



The LEARNMe White Paper on Linguistic Diversity



With the support of the
Lifelong Learning Programme
of the European Union



The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Mercator Network of Language Diversity Centres

THE LEARNMe WHITE PAPER ON LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY

A product of the LEARNMe project (Language and Education Addressed through
Research and Networking by Mercator)

February 2016

This paper has been prepared by

Jarmo Lainio (Stockholm University)

In collaboration with the Mercator Network partners

Cor van der Meer, Jorrit Huizinga

(Mercator Research Centre on Multilingualism / Fryske Akademy);

Elin H.G. Jones (Aberystwyth University);

Csilla Bartha, Szabolcs Varjasi

(Research Institute for Linguistics – Hungarian Academy of Sciences);

F. Xavier Vila, Guillem Pujades (CUSC – University of Barcelona)

A full version of this White Paper can be found at

<http://www.learnme.eu/>



Table of Contents

Preface	5
The structure of the WP	6
Chapter 1. Introduction and background to the LEARNMe project on Linguistic Diversity	9
1.1 Background	9
1.2 Aims of the LEARNMe project and the White Paper	12
1.3 The practical process from start to final paper	13
1.4 Our understanding of Linguistic Diversity- initial and developmental stages	17
Chapter 2. Summary of considerations	19
2.1 Considerations for the general use of the concept of Linguistic Diversity	19
2.2 Considerations for the use of the concept of Linguistic Diversity in politics, legislation and policy making	20
2.3 Considerations for researchers	20
2.4 Considerations for the improvement of Linguistic Diversity for media	21
2.5 Considerations for educational standards in order to improve Linguistic Diversity in societies and for individuals in education	22
Chapter 3. Linguistic Diversity and research perspectives on it	23
Chapter 4. Analysis of the concept of Linguistic Diversity in the position papers	28
4.1 Concepts, keywords and their coverage	28
4.2 The concept of Linguistic Diversity and its clusters – tendencies and consequences	30
4.3 From common to more unique concepts used	35
Chapter 5. Linguistic Diversity in policy and practice - Cases and studies in the workshops	38
5.1 Linguistic Diversity reflected in predefined themes	38
5.2 Language policies and sociopolitical dimensions	38
5.2.1 Studies and cases of language policy issues referred to in the workshops and position papers	40
5.2.2 The role of the national context, some examples	41



5.3 The focus target field of media and LD	46
5.4 The focus target field of education and LD	48
5.4.1 Studies and cases on education and LD	49
Chapter 6. Reflections on other studies and the added value of the LEARNMe project	53
6.1 Reflections on other studies	53
6.2 Reflections on the possible impact of research on language policy and practice	59
6.3 Summary and added values of the closing Budapest conference	61
6.4 Added values of the LEARNMe project	62
Chapter 7. Concluding remarks and some ideas for the future treatment of Linguistic Diversity in theory and practice	64
Appendices	67
Appendix 1. List of theoretical concepts ,WS 1-3, PP3	67



Preface

The document before you is the result of a three-year international network project, LEARNME, focusing on Linguistic Diversity (LD)¹ from policy, research and practice perspectives. It outlines the project, its background, its rationale and process from the beginning in January 2013 to the publication of this document in 2016. It contains considerations and recommendations for policy makers, researchers and practitioners, with special regard to language policy and practice, education, media and legal aspects. In its interpretation of LD it explicitly includes signed languages alongside regional and minority languages. For the reader who is more interested in a summarized approach, it may suffice to read the main parts of the Introduction below to understand the aims and motivations of the project, and then to proceed to the Considerations. An abridged version of the White Paper – the main findings and considerations – has also been published separately (see LEARNME website: www.learnme.eu). For the reader who wishes to engage in-depth with the White Paper (WP), the three Position Papers (PP below) produced within the project may also be of interest, as well as other material collected and published on the project's website (www.learnme.eu). The PPs contain summaries of the three LEARNME workshops (WS below) and the presentations given, and include an insight into some of the challenges met by the project in undertaking this work. These challenges concerned scientific-theoretic discussions, presentations of policy decisions and their implementation, as well as conceptual and a wide range of practical aspects. In addition, the WP contains a selection of summaries of research presentations, and a number of best practice cases are provided.

Discussing issues related to LD but doing so only in English presents a potential paradox. On the one hand, the contemporary *lingua franca* of research is English, and much of the frontline development of new theories, concepts and ideas takes place in that language, even among researchers whose native tongue is not English. On the other hand, relying only on English brings with it the danger of (re)producing a skewed discourse on linguistic diversity. This risk may be increased by the fact that most international documents, legislation etc., are drafted in English, albeit occasionally in parallel with a few other languages, for example in French, as is the practice within the EU or Council of Europe (CoE) contexts. These English language originals are often translated into other languages, as are the keywords and concepts

¹ The concept of Linguistic Diversity will be extensively discussed later in this paper, starting in chapter 1.

used in them.

However, we believe that the risk of English bias was averted to a reasonable extent by a combination of factors. First of all, although the transnational oral and written exchanges of our network took place mostly in English, the modest percentage of native English speakers taking part in the network was in itself a guarantee against Anglo-centric biases (and most of the native English speakers were at least bilingual). Secondly, the multinational and multilingual composition of the network assured that a variety of research traditions and sociolinguistic sensibilities were taken into account; the inclusion in the debates of concepts such as *Ausbau*, *semilingualism* or *linguistic normalization*, or the attention to Roma and sign language communities, stemming from German, Scandinavian, Catalan, Hungarian and Welsh sociolinguistic traditions respectively, bear witness to this wider approach. Thirdly, the presentation of numerous case studies from a large variety of situations increased the cross-linguistic validity of the conclusions. We therefore believe that our findings and considerations have been tried and tested in many language contexts. However we welcome further consideration of them in other languages and from other contexts, and in the spirit of linguistic diversity we recommend researchers to also engage with these issues in their own oral, written or signed languages. Materials in various languages other than English have been published on the website of the LEARNME project as part of the multilingual dimension of this project.

The structure of the WP

Chapter 1, immediately after this preface, presents the introduction and the background to the project. In Chapter 2, a summarizing chapter, our *considerations* and *recommendations* are given. These conclusions and recommendations in the WP have been distilled from the sources and encounters with participants during the four major events (three workshops and a final conference, see below), and also from discussions held among the project members, during internal project meetings and in online exchanges.

The considerations are mainly based on three practically-orientated and scientifically directed workshops organized by the project, on the presentations made during these workshops, and on the ensuing PPs. The main results of this aspect of the work is presented in Chapters 3-5. Each of the three workshops had different aims: the one in Aberystwyth, Wales, UK (2103), focused on media and research; the one in Stockholm, Sweden (2104), focused on education and best practices; and the one in Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain (2015), focused on legal aspects. The final conference (held in Budapest in 2015), the results of which are partly

integrated here but also presented in a separate Conference Proceedings report², focused on language policy issues, research, practitioners' involvement and the state of art of sign language, specifically in Hungary. All four events included aspects of language policies and research. A position paper was produced from each workshop as well as the Proceedings volume on the content and the outcomes of the Final Conference. The summaries in the WP include, firstly, the main ideas in some of the 35 presentations during the workshops, by researchers, activists, education practitioners, legal experts, students, policy makers, politicians and authority representatives. Secondly, added to this are the main findings and results of the final conference in Budapest in September 2015, and its ca. 60 presentations.

