedersen 2009: 9), and that we need to put long-distance international mobility into context and resist fetishising it. The sheer scale of mundane mobility and local migration in the West is startling. In the United Kingdom, for example, between April 2000 and April 2001, 11 percent of the population moved home (ONS 2005: 3) – more than 2,500,000 moves. ONS (2012: 2) shows that this annual rate has not changed much since that date and has remained above 2,500,000 every year since 2001 – just under half of that number moving to a different local authority area. There were more than 25 million house moves in the first decade of this millennium, therefore (see Britain 2013a for the scale of other such mobilities). Pooley, Turnbull and

¹³ Though note that there are more countries today than there have ever been – almost twice as many in 2014 (201) as in 1950 (105).

Adams, examining changes in mobility across the twentieth century, argued that, for most people, ‘everyday mobility consists mainly of local travel connected to essential everyday tasks . . . *this aspect of mobility* has changed little over time . . . [there has been] too little emphasis on important elements of stability in everyday mobility’ (2005: 1, 224, emphasis added). Levels of mobility, they claim, have been relatively stable in the United Kingdom over the past century. What has changed is *how* people are mobile – automobility, for example, is certainly up, but predominantly in rural areas where cars are needed, and not so much in the ‘superdiverse’ city.¹⁴

The argument overall, here, is not to deny that long-distance mobility is significant but to recognise the diversity within the mobility figures, to suggest that we are, in the West, at the present time, especially sensitised to it and that we should not overestimate the extent to which people’s mobilities are long-distance.

Despite these cautions, what Arnaud and Spotti (2014) call ‘superdiversity discourse’ is most definitely on the increase in sociolinguistics. The lack of clear definitional parameters for what is and is not superdiverse, however, has led to a considerable broadening, bleaching and slippage of the term. Cynics might argue that pretty much any place with some migrants is being labelled as superdiverse in the literature right now. One could ask, Where *isn’t* it superdiverse? For the past decade I’ve been carrying out dialectological research with Andrea Sudbury on a community that meets all the criteria for superdiversity – 49% of the population not locally born (in Europe, only Andorra and Monaco have a higher proportion of immigrants), with more than sixty countries represented in the population (with different legal statuses, restrictions on rights, etc.), thirty different home languages, and so on. In fact, the community in question is the Falkland Islands. As Adey has argued, ‘if mobility is everything, then the concept has little purchase’ (2006: 76), and one wonders what the concept of superdiversity buys us in this context. It appears not to be so new or so remarkable (or even so necessarily urban – rural superdiversity is there but largely ignored¹⁵). It has certainly reoriented

¹⁴ Internal migration in the United Kingdom, for example, has also been disproportionately affecting rural areas, which have experienced significant net increases in in-migration since at least the 1950s (see Britain 2013b).

¹⁵ In Britain (forthcoming), I provide evidence of: the demographic impact of post-2004 migration from the EU accession states of Eastern Europe and the Baltic on rural areas in southern England, a number of rural southern English towns whose “non-White British” populations have risen from less than 4 percent of the total in 2001 to well over 20 percent in 2011, and significant international migration to rural areas of England during the medieval period. I argue that as we expect multiethnolects in the city, but not in the countryside, there are no studies of

the sociolinguistic spotlight, such that other, more mundane, perhaps less visible, less ideologically contentious, but certainly no less intense mobilities have gone out of view.

One could also argue that superdiversity research smacks therefore of nomadism. Despite Makoni's (2012: 193) warning that it 'contains a powerful sense of social romanticism, creating an illusion of equality in a highly asymmetrical world' (see also Rampton 2013: 3), the international migrant, it could be argued, has indeed rather become fetishised yet undifferentiated in contemporary sociolinguistics. Cresswell argues that this fetishisation is not infrequently 'raced', repeating 'centuries of Western romanticization of the non-Western other ... it is a thoroughly Orientalist discourse investing the ... non-sedentary population with desire and romance ... its advocates often overlook the colonial power relations that produced such images' (2006: 54). It is certainly the non-Western, noncosmopolitan migrant who is subjected to the greatest degree of linguistic gaze, within both superdiversity and multiethnolect research. It also not infrequently presents an asocial perspective on the migrant (something else Rampton 2013 warns against) – in work on multiethnolects, it is not uncommon to find migrants lumped together as one group,¹⁶ in an assumption of similarity, when in fact different ethnic groups in the community and different members of the group may well have distinct migration histories and different degrees of exposure to the host language, and when they pull differently from the ambient dialect repertoire. To what extent there exist fused multiethnolects is an empirical question and should not be an *a priori* assumption. If, as is claimed, urban speakers in superdiverse neighbourhoods are fusing a new distinctive and multiethnic code, researchers should be able to demonstrate that a speaker's ethnic background is *not* a significant predictor of the patterning of language variation – if it is, the fusion has not been successful. This is what, for example, Papazachariou (1998) demonstrated in his examination of what, had his work appeared ten years later, could have been called the rural multiethnolect of Goumenissa in northern Greece. This small town had witnessed the arrival of a number of different ethnic groups at different times, speaking different varieties of Greek, but he demonstrated that, today, variant choice in the new fused dialect does *not* correlate with ethnic origins. When scholars have teased apart different ethnic groups in work on