Chapter 3, Linguistic Diversity and Research Framing, aims to prepare the reader for the challenge of diverging views within the field of research, concerning LD and the descriptions or definitions of it. Furthermore, it discusses views on the role of researchers, policy makers and practitioners in the development of LD.

In Chapter 4, Analysis of the concept of Linguistic Diversity, the analytical work and attempts to redefine and reconceptualize LD are described, based on concepts used in the presentations and the position papers from the workshops. In addition, a fundamental discussion on the type of concept that LD represents, namely as a *keyword in a discourse*, is given. In this chapter some of the main findings of these dialogues and discussions on the conceptual dimensions of LD are also presented.

In Chapter 5, Linguistic Diversity in policy and practice, some of the prominent cases and studies presented during the workshops are summarized and their main arguments and insights are used as a source for discussing the different focal points of the project, namely media, education and language policy, as well as legal aspects.

In order to be able to relate our project's findings and reasoning to other, similar studies, Chapter 6, Reflections on and comments on other studies, specifically points to the added value of the LEARNME project, as well as making reference to the outcomes of earlier, comparable studies.

Chapter 7, Concluding remarks, finally tries to reflect on the project's outcomes, and on the next steps that could be taken in order to promote LD.

In the Appendices the concepts relating to LD that were filtered out during the project are listed.

The development of the WP and the project itself have had valuable input from three invited external researchers, whose contributions included comments on earlier versions of this paper. These experts were Professor Jeroen Darquennes from the University of Namur,

² The Proceedings can be found at the project website www.learnme.eu.

Belgium, Professor Tom Moring from the University of Helsinki, Finland, and Dr Eithne O'Connell from Dublin City University, Ireland. We sincerely thank them for their contributions.

Special mention should also be made of the role of David Forniès and Maria Areny of the Centre Internacional Escarré per les Minories i les Nacions (CIEMEN) in Barcelona, a partner organization during the first two years of the project as well as during the planning stage in 2012. CIEMEN had to withdraw as a formal partner in the project at the end of 2014 and was replaced by the University of Barcelona (CUSC-UB). David Forniès and Maria Areny contributed as full partners to the first two Workshops and Position Papers and as participants in the third workshop and the Final Conference.

Chapter 1.

Introduction and background to the LEARNME project on Linguistic Diversity

1.1 Background

The LEARNME project (2013-2016) set out ambitiously to develop new insights and create recommendations on an intensely debated issue that is acutely present and of crucial importance in many parts of the world today, namely *Linguistic Diversity* (LD below). Not only is the phenomenon of LD of *societal* importance, but it is also a challenge for any *individual* in this globalized and transnational world of ours. In addition, due to rapid changes in terms of international and national *legislation*, the increasing role of *civil society*, constant and increasing *mobility*, economic uncertainty, changing socio-economic compositions and varying degrees of *access to education*, the growth of *social media* and *ICT*, LD and *multilingualism* have become even more highlighted as pressing challenges for societal and personal activities,. There are different ways of dealing with such dimensions of change and changeability, not all of which have their roots in present-day demographic changes or mobility.

Europe has a long history of LD, in and between its regions, countries and states. LD has been stated as part of the cultural heritage of Europe. This is and has been reflected in various national strategic and political statements as well as within the European Union (EU)³ and the Council of Europe (CoE). There are well-grounded beliefs that lived linguistic diversity and attempts to promote it are beneficial for the cohesion, mobility, productivity and stability of the European Union, which is also why it has become one of the cornerstones of European cooperation. However, LD is a challenging and dynamic concept that must be constantly revisited, reanalyzed and redefined in order to fully understand its impact and relevance in all parts of the European Union and beyond. Furthermore, it is clear that Europe is entering into a new era of multilingualism, in which innovative ideas on how the traditional multilingualism of Europe can be used as a resource that can be adapted to address the needs of the migration waves of the last years, should be seen as one of its crucial challenges.

This new era, in which the well-being of and support towards the traditional European

³It shall respect its rich cultural and linguistic diversity, and shall ensure that Europe's cultural heritage is safeguarded and enhanced.' Article 3 of the Treaty on European Union <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:12008M003>

'The Union respects cultural, religious and linguistic diversity.' Article 22 of the European Charter of Fundamental Rights http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/charter/index_en.htm

multilingualism should be part of the investment for the future, offers some particularly worrying signals to the very existence of linguistic minorities. At the moment – and despite a wide range of EU, EC (European Commission) and EP (European Parliament) recommendations – language policies, their implementations, practices and legal regulations vary greatly from country to country in Europe. There also persists a gap between European official rhetoric, the national level implementation of measures supporting LD, and research findings. Frequently, established knowledge based on research is not taken into account in such situations nor is it always interpreted or understood as intended by research. Educational issues are at the core of such discourses and interpretations, in which different languages are attributed different levels of prestige and importance. Therefore, linguistic assimilation continues to pose a widespread threat to the possibilities of achieving equitable social and educational conditions for all – thus influencing everyone’s well-being – as well as jeopardizing the promotion of Europe’s cultural heritage. In short, both the situations of speakers and learners of vulnerable languages, as well as the languages themselves, are constantly under threat.

There are several reasons for this state of affairs. One is that from many ideological perspectives, often based on economic-ideological explanations, LD is seen as an unwanted dimension in territorially defined European geopolitical spaces, both historically and at present. Another is, as already mentioned, that the results of research are not easily perceived, nor are they always effectively communicated or packaged in ways that politics can take them into account. Thirdly, there are widespread, resistant negative attitudes regarding the phenomena of LD and multilingualism, which are value-laden and not easily influenced. A fourth reason is that in key European documents (European Charter of Fundamental Rights; The Barcelona Objectives on Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity; European Commission communication COM(2003)449), LD is understood to be a single, unified phenomenon, which is in stark contrast with the interpretations and effects such objectives have had at national levels.

There is thus reason to believe that mapping and identifying different interpretations of linguistic diversity according to language context, historical approaches, political landscape and language policies could help to clarify how the different levels of implementation of international agreements and national policies have developed. Furthermore, it could reveal why principles that are seen on the one hand as cultural and political cornerstones of Europe (as well as being perceived as beneficial), remain on the other hand highly contested in practice.

In this context, education and language learning are clearly at the core of views on LD, as is the implementation of language and educational policies, at all levels of education, and in formal as well as informal learning situations. However, the knowledge of how such educational issues, research, local contexts, language policies and the lived experiences of

speakers of various languages actually combine together is quite restricted. Such knowledge needs to go beyond the currently limited number of informed researchers and stakeholders. A dimension of vital importance is also the role of the media, especially at the national and local levels and the ways in which these factors are discussed.

The concept of LD and its impact are very much core issues in a multitude of research fields, including education, ethnology, sociology, sociolinguistics, legal studies, political studies, media studies and language policy and planning studies, to name a few. But since LD is interpreted and discussed in much wider circles of society, the results of research undertaken need to be provided so that they explicitly and critically discuss the challenges and problems of LD and multilingualism in vulnerable situations. For example, while the emphasis is placed clearly on education, at the same time, the differences and similarities that exist between various levels of legislative frameworks as well as local practices need to be discussed at international, European, state/national and regional/local contexts.

Consequently, lesser-used or minority/minoritized languages, language learning, and educational and language policies are influenced by a host of other societal, ideological, historical, legal and cultural factors. Across the European Union there are marked differences in languages' legal positions and status, territorial distribution, the roles of standard variants, the use of lesser-used or minority languages in institutional domains, in media, in business and commerce, all of which impact on the communicative context in which also all education processes are located.