Multicultural Rural Englishes in the literature, not because they don't or can't exist, but because we haven't looked.

¹⁶ It is not always possible to record a large enough sample from a large enough range of different ethnic groups in studies of multiethnolects, so there are practical limitations on the extent to which this empirical question can be fully addressed.

multiethnolects, considerable interethnic diversity has been found. Cheshire and Fox (2009: 18), for example, in work on the past tense of the verb *be* in Multicultural London English found large differences between different ethnic groups in their data, suggesting both a lack of a fused system (for this variable at least) and the preservation of distinctive ethnic variation. So while the black Caribbean speakers in their sample produced nonstandard first-person plural forms ('we was') in 80 percent of all potential tokens, the Bangladeshi speakers only did so 14 percent of the time. To go one step further, we could ask why we need labels like 'multiethnolect', when we already have well-established terms that capture the relevant linguistic process and outcome, such as koine and koineisation. To label them as distinct fetishises the ethnic other in ways reminiscent of claims of creole exceptionalism.

Conclusion

Dialectology has long been, and largely remains, locality based, and it is therefore not at all surprising that the discipline looks at the world through place-coloured spectacles. Sedentarism is one of the most important authenticators of dialect, and shapes both how practitioners collect their data and how they theorise resulting analyses of them. And there is little evidence yet of an engagement, for example, with what have come to be known as 'mobile methods' (e.g. Büscher et al. 2011), ways of observing the mobile. Perhaps more surprising are the underlying sedentarist ideologies at work in sociolinguistic accounts of dialect that is apparently on the move – the ways in which innovations diffuse across communities, the ways in which new dialects form as a result of migration, the ways in which individual migrants linguistically adapt to new dialect landscapes. But as we have seen, these too are sedentarist – in the case of new dialect formation, for example, mobility is seen as an external event that causes momentary social and linguistic disruption that is eventually rationalised to a state where 'normal service resumes'. This externalisation of mobility, particularly evident in Labovian distinctions between transmission and diffusion, problematically presents it as something which might under certain circumstances not prevail.

Merriman argues that 'uncritical celebrations of the incessant movements constituting the world are said to be in danger of diverting our attention away from the task of identifying the complex politics underpinning the production and regulation of mobilities' (2012: 5). There is certainly a need in contemporary dialectology to heed Merriman's warning, both, as I have shown elsewhere, in examining the consequences of mundane mobilities (Britain

2013a) and in work on multiethnolects, lest we indeed be guilty of an overfascination with flow, at the expense of a more socially sensitive account of the mobilities that underpin the apparently (super)diverse. Multiethnolect scholarship, for example, slips into nomadism in not itself sufficiently celebrating and taking account of the diverse ethnic backgrounds of its speakers, and it is ironic, in this age of heightened sociolinguistic sensitivity to 'identity', that the identities of individual speakers are lost as they are amalgamated into the multiethnic whole. Multiethnolect speakers appear to be stereotypical examples of Cresswell's 'postmodern nomad ... a remarkably unsocial being – unmarked by the traces of class, gender, ethnicity, sexuality, and geography' (2006: 53). It is the task of emergent work both on superdiversity and on contemporary linguistic change to ensure that, in moving the field forward, we do not lurch it from a long-standing sedentarism to an equally problematic nomadic stance towards mobility. What for me further nails down the problematic nomadism of superdiversity, however, is the overcelebration of the long-distance traveller. While refugees and the cosmopolitan jet-set are especially visible, the mobilities with which they engage are exceptional relative to the vast majority of the population's everyday toing and froing.¹⁷ It fetishises the (especially "non-White") international migrant, while failing to take into consideration the general local population churn that proceeds, quietly, but at a far, far greater magnitude. It is this local mundane mobility which more intensively orients people to places, neighbourhoods, homes. Scale is important.

While critiquing uncritical celebrations of incessant movement, Merriman argues that such a lack of discrimination is not a necessary result of placing mobility centre stage (2012: 5). A dialectology that welcomed mobility but avoided the extreme poles of sedentarism and nomadism would need to embrace – methodologically when collecting data as well as theoretically in model building – the fact that humans are all mobile, that mobility is not external, or secondary, but also appreciate that mobilities are overwhelmingly mundane, 'socially differentiated and unevenly experienced' (Adey 2010: 92).

¹⁷ Today, I moved around my flat a lot, took the tram to the office, walked around various rooms at work a lot, walked home via the supermarket to buy tomatoes and bread, then moved around the flat a lot. Tomorrow will be very similar, as will the next day and the next. Hardly exotic, but these are extremely well-worn, routine paths. Peters, Kloppenburg, and Wyatt nicely capture the rather mundane nature of much movement in suggesting that "[m]obility can be understood as the ordinary and everyday achievement of planning and organising co-presence with other people and with material objects such as tables, chairs and occasionally also cake" (2010: 349).

REFERENCES

- Adey, P. 2006. If mobility is everything, then it is nothing. *Mobilities* 1: 75–94.
2010. *Mobility*. London: Routledge.
- Adey, P., and B. Anderson. 2011. Anticipation, materiality, event: The Icelandic ash cloud disruption and the security of mobility. *Mobilities* 6: 11–20.
- Arnaut, K., and M. Spotti. 2014. Superdiversity discourse. *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies* 122: 1–11.
- Barz, R., and J. Siegel (eds.). 1988. *Language Transplanted: Development of Overseas Hindi*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Benediktsson, K., A. Lund, and E. Huijbens. 2011. Inspired by eruptions? Eyjafjallajökull and Icelandic tourism. *Mobilities* 6: 77–84.
- Blommaert, J. 2014. From mobility to complexity in sociolinguistic theory and method. *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies* 103: 1–24.
- Bortoni-Ricardo, S. 1985. *The Urbanization of Rural Dialect Speakers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Britain, D. 1997. Dialect contact and phonological reallocation: ‘Canadian Raising’ in the English Fens. *Language in Society* 26: 15–46.
2009. One foot in the grave? Dialect death, dialect contact and dialect birth in England. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 196/197: 121–155.
2010. Conceptualisations of geographic space in linguistics. In A. Lameli, R. Kehrein, and S. Rabanus (eds.), *Language and Space: An International Handbook of Linguistic Variation*, vol. 2: *Language Mapping*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. 69–97.
2012a. Countering the urbanist agenda in variationist sociolinguistics: Dialect contact, demographic change and the rural-urban dichotomy. In S. Hansen, C. Schwarz, P. Stoeckle, and T. Streck (eds.), *Dialectological and Folk Dialectological Concepts of Space*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 12–30.
2012b. Diffusion. In A. Bergs and L. Brinton (eds.), *English Historical Linguistics: An International Handbook*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2031–2043.
2012c. Innovation diffusion in sociohistorical linguistics. In J. M. Hernandez Campoy and J. C. Conde Silvestre (eds.), *Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell, 451–464.
2013a. The role of mundane mobility and contact in dialect death and dialect birth. In D. Schreier and M. Hundt (eds.), *English as a Contact Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 165–181.
2013b. Space, diffusion and mobility. In J. Chambers and N. Schilling (eds.), *Handbook of Language Variation and Change*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Wiley, 471–500.
Forthcoming. Which way to look?: Perspectives on ‘Urban’ and ‘Rural’ in dialectology. In E. Moore and C. Montgomery (eds.), *A Sense of Place: Studies in Language and Region*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Britain, D., and S. Fox. 2009. The regularisation of the hiatus resolution system in British English: A contact-induced ‘vernacular universal’? In M. Filppula, J. Klemola, and H. Paulasto (eds.), *Vernacular Universals and Language Contacts: Evidence from Varieties of English and Beyond*. London: Routledge, 177–205.
- Bucholtz, M. 2003. Sociolinguistic nostalgia and the authentication of identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7: 398–416.
- Büscher, M., J. Urry, and K. Witchger. 2011. *Mobile Methods*. London: Routledge.