A main emphasis in this project is placed on education, where language policies are implemented, and where research results and practical experiences of promoting various languages are communicated and considered. By making accessible adequate knowledge on education, linguistic diversity and multilingualism, and by identifying educational practitioners and policy makers as two main target groups, we hope to be able to fulfill the ambitious aims of the project⁴. This process, however, cannot succeed without the involvement and presentation of research in various fields.

⁴ For example, Norberg Brorsson, Birgitta & Jarmo Lainio 2015. Flerspråkiga elever och deras tillgång till utbildning och språk i skolan. Implikationer för lärarutbildningen. Uppföljningsrapport till EUCIM-TE -projektet. Litteratur och språk, nr 10 (2015). Ed. Ingemar Haag. Eskilstuna/Västerås: Mälardalens högskola.

1.2 Aims of the LEARNMe project and the White Paper

The aims in short of the project were as follows.

We wanted to:

- create an accessible understanding of the challenges and problems of LD, as well as point out possible solutions;
- provide policy guidelines/recommendations for policy stakeholders in the field, as well as for practitioners; these guidelines/recommendations are meant to provide an outline of how multilingual needs of lesser-used languages, as a role model for other languages, can be approached;
- find how implicit or explicit policies on multilingualism and linguistic diversity can be effective through education, and clarify for what purposes this is necessary; (education being understood widely from the beginning, as was the concept of lesser-used languages, which for us included regional or minority languages, migrant languages and sign languages);
- understand how the above-mentioned points relate to the understanding of the concept of LD in policy terms;
- promote equality of all languages and the availability of the learning of all languages in an academic context, involving the educational practice and policy makers;
- actively involve educational professionals, practitioners, academics and policy makers, inviting them to workshops and to the final conference and to contribute to the content and promotion of a final white paper;
- bring together representatives and stakeholders from various angles to formulate policy recommendations for a better support to linguistic diversity in the EU's educational systems;
- use the lesser-used languages as a showcase, since they are natural laboratories for multilingual societies and multilingual educational models; best practices in this field are taken as examples in the Position Papers and the White Paper;
- confront existing prejudice and support the normalization of the European linguistic reality of diversity; and finally,
- to aim at the inclusion of multilingualism from an early age into the educational practice across the educational careers of all; this could increase the prestige of all languages and contribute to reducing the percentage of early school leavers.

In order to achieve these goals, we wanted to bring together actors in the fields of importance to LD: experts, educators, community organizations, grassroots organizations, researchers, and policy makers from different backgrounds and all levels. Representatives of

these different categories were invited to three workshops, in which main dimensions were set to be discussed in beforehand, as follows.

The arrangements of and results of the workshops, as formulated and summarized in the PPs, which can all be found on the project website (www.learnme.eu), were:

- 1) The first workshop (WS1, Aberystwyth) was entitled “Revisiting, reanalysing and redefining research on linguistic diversity: media, education and policy”, stressing the media and its research sectors, sometimes however involving the other fields mentioned in the workshop outline and the general issues.
- 2) The second workshop (WS2, Stockholm) concentrated more on educational issues, and therefore was called: “Revisiting, reanalysing and redefining research on linguistic diversity: education, policy and media”, stressing both educational linguistics and language policy research findings, as well as practical experiences from these fields, and in addition bearing in mind the general issues.
- 3) The third workshop (WS3, Barcelona), focussed on the juridical and political dimensions of language policies, as expressed by its title “Revisiting, reanalysing and redefining research on linguistic diversity: policy, media and education”, and paid particular attention to the consequences of legislative measures on the position of lesser-used languages in all domains of life, bearing in mind the general issues, as in the other workshops.

1.3 The practical process from start to final paper

In order to formulate the White Paper and its discussions, recommendations and conclusions, the three workshops were arranged. From each of the workshops a Position Paper was published.

Prior to the workshops, five common preliminary sub-themes were identified in the preparatory processes by the LEARNMe team as starting points for discussions and presentations (see below). These were the themes for the workshop in Aberystwyth (Wales), but by adding themes connected to the specified contents of the two other workshops, six themes were identified for the Stockholm workshop and seven for the one in Barcelona. Experts and other presenters were invited to share their views on these sub-themes, but with a specific focus for each workshop. Three experts were also invited to all three workshops, Professors Jeroen Darquennes (Namur, Belgium) and Tom Moring (Helsinki, Finland), and Dr Eithne O’Connell (Dublin, Ireland). Their task was to engage in a continuous dialogue with the project partners throughout the duration of the project, commenting on its progress and contributing to its development.

The initial five common themes for the workshops were:

- 1) **Policy and Practice**: Top-down and bottom-up approaches to research, policy and practice; International Level; Nation-state/Country; Regional and Local levels;
- 2) **Terminological Diversity and its consequences**; Terminology as an institutionalised field (e.g. language, dialect, vernacular, bi-/multilingualism, plurilingualism, translanguaging, second vs foreign language, multilingual competence, minority language, immigrant languages, lesser used language, state language, official language etc.);
- 3) **Socio-political approaches and ideological objectives**: e.g. assimilationist, additive/multicultural/segregated linguistic and cultural independence etc.; identities;
- 4) **Methodological Issues**: e.g. “Languaging” and approaches to Linguistic Diversity; permeable and impermeable language frameworks; indigeneity and research.
- 5) Sociolinguistic practices in the fields of Education, Media (including social media) and Policy.
- 6) A sixth theme was introduced for the workshop in Stockholm and was formulated as follows:
- 7) **Examples of best practice** at any level of education for multilingual students.

Examples of best practice within the field of formal and informal multilingual language learning were thus discussed and presented over the two days in Stockholm.

WS3 in Barcelona focussed on the legal and political aspects of LD. In line with this orientation, presenters at the Barcelona Workshop were invited to concentrate on two particular aspects:

- 1) **a. Recent developments** regarding the legal protection of minoritized languages.
b. Impact of legislation on sociolinguistic realities.

The subthemes and the programs of the WSs have often overlapped and frequently also been widely covered in the presentations of individual presenters and contributors. In our account of the three WSs it is therefore not feasible or practical to keep the subthemes strictly apart in this final paper. This thought was expressed in PP3 (p. 48) as follows: [...]

“the analysis of the contents showed clearly that the contributions and discussions at the WS3 only projected themselves irregularly onto the theoretical grid provided by the six sub-themes identified for the two previous workshops.” This was similarly stated in PP2 (p. 7): “[...] the division into themes competes with alternative ways of structuring the presentations and their ways of connecting to a discourse on linguistic diversity. Similarly to the first workshop these characteristics of interdisciplinary work are repeated here [...]”

Naturally, the contents, conclusions and discussions of these topics differed somewhat in the three workshops. The outline of them was, however, similar, and for example video recordings, power-point presentations and other documentation were collected and published online after the workshops. These can all be found via www.learnme.eu.

This taken together means that 35 scholarly and other presentations from the workshops, plus video commentaries and other documentation from the workshops in various languages, are online and openly available. This also means that the project has collected a vast amount of reflections on LD and the topics of the workshops, which cannot be fully incorporated into the compilation of the WP. Considering this complexity and the huge amount of possible uses of the concept of LD, several steps have been taken to reduce the information to be included in a summary. The three workshops (abbreviated as WS1, WS2, WS3) and the Position Papers following them (abbreviated as PP1, PP2, PP3) constitute the main sources for the WP, since they have integrated the views of numerous world-leading scholars and participants in respect of LD, from several European countries and further afield (see also below on the outcomes of the final conference, which differed in volume and scope from the three preceding WSs).