- Budd, L., S. Griggs, D. Howarth, and S. Ison. 2011. A fiasco of volcanic proportions? Eyjafjallajökull and the closure of European airspace. *Mobilities* 6: 31–40.
- Chambers, J. 1992. Dialect acquisition. *Language* 68: 673–705.
- Cheshire, J., and S. Fox. 2009. Was/were variation: A perspective from London. *Language Variation and Change* 21: 1–38.
- Cheshire, J., P. Kerswill, S. Fox, and E. Torgersen. 2011. Contact, the feature pool and the speech community: The emergence of multicultural London English. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 15: 151–196.
- Coupland, N. 2010. The authentic speaker and the speech community. In C. Llamas and D. Watt (eds.), *Language and Identities*. Edinburgh University Press, 99–112.
- Cresswell, T. 1997. Imagining the nomad: Mobility and the postmodern primitive. In G. Benko and U. Strohmayer (eds.), *Space and Social Theory: Interpreting Modernity and Postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell, 360–379.
2006. *On the Move: Mobility in the Modern Western World*. London: Routledge.
2011. Mobilities I: Catching up. *Progress in Human Geography* 35: 550–558.
2012. Mobilities II: Still. *Progress in Human Geography* 36: 645–653.
2014. Mobilities III: Moving on. *Progress in Human Geography* 38: 712–721.
- Cresswell, T., and C. Martin. 2012. On turbulence: Entanglements of disorder and order on a Devon beach. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 103: 516–529.
- Czaika, M., and H. De Haas. 2014. The globalisation of migration: Has the world become more migratory? *International Migration Review* 48: 283–323.
- Eckert, P. 2003. Sociolinguistics and authenticity: An elephant in the room. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7: 392–431.
- Ellis, A. 1889. *On Early English Pronunciation: Part V*. London: Truebner and Co.
- Fox, S. 2007. *The Demise of Cockneys? Language Change in London's 'Traditional' East End*. PhD dissertation, University of Essex.
2015. *The New Cockney: New Ethnicities and Adolescents' Speech in the Traditional East End of London*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Freudendal-Pedersen, M. 2009. *Mobility in Daily Life: Between Freedom and Unfreedom*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Gregory, D. 1985. Suspended animation: The stasis of diffusion theory. In D. Gregory and J. Urry (eds.), *Social Relations and Spatial Structures*. London: Macmillan, 296–336.
- Hall, T. 2009. Footwork: Moving and knowing in local space(s). *Qualitative Research* 9: 571–585.
- Hannam, K., M. Sheller, and J. Urry. 2006. Editorial: Mobilities, immobilities and moorings. *Mobilities* 1: 1–22.
- Heidegger, M. 1962 [1927]. *Being and Time*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hernández Campoy, J. M. 2003. Exposure to contact and the geographical adoption of standard features: Two complementary approaches. *Language in Society* 32: 227–255.
- Horvath, B. 1985. *Variation in Australian English: The Sociolects of Sydney*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Inoue, F. 2010. Gravity model of diffusion for Tokyo new dialect forms. *Leeds Working Papers in Linguistics and Phonetics* 15: 92–100.
- Jeffries, S. 2010. Clear sky thinking. *The Guardian* G2, April 20, 8–11.

- Jensen, O. 2011. Emotional eruptions, volcanic activity and global mobilities: A field account from a European in the US during the eruption of Eyjafjallajökull. *Mobilities* 6: 67–75.
- Kabachnik, P. 2010. Place invaders: Constructing the nomadic threat in England. *The Geographical Review* 100: 90–108.
- Kerswill, P. 1993. Rural dialect speakers in an urban speech community: The role of dialect contact in defining a sociolinguistic concept. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 3: 33–56.
- Kerswill, Paul, and A. Williams. 2000. Creating a new town koine. *Language in Society* 29: 65–115.
- Labov, W. 1966/2006. *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1982. Building on empirical foundations. In W. Lehmann and Y. Malkiel (eds.), *Perspectives in Historical Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 79–92.
2001. *Principles of Linguistic Change*, vol. 2: *Social Factors*. Oxford: Blackwell.
2007. Transmission and diffusion. *Language* 83: 344–387.
2010. *Principles of Linguistic Change*, vol. 3: *Cognitive and Cultural Factors*. Oxford: Wiley.
- Larmouth, D. 1981. Gravity models, wave theory and low-structure regions. In H. Warkentyne (ed.), *Methods IV: Papers from the 4th International Conference on Methods in Dialectology*, University of Victoria, Canada, 199–219.
- Makoni, S. 2012. A critique of language, languaging and supervenacular. Uma crítica à noção de língua, linguagem e supervenáculo. *Muitas Vozes, Ponta Grossa* 1: 189–199.
- Malkki, L. 1992. National geographic: The rooting of peoples and the territorialization of national identity among scholars and refugees. *Cultural Anthropology* 7: 24–44.
- Massey, D. 1993. Power-geometry and a progressive sense of place. In J. Bird, B. Curtis, T. Putnam, G. Robertson, and L. Tucker (eds.), *Mapping the Futures: Local Cultures, Global Change*. London: Routledge, 59–69.
- Matsumoto, K., and D. Britain. 2003. Contact and obsolescence in a diaspora variety of Japanese: The case of Palau in Micronesia. *Essex Research Reports in Linguistics* 44: 38–75.
- Mendoza-Denton, N. 2008. *Homegirls: Language and Cultural Practice among Latina Youth Gangs*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Merriman, P. 2012. *Mobility, Space and Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Milroy, J. 1992. *Linguistic Variation and Change*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Milroy, J., and L. Milroy. 1985. Linguistic change, social network and speaker innovation. *Journal of Linguistics* 21: 339–84.
- Milroy, L. 1980. *Language and Social Networks*. Oxford: Blackwell.
2002. Mobility, contact and language change – working with contemporary speech communities. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 6: 3–15.
- Mougeon, R., and E. Beniak (eds.). 1994. *Les origines du français québécois*. Sainte-Foy: Les Presses de l'Université Laval.
- Office for National Statistics (ONS). 2005. *Reversal of the Southward Population Flow since Start of the New Century: Focus on People and Migration*. London: ONS.
2012. *Internal Migration by Local Authorities in England and Wales, Year Ending June 2011*. London: ONS.

- Orton, H., and E. Dieth. 1962. *Survey of English Dialects: Introduction*. Leeds: E. J. Arnold and Son.
- Papazachariou, D. 1998. Linguistic variation in intonation: Language and the construction of identity among Northern Greek adolescents. PhD dissertation, University of Essex.
- Penny, R. 2000. *Variation and Change in Spanish*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Peters, P., A. Kloppenburg, and S. Wyatt. 2010. Co-ordinating passages: Understanding the resources needed for everyday mobility. *Mobilities* 5: 349–368.
- Piller, I. 2014. Superdiversity: Another Eurocentric idea? Available at www.languageonthemove.com/language-globalization/superdiversity-another-eurocentric-idea.
- Pooley, C., J. Turnbull, and M. Adams. 2005. *A Mobile Century? Changes in Everyday Mobility in Britain in the Twentieth Century*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Rampton, B. 2013. Drilling down to the grain in superdiversity. *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies* 48: 2–15.
- Sayers, D. 2014. The mediated innovation model: A framework for researching media influence in language change. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 18: 185–212.
- Schilling, N. 2013. *Sociolinguistic Fieldwork*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schivelbusch, W. 1986. *The Railway Journey: Trains and Travel in the Nineteenth Century*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sharma, D. 2011. Style repertoire and social change in British Asian English. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 15: 464–492.
- Sheller, M., and J. Urry. 2006. The new mobilities paradigm. *Environment and Planning A* 38: 207–226.
- Trudgill, P. 1974. Linguistic change and diffusion: Description and explanation in sociolinguistic dialect geography. *Language in Society* 3: 215–246.
1983. *On Dialect*. Oxford: Blackwell.
1986. *Dialects in Contact*. Oxford: Blackwell.
2004. *New Dialect Formation: The Inevitability of Colonial Englishes*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Urry, J. 2000. *Sociology Beyond Societies: Mobilities for the Twenty-first Century*. London: Routledge.
2007. *Mobilities*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Vannini, P. 2010. Mobile cultures: From the sociology of transportation to the study of mobilities. *Sociology Compass* 4: 111–121.
- Vertovec, S. 2007. Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30: 1024–1054.
- Weinreich, U., W. Labov, and M. Herzog. 1968. Empirical foundations for a theory of language change. In W. Lehmann and Y. Malkiel (eds.), *Directions for Historical Linguistics*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 97–195.
- Woods, N. 1997. The formation and development of New Zealand English: Interaction of gender-related variation and linguistic change. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 1: 95–126.
- Woods, M. 2011. *Rural*. London: Routledge.
- Yeoh, B. 2006. Mobility and the city. *Theory, Culture and Society* 23: 150–152.
- Zlotnik, H. 1999. Trends of international migration since 1965: What existing data reveal. *International Migration* 37: 21–61.