Needless to say, language or languages, as concepts or social phenomena, are not inherently good or bad, but they are of great social, educational and functional importance, the fates of which are decided by personal, symbolic, practical, economic and political values attached to them.⁵

The final conference held in Budapest in September 2015 built on the structures and experiences of the workshops and the summaries made in the PPs. Its role was somewhat different to that of the three workshops since it needed to follow up from the earlier events and add aspects that had been less widely covered in the project. These aspects concerned the geographical extension of the project to areas that had been less well represented earlier, the inclusion of additional practitioners' experiences, as well as a clear emphasis on signed languages, as a matter of scientific and practiced representations.

The views and results of the conference supported many of the discussions and conclusions represented in the WSs and PPs. The Budapest conference website (<http://learnme.mta-tkk.eu>) also adds substantially to the other types of materials produced within the project's workshops, such as video clips, recordings of presentations and signed presentations.⁶ Many of these materials, as well as the conference website itself, can also be

⁵ It is argued nowadays that *diversity*, whether biological, cultural, linguistic etc., is intrinsically good for humankind. We sympathize with that stance, but have still used other arguments for promoting linguistic diversity, which are based on educational, legal and social considerations.

⁶ Furthermore, all attendants of the conference were provided with a USB pendrive containing – amongst other things – abstracts, the LEARNME Position Papers, and a number of videos showing

found through www.learnme.eu

During the final conference the social issues specific to the Central-Eastern European region – particularly, discourses affecting highly disadvantaged groups, such as the Roma and the Deaf community – came to the focus of a wide audience of experts and policy-makers. Exemplary initiatives were very much in the limelight, presenting the Central and Eastern European region as well as Hungary itself as potential role models for other states, in particular with regard to specific issues. Both in its content and its methodological approaches, the conference aimed to create a multidisciplinary platform for researchers, policy-makers and educators, as well as for media practitioners and experts. It also dealt with issues concerning the present and the future of minority communities and their languages from new perspectives: representatives of different disciplines were encouraged to think from the position, interests and knowledge of these communities and in mutual engagement with them.

The two-day conference provided an excellent opportunity for researchers, politicians, practitioners and members of minority communities from Hungary, Central-Eastern Europe and the EU to meet and enter into a dialogue, while focusing on legal, language policy and media aspects of linguistic diversity, along the lines of education, learning and access to knowledge in a broad sense. The event aimed to convey the message that the linguistic diversity of Europe can only be sustained long-term, if new perspectives and forms of knowledge and competence exchanges are involved, and if in addition to political, legal, academic and educational experts, acknowledgement and opportunities should be available to the affected communities as well the inclusion of best practice models and experiences of grass-root movements.

Besides plenary and section presentations, roundtable discussions, workshops and other interactive programmes were held and the event also hosted numerous video demonstrations, internet platforms, presentations of community engagement practice and a poster exhibition. The experiences of the organizers of the final conference and the outcome of the presentations during it, are integrated into the Considerations.

Before summarizing the Considerations that we have formulated on the basis of our experiences during the project, there is a need to establish both the understanding of LD that we had at the outset and also the specific contribution of this final report in comparison to other, similar earlier projects and recommendations. In other words: what are the new findings and insights that are brought to light by this project? We will also return to these matters in later chapters, especially in Chapter 6 and partly in Chapter 7.

interviews with language users.

1.4 Our understanding of Linguistic Diversity – initial and developmental stages

Our general starting point was that LD is an asset that enriches both societies and individuals, and creates fertile soil for internationally embraced targets of democratic societies and the integration of all into fact is that authors tend to coincide in that current Europe is experiencing rapid mutations as far as their languages shared societal processes. LD-friendly policies should foster equity and equality in various respects, sustainable values and empowerment of dominated groups in societies, in order to create better possibilities in the cultural-linguistic, educational and economic fields for all. The concrete targets of such measures are often made up of *plurilingual speakers* and *multilingual societies*, and equally often of *languages* that exist under more or less dominated and vulnerable conditions. One crucial foundation for our discussion is that linguistic – and cultural – diversity is seen as a corner-stone of EU cooperation and ideology, and for its language policy-making, e.g. as stated in Articles 2 and 3(3) of the Treaty on European Union, and Articles 21(1) and 22 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights, as well as in many international resolutions and declarations.⁷ However, on the one hand, this EU level policy has recently been restricted to cover fewer languages⁸, which are typically major European, official languages taught in public schools as state languages, as second languages for migrants in those states, and as foreign languages in other EU countries. In contrast to this, lesser-used, dominated or *minoritized* languages (such as smaller state languages, co-official, regional or minority languages, migrant languages, sign languages) can foresee both less recognition in international policy documents, and find their possibilities to participate in, for example, EU language promotion initiatives, increasingly restricted.⁹ They also meet with more difficulties and challenges, for example in the fields of media and education. In principle, this can be changed through insights into language planning and language policy (LPP), internationally and nationally. However, in the light of recent

⁷ See the so-called Alfonsi report (2013) for a list of these (*Report on endangered European languages and linguistic diversity in the European Union* (2013/2007(INI)).

<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+REPORT+A7-2013-0239+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN>

⁸ See *European Roadmap for Linguistic Diversity* (<http://www.npld.eu/uploads/publications/313.pdf>) and *Strategic Research Agenda for Multilingual Europe 2020*, Presented by the META Technology Council. Berlin: Springer, Also available through: <http://www.npld.eu/uploads/publications/214.pdf>

⁹ The NPLD (Network to Promote Linguistic Diversity) has worked out the *European Roadmap for Linguistic Diversity*, which had an official launch in Brussels 18th of November 2015. This spells out routes to improve the situation for dominated languages in the EU in some detail (<http://www.npld.eu/uploads/publications/313.pdf>).

developments, this may not be feasible since the European Commission broke with tradition in 2014 did not appoint a Commissioner responsible for multilingualism.

In our Project Plan (2012), we stated that “linguistic diversity is a challenging and dynamic concept that must be constantly revisited, reanalysed and redefined in order to fully understand its impact and relevance in all parts of the European Union.” We understood and foresaw some of the complexity surrounding it since its interpretation and use differed widely in different social and national contexts; it was understood differently in different disciplines as well as differently among researchers and across research approaches. We also agreed that there would be a need to widen the scope of studying it from perspectives other than a “top-down” one – as has been the case in much of language policy and planning studies – and that the lived experiences of LD needed to be reported “from the ground” and included in the deeper understanding of what LD is and what it does in different contexts – as is shown in, for example, ethnographically oriented directions of sociolinguistics.

Still, from early on we could not see a simple way of defining Linguistic Diversity, which becomes all the more logical, when in hindsight we can see that it does not stand alone; it is both covered and complemented by other concepts of similar importance and spread, such as *multilingualism* and *language diversity*. Furthermore, it is part of conceptual webs that define LD by their own use and connectedness to issues that are covered by LD, often in specified and topical ways.

We have proceeded along all of these tracks, and the project also contributes to each of the questions and views that LD raised initially. At the end of the report, we try to present and summarize our recent understanding of LD.

Chapter 2.

Summary of considerations

During the workshops and in the presentations, a host of suggestions were put forward to neutralize negative and critical developments reported about in the various studies on LD.

Some examples of the different outcomes for the discussions on LD in the three main fields of the project, language policy, media and educational fields, are given below. Due to the overlapping and interdisciplinary character of the use of LD, it is sometimes necessary to present the considerations in more open-ended ways. Research has been a main starting point, but at the same time the project has the aim of integrating practice-based experiences, as well as national society level and international policy developments. Due to the geopolitical backgrounds of the partners, central, eastern, western, northern and southern European experiences are represented. Some considerations are also based on North American and South African experiences.

The inclusion of both general themes and more specified topics makes it possible to bring in both general and deep perspectives. The three fields of language policy, media and education are combined in an overall attempt to qualify the considerations. This also creates a potential to combine top-down and bottom-up perspectives, and to integrate the collective knowledge base of several scientific disciplines.

2.1 Considerations for the general use of the concept of Linguistic Diversity

- Linguistic Diversity needs to be considered as a dynamic, non-definitive and non-finalised working-concept and term, which may require, not one general, but several context-dependent definitions and even redefinitions over time.
- In the European context, Linguistic Diversity should always include and give due recognition to different broad language groupings: 'majority' and 'minoritized languages' with their varieties, 'regional and indigenous minority languages', 'migrant minority languages' and sign languages.
- Linguistic Diversity should make reference to linguistic rights, in ways that make it possible for people to use their language(s) in a non-hostile environment.

2.2 Considerations for the use of the concept of Linguistic Diversity in politics, legislation and policy making

- In addition to the above points, policies that affect Linguistic Diversity should recognise the importance of social, economic, cultural, demographic, geographic and political conditions.
- Language policies about Linguistic Diversity should include the understanding of local practices of individual plurilingualism and societal multilingualism for the well-being of people living in any named area.
- Linguistic Diversity should reflect upon the relationship between territorial considerations and linguistic continuity across language communities, and not confine this relationship to the level of recognized states and official sub-state governance.
- Policies affecting Linguistic Diversity need to challenge prevailing definitions that are based only on restrictive and exclusive groupings of standardized state-languages, which exclude other types of languages from enjoying the same opportunities.
- Such policies, therefore, should be reconsidered so that their actions are not limited to a restricted number of state languages in, for example, internationally based funding within the EU, such as for the development of ICT tools, the promotion of linguistic rights, the facility of learning languages through mobility programs or the support for creative translation.

2.3 Considerations for researchers

- In addition to the above points, research on Linguistic Diversity should take into account the importance of social, economic, cultural, demographic, geographic and political contexts when dealing with the dynamic language relations between people, communities and agencies of governance.
- Research related to Linguistic Diversity should be connected to language vitality, in breadth and in depth, as well as to language awareness.
- In order to fulfil this, research should include considerations of the views of the language users. In fact, different types of cooperative research should be developed, in order to bring in a bottom-up perspective, in parallel with other ways of representing the knowledge on the ground among speakers, for more reliable and stable research results.
- Studies on Linguistic Diversity should also include the diversity of and between non-standardised vernacular languages.
- There is a need for more in-depth studies of individual cases, followed by generalizations from such cases, and ensuing contributions to theorization in so far as is possible. International comparative studies can give an added value to these perspectives; however,

local studies remain important.

- Furthermore, research on Linguistic Diversity should give due consideration to the possibility that it has an impact on language policies and language practices. Therefore, such research should take into account the need to combine methodological perspectives.
- Researchers should give due attention to the specificities of each sociolinguistic situation when choosing theoretical perspectives, creating the design for a study, and making recommendations to LPP for each case.
- Researchers should continue their efforts to refine definitions of their concepts and theoretical frameworks, and account for their use in both academic/scientific and general/public use. In doing so, they should develop a critical and self-reflective openness to alternative views.

2.4 Considerations for the improvement of Linguistic Diversity for media

- The role of the media is crucial for the sustainability of LD for several reasons. Minority media should, for example, be able to set public agendas for collective debate, have the possibility to choose content and be encouraged to develop its linguistic potential, according to the needs of different social and linguistic groups, and it should be supported in relation to these multidimensional tasks.
- Educational provisions for minority media should be developed to meet these LD goals, and minority media both public and private should be facilitated in order to adapt to the changes in technology.
- Minority media thus need their own specific journalism training, relating to the selection of both language and content in such a way as to be able to deal with the life-worlds of the minority, on its own terms and from its own perspectives.
- Media entities and media content should better reflect societal linguistic diversity. Current media practices often monolingualize societal experiences by representing them through single language production paradigms, and hence systematically exclude or marginalise the dominated languages. As a result, majority – or dominant - language speakers are hardly ever exposed to dominated languages through the media, and this presents a skewed understanding of current linguistic diversity. Equally, such policies and practices present users of minoritized or dominated languages with mediatized monolingualism presented as a norm.
- Social media (participatory media, new media etc) should facilitate the use of languages and enhance LD. Major social media platforms do not allow always full participation for all

languages, and currently only support official languages for some functions.

- In ICT, where language tools are being built – for example voice recognition – these models should allow *all* languages to be included and to participate, and should not discriminate against dominated or lesser-supported languages.
- Adequate resources should be provided to create an environment for sustainable minority media. Where markets fail, public resources should be made available. There is no logical case to be made that minority media should have media production – for example broadcasting time – allocated according to its population size. Irrespective of the numbers of speakers, the provision of media products needs to be similar to that of mainstream media, in order for the media to fulfil its supportive tasks to LD.

2.5 Considerations for educational standards in order to improve Linguistic Diversity in societies and for individuals in education

- The basic principle of education should be *equity* and *equal access* to education, not provision of identical and mainstreamed education for all.
- Educational professionals and policy makers should receive training in the fundamental aspects of child and adult plurilingualism, as well as the benefits of the sustained use of several languages, plurilingual education and multilingualism.
- All children have the right to use, develop and learn their first languages/ mother tongues, and the educational system should – from the perspective of LD – make strong efforts to promote the individual plurilingualism of children. A feasible solution implies cooperation with the users of these languages.
- Children and adults should be provided with a fair chance to develop firstly, basic literacy, and secondly, academic literacy in their languages.
- Children have a right to be given access to the language and culture of their heritage, which should be provided by the educational system.
- Children should be given optimal conditions to develop a functional and high-quality *bi- or plurilingual capacity*, in order for them to have an opportunity to function in and promote a *multilingual society*, that is, to contribute to LD.
- The functional plurilingualism of children and adults should be adapted to make it possible to participate in a multilingual labour market.
- The functional plurilingualism of children and adults should be adapted to make it possible for them to participate in and contribute to a democratic society.

Chapter 3.

Linguistic Diversity and research perspectives on it

In this chapter some key methodological and research issues are briefly discussed, which constitute scientific challenges to the study of LD. This part is included, since research is one main starting point for discussing and understanding the issues raised by LD, and to some extent the very reason for the promotion of it in LPP. One main challenge in the study of LD as an interdisciplinary topic is that it is part of a paradigm shift. This means that a substantial change in the theory base of studies of LPP and LD has been taking place within language- or linguistically oriented disciplines. Basically one can say that it concerns an opposition between quantitative and predefined understanding (structuralist and positivist) of, in this case, LD, vs. qualitative and explorative (post-structuralist and social constructivist) views on it. Its main controversies are summarized below.

Different disciplines understand LD differently and approach the phenomena that the concept signifies and affects in different ways. At least two dimensions can be included in this. One is to what extent predefined concepts – *top-down* initiatives, *large-scale* often *quantifying* perspectives, and methods adapted to those – should be used.¹⁰ This direction is also occasionally referred to as an *essentialist* or *macroscopic* perspective in debates on the issue. Literature referred to in support of these findings cover language policy and planning studies, macro-sociolinguistics, variationist sociolinguistics and much of the sociology of language direction. As a reaction to these views, competing and different angles on the same topic have been developing since the 1990s. Examples of writings in the former tradition can be found in Haugen (1987), Fishman (1991), Kaplan & Baldauf (1997), Hornberger (2006), and some of the articles in volumes like Li Wei (ed.) (2007)¹¹. Note however, that during the career of an

¹⁰ Due to the binary and thus simplifying characteristics the pair of *essentialist* vs. *non-essentialist*, we have not used them extensively in this report. Furthermore, the understanding of the concepts varies, depending on the scientific field and it seems, also according to national context.

¹¹ Haugen, E. (1987). *Language planning*. In *Sociolinguistics*, Vol. 1, U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, K.J. Mattheier & P. Trudgill (eds), *Sociolinguistics*, Vol. 1 Berlin: De Gruyter; Fishman, J.A. (1991). *Reversing Language Shift. Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters; Kaplan, R. B. & R. B. Baldauf (1997), *Language planning: From practice to theory*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters; Hornberger, N. 2006. *Frameworks and models in language policy and*

individual researcher, he or she may well have embraced other, more recently developed directions of study. The binary and rough description above can also be complemented with intermediate levels (meso, in addition to macro and micro), with its encompassing methods to deal with the target of study at this level, for example social networks studies (e.g. Milroy 1989). Some institutional representatives in the field of LPP, such as NGO's and some types of institutions and authorities, should also preferably be placed at this level, rather than at for example at macro or micro ones.

The alternatives that challenge these approaches include *local practices*, *bottom-up* and often *qualitative, small-scale, individual* perspectives. This approach is also occasionally referred to as a *non-essentialist* perspective. Another characteristic is that such research may be based on open-ended, interactional empirical data. Literature referred to in this direction often mentions works by Heller & Martin-Jones (2001), Pavlenko & Blackledge (2004), Blommaert (2005), Makoni & Pennycook (2007), Rampton (2007), Garcia (2009), Jørgensen & Möller (2009), Blackledge & Creese (2010), Pennycook (2010), and Blommaert & Rampton (2011)¹², among others. One additional dimension of this tradition is that it is often targets Eurocentrism and/or colonialism.¹³

planning. In: T. Ricento (ed.), *An Introduction to Language Policy, Theory and Method*. Oxford: Blackwell; Li Wei (ed.) 2007, *The Bilingualism Reader*. Second edition. London: Routledge.

¹² Heller, M. & M. Martin-Jones (2001). 'Introduction: Symbolic domination, education and linguistic differences'. In: Heller, M. & M. Martin-Jones, (eds.) *Voices of authority: Education and linguistic differences*. Westport, CT: Ablex; Pavlenko, A. & A. Blackledge (2004). 'New theoretical approaches to the study of negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts'. In: A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge, (eds), *Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters; Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse. A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press; Makoni, S. & A. Pennycook (2007). 'Disinventing and reconstituting language'. In: Makoni, S. & Pennycook, A. (eds) (2007). *Disinventing and reconstituting language*. Clevedon, Buffalo & Toronto: Multilingual Matters; Rampton, B. (2007), Neo-Hymesian linguistic ethnography in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 11/5: 584–607; García O. (2009). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell; Blackledge, A. & A. Creese (2009). *Multilingualism. A Critical Perspective*. London, Continuum; Jørgensen, J. N. & J. Spindler Möller (2009) 'Poly-Lingual Languageing in Peer Group Interaction.' In: *Nordisk tidsskrift for andrespråksforskning* Vol. 3:2 39-56; Blackledge, A. & A. Creese (2010). *Multilingualism, A Critical Perspective*. London, Continuum; Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a local practice*. London: Routledge; Blommaert, J. & B. Rampton (2011). 'Language and Superdiversity.' *Diversities* 13:2; www.unesco.org/shs/diversities/vol13/issue2/art1 © UNESCO.

¹³ In the background other theoretical, ideological and research dimensions may be traced, which may both distance themselves from the rough macro-micro -distinction, but these will not be dealt with in this paper, the aim of which among other things is to point at one main division in the views on language, and the research on it the field of LPP. For such background views, see for

One commonality of these opposing views is to consider to what extent the *macro*- or the *micro*-perspective is the most valid to study LD and its effects, and which ensuing theories and methods should be used in order to remedy damage that has been done at the different levels, within the study of LPP for example, and with regard to the promotion of LD. One conclusion within the project is that the questions asked also should direct the perspective with which to deal with them (Darquennes, PP1, PP3). Attempts of combining the macro and micro views have been successfully performed, both by researchers already mentioned, and by e.g. by Haglund (2007), McCarty (2011) and Pietikäinen (2010)¹⁴. In addition, the concept of *strategic essentialism* was used by Spivak (1999)¹⁵, pointing to the argument that advocates of 'non-essentialist' perspectives may occasionally adopt an essentialist stance for strategic reasons. As with some of the other binary concepts used in research and the description above, such sharp divisions are often accompanied with other, more continuous understandings of the phenomena studied.

For the purpose of the WP we need to acknowledge among other things the motifs for such opposing views, at the same time as we find it necessary to find ways to bridging between them. The qualitative, bottom-up and often micro aspects, increase our deeper understanding of what actually happens when people communicate, and how they develop and achieve their goals in context as well as how agreements and disagreements are made. This may involve the practitioners' views and claims for empowerment more directly, but nevertheless this approach can have the ambition to connect these aspects to societal, macro level issues and conditions. The quantitative and often macro perspectives, increase our broad understanding of how things connect, how more general situations can be understood and how changes take place. This type of studies also is preferred by legal framing and theories on language planning from a societal perspective. In some fields, law, for example, an open-endedness of concepts

example the writings of Pierre Bourdieu on the linguistic market and social habitus, and other views in which the relationship between language and political economy are discussed (e.g. Kenneth McGill (2013). 'Political Economy and Language: A Review of Some Recent Literature'. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 23:2 196–213).

¹⁴ Haglund, C. (2007). 'Linguistic diversity, institutional order and sociocultural change: Discourses and practices among teachers in Sweden.' In: *Learning and teaching in two languages? Resources of multilingual education in context*, Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang; Pietikäinen, S. (2010) 'Sami language mobility: scales and discourses of multilingualism in a polycentric environment'. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 202 79–101; McCarty, T. (2011). 'Introducing Ethnography and language policy.' In: McCarty, T. (ed.) *Ethnography and language policy*. New York & London: Routledge

¹⁵ Spivak, G. C. (1993) *Outside in the Teaching Machine*. New York: Routledge

and a lack of pre-defined starting points as promoted by qualitative views, is be exactly what legal discourses attempt to avoid in order to match legal texts to their related legal matters as precisely as possible. On the other hand, and paradoxically perhaps, legal texts also strive for general statements, in order to leave space for flexibility in relating legal considerations to practice. Having said that, it is important to add that it is still a matter of concern that the voices from below are not easily integrated and heard in the type of top-down, macro-level policy-making.

As has been pointed out here as well as in other studies and conclusions concerned with such divided perspectives, a combination of these can contribute more to both angles of study. Another conclusion of this discussion is that more studies of the micro (and the intermediate, meso or group level) and bottom-up type are needed, to create a greater understanding of what happens when people communicate and act, and to what extent this may lead to political impact in the field of LD. On the other hand, also more macro-directed studies are needed, in order to generalize and to paint the critical large-scale picture. Conversely, the detailed, small-scale studies evaluate the validity of large-scale studies. The optimal solution, which in research terms is the most demanding and time-consuming, but also the most rewarding for policy-making, is to combine them. Given the contextualized dimension of LD, it would also be rewarding to undertake such parallel studies in different geopolitical contexts, in order to gain a general, European level of understanding. The way LPP is planned and implemented needs more flexible alternatives to complement the top-down and bottom-up dichotomy, which at any rate is a simplified understanding of how the processes of LPP occur (Darquennes, WS1, WS3; cf. May 2005, and articles in Ricento (ed.) 2006)¹⁶. Also in this respect, different research traditions and outcomes in cooperation may contribute to more functional methodological choices in specific language contexts.

Nevertheless, both of the two broadly described perspectives above – top-down and macro vs. bottom-up and micro – share the view that the insights of research and evaluation studies in various fields of the language planning and policy fields, are perceived to have been undervalued by politicians and decision-makers. This was pointed out recurrently in the presentations of all four events arranged by the LEARNMe project.

Since the opposing scientific views mentioned above have a bearing on the issues of LD, and this was acknowledged by the project from the outset, it was ensured that representatives and presentations from both perspectives were included in the programmes of the WSs and in the final conference. This is reflected on the one hand in the analyses of LD itself as a concept,

¹⁶ May, S. (2005) Language rights: Moving the debate forward. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 9:3 319-347.

and in the discussion on its related concepts, which are treated in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 summarizes the key presentations of these main dimensions during the WSS.

Chapter 4.

Analysis of the concept of Linguistic Diversity in the position papers

4.1 Concepts, keywords and their coverage

To understand the complex issues of LD, as well as the concept of LD, it is necessary to approach them from several angles. In this chapter we will discuss LD as a phenomenon and a concept. Firstly, it may be discussed from the point of view of what it refers to, its meanings, both *denotations* and *connotations*. We have tried to identify some of the main fields of reference of LD (see Chapters 5 and PPs 1-3).

Secondly, there are other concepts, which seem to partly overlap in meaning with LD, for example *language diversity* or *multilingualism*. Googling “linguistic diversity” gives 1,140,000 hits (2015-08-25) and “language diversity” 50,400,000 hits, the latter seems to include examples of the former (2015-08-25). “Multilingualism” receives 616,000 hits (2015-08-25; “bilingualism” 2,650,000; 2015-08-25) and occasionally also makes reference to linguistic/language diversity. We have concentrated on LD due to its central position in recent policy documents and discourses on language issues at the European level.

Thirdly, LD evokes and involves many other concepts that are directly or indirectly related to it, which presuppose and extend its use. In this report concepts that were used and ideas developed in the three workshops arranged as part of the project, will be touched upon. These can be divided into sub-groups or clusters of reference.

Fourthly, in cases where there is some kind of basic agreement on what the concept of LD stands for, in at least a preliminarily defined context, questions may be raised about how well political and other actors have created language friendly conditions for it, or adversely, how attempts have been made to hinder it. One recurrent feature in this is also that in all three topical fields of the workshops, this was a direct theme in many of the presentations. One basic starting point is that research and scholars can contribute to a deeper understanding of all these points. This fourth and last aspect will be further developed in Chapter 5.

Regarding the use and impact of LD as a concept, one may add the following.

Linguistic Diversity fulfils the general criteria of being a *keyword* in a scientific sense¹⁷, which among other things means that it typically:

- is frequently used,
- has many meanings (especially connotative meanings, the number of which it often extends), which depend on its communicative contexts; that is, it has open-ended semantics and may need an agreed-upon context for it to work as intended,
- is part of a word cluster, and forms a core in that type of conceptual web (for example, see the discussion below on the common concepts used in all three of the workshops),
- may often compete with other words, that is, is part of a “semantic battle”, which may be settled over time by changing use of both the keyword and its clustered words,
- is impossible to define precisely the meaning of it, although preliminary working definitions in the communicative or topical fields in which it is used, can be formulated,
- carries political and social weight, and reflects ideas, political or other programmes or values, and is intended to further those ideas or values,
- may likewise reflect a historical period,
- may thus reveal deeper patterns of thought and changes,
- may have an older usage or meaning, which has either changed or remained rather stable, and it may be part of fashion trends within fields of communication, such as media language, politics, and specific discourses on societal fields like education and media, but also in research,
- needs, in the interest of society, to be frequently extended and developed, in the light of societal development and changes.

We have presented this list of characteristics of a keyword, among which LD can be counted, in order to underline the complexity of our task, but also to provide a necessary background to understand the conflicts, perceived misuse and (mis-) understandings such concepts may cause. It is of benefit for the users of this and other keywords, to grasp the general characteristics of a keyword, both to understand the confusion about it and to make efforts to clarify its use for others, and even for oneself, on any occasion when it is used. One example of how strongly political a concept can be, comes from the reflections on glottonyms in Chapter 5, based on the three Ws. Naming a language in a particular and conscious way is

¹⁷ Articles on the history of concepts, by Lindberg, Brylla, and Lettevall, all in: Lindberg, Bo (ed.) (2005), *Trygghet och äventyr. Om begreppshistoria*. Konferenser 59. Stockholm: Kungliga Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitetsakademien./The Royal Swedish Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities.

a direct and strong political statement.

Our general purpose here in Chapter 4 is firstly, to understand the reference to LD as a concept by various actors in the fields of media, education and language policies, and secondly, to critically review how, where and possibly why the often broadly politically agreed goal that the concept implies, is often not achieved, in the implementation of various policies, internationally, transnationally and nationally, even locally. To this end, we believe that researchers both have a potential and a duty to participate in such discussions. On the other hand, as has been pointed out for keywords like this¹⁸, the use of them in *everyday language*, in which clear changes have taken place compared to scientifically, often well delimited use, may effectively prevent its use from being returned to the scientific field. Furthermore, conscious changes of a keyword may have tactical, political or ideological roots, the aim of which are likewise, political and ideological.

The WP does not give final answers to some issues raised about LD, but through it we hope to demonstrate that research results in different disciplines and by a variety of researchers may coincide in their main points. We also show, that the views on how to get there, may differ due to different theoretical and scientific starting points. Even so, such divides in theoretical views may, as a result of an exchange of ideas and views, take steps in the same direction, which is also a part of the findings of this WP.

4.2 The concept of Linguistic Diversity and its clusters – tendencies and consequences

It is difficult to pick out one, correct interpretation (“definitive meaning”), which should replace the other understandings of the concept of LD. In addition, its use follows the same type of changes and development that other debated and politically “hot” concepts have gone through, and which have been extensively studied at international level and in national contexts, e.g., keywords like *bilingual education*, *mother tongue*, *plurilingualism* (level of the CoE), *multilingualism* (level of the EU), *semilingualism*, *nationalism*, *multiculturalism* and *integration*, to mention only a few. This does not, however, mean that it is impossible to state needs to deepen the understanding of LD as a phenomenon, nor does it mean that one could not formulate recommendations on how to achieve better results in the adaptation and implementation of such concepts.¹⁹

¹⁸ Lettevall in Lindberg (2005; cf. Footnote 6).

¹⁹ This can be compared to a discussion on *racism*, which may well cover different understandings of the concept, which should not reduce the need to combat the phenomena and

Our first conclusion is thus, that depending on the geopolitical context, whether LD primarily concerns the policy itself or its implementation, the meaning, development and the use of it and concepts needed to connect to it vary. In many cases this variation is mediated through the lenses of various scientific disciplines and their language ideologies, which could be called theoretical contexts, but also through the transdisciplinary flow²⁰ – or borrowing – of such concepts from one field of study to another.

The number of terms which appeared in all three workshops, WS 1-3, (called coincidence cases) is extremely low; these hypothetically could have indicated a core of words clustering around LD that could clarify its dimensions. These were:

<i>Occurred in</i>	Aberystwyth	Stockholm	Barcelona	
269 Language rights (1) (2) (3)	1	2	3	Specialised term
275 Language use (1) (2) (3)	1	2	3	Specialised term
277 Language vitality (1) (2) (3)	1	2	3	Specialised term
279 Linguaging (1) (2) (3)	1	2	3	Specialised term
349 Minority language (1) (2) (3)	1	2	3	Specialised term
406 Normalization (1) (2) (3)	1	2	3	Specialised term
412 Official languages (1) (2) (3)	1	2	3	Specialised term
571 Welsh (1) (2) (3)	1	2	3	Glottonym

In a way, these words are indicative for the project and for the discussions on LD, and demonstrate the fact that LD is a multifaceted concept. The legal aspect of language rights was repeatedly included in all three workshops, and was connected to all three thematic foci, and also related to human rights, education and media in some presentations.

effects of actions reflected by the concept (e.g., Ramón Grosfoguel 2011. La descolonización del conocimiento: diálogo crítico entre la visión descolonial de Frantz Fanon y la sociología descolonial de Boaventura de Sousa Santos, in *Formas-Otras: Saber, nombrar, narrar, hacer* (IV Training Seminar de jóvenes investigadores en Dinámicas Interculturales, Fundación CIDOB, Barcelona): 97-108.

http://www.cidob.org/es/content/download/29942/356572/file/97-108_Ramon+Grosfoguel.pdf

Ramón Grosfoguel (undated). What is racism? Zone of Being and Zone of Non-Being in the Work of Frantz Fanon and Boaventura De Sousa Santos. Department of Ethnic Studies, UC Berkeley. (Translation by Jordan Rodriguez).

²⁰ It is clear that advances in one discipline may cause the need of borrowing and adapting its concepts to other disciplines, in order to increase the clarity of the discipline borrowing them. Such borrowing also takes place in cases when every-day language introduces scientific concepts. In both cases, the use of the borrowed concepts may be altered, compared to the intended used in the original discipline.



Language use may be seen as a neutral and all-encompassing word, thus it is questionable whether it retains the specialized status it has received within sociolinguistics; it is used in more specific contexts in LPP literature as part of a semantic web including e.g., language proficiency and language form.

In the discussion on terminology during WS1, Darquennes stated that in addition to the perspective difference between macro and micro views, the latter more often seems to need to use other open-ended concepts for their argumentation and analyses, like *ancestry* or *language*. However, the alternatives developed to replace these, for example *use of languages* with *translanguaging*, opens up for difficulties in the next step, for example for educational choices in multilingual settings. Another problem touched upon was the established use of concepts, like *language*, in political discourses, which would run into communicative problems, if this type of rather ambiguous, general concepts were not used.

Language vitality is clearly connected to the discourse on language maintenance and to LD in the sense of preserving and developing vulnerable languages at all levels, as an indication of LD. It also connects to the attempts to develop indices and scales to establish minimum standards for language maintenance in the tradition of both UNESCO and Ethnologue.²¹

Languaging is a concept that has become symbolic for a number of qualitative, ethnographically oriented, social constructivist views on language and language resources, especially with regard to multilinguals. It is also at the core of the scientific discourse, challenges and disputes that were aired during the workshops, on methods and theories and their implication for language policies. A host of other, related but slightly different concepts have been developed in parallel to this referring to multilingual situations: *translanguaging*, *metrolingualism*, *heteroglossia*, etc. (for example, Jørgensen & Möller 2007; García 2011; Blackledge & Creese 2010).

Minority language is, despite its sometimes inadequate denotation of both medium-size languages like Catalan and indigenous languages like Sami, still a necessary tool to refer, for example, to both legislation for dominated languages, and to point out the characteristics of the minoritized language position, in terms on number of speakers, political and economic power etc. 'Minority language' as a concept is also used to refer to migrant languages, which however, when there is a legislation in place for officially recognized minority languages, may cause both confusion and conflicts.

During WS1 the concepts referring to minoritized languages (minority, regional, heritage, indigenous, non-state, co-official, lesser-used, 'medium' languages, most of which furthermore

²¹ (Cf. <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/endangered-languages/language-vitality/>; <https://www.ethnologue.com/statistics/country>).

lack a cohesive use (Moring, PP1)) were discussed. One view was that the concept of minority has changed in such situations, in which the traditional, state territory does not cover the languages in question. Trans-national, trans-border and inclusive spaces of communication call for a reconceptualization also of the keyword *minority* (Amezaga & Arana, PP1). Such changes of keywords seem to take place in context, in specific geopolitical contexts, but the change challenges the connection precisely to geopolitical, defined areas, like a state territory. Minoritized languages were also discussed in relation to English as a lingua franca (O'Connell WS1). Such is the dominance of English as a global language that even dominant languages may be seen as minoritized in relation to it. One consequence of this phenomenon is that LPP measures must increasingly be adopted not only to small but also more dominant languages which have the opportunity to benefit from the hard-won experience of smaller languages. In this, a paradox was discussed. The acceptance of additional official languages in the EU context might minoritize smaller, dominated languages even more, than the use of for example three major official languages (such as English, French, German) in international contexts, such as European level official cooperation. The increased tendency to use the term *minoritized* can also be interpreted as an attempt to reflect upon the dynamism and changeability of the social and political conditions that influence the status and position of languages and varieties at given historical points and contexts.

Considering that one of the partners²² is from the original area of the use of the concept of *normalization*, Catalonia, it is not surprising that it has occurred also in the discussions of all three WSs. This is a term that could be seen as a novelty for many outside the Catalan, Basque and Galician contexts, except for scholars and others who for various reasons have found an interest in these languages and their political situations. This is also a concept that seems to fill a semantic gap in many other languages dealing with the issues of LD, largely due to it being fairly well established and accepted in its local definition. Its extension, however, largely takes place through English and French, but since the Catalan situation is quite well-known beyond its own territories, it also is disseminated through Spanish and Catalan (see further in Chapter 6).

Official languages as a concept is at the core of the EU and international cooperation and language policy discussions on LD. It also concerns discussions on the possibility and striving among activists for some medium-size languages with a regional or national co-official status to improve its status, nationally and internationally. It is connected to other types of official status of languages (official minority languages, such as Irish in Ireland and Finnish in Sweden).

The glottonym *Welsh* is naturally present in all three workshops. Firstly, one of the partners

²² Both CIEMEN (partner 2013-2014) and the University of Barcelona (partner 2015-2016).

originate from Wales. Secondly, many of the issues discussed during the workshops have gone through different phases and attempts to support Welsh as part of the LD of Wales and the UK, and thirdly, many of the best practices in the active promotion of RMLs (regional or minority languages), in media promotion and in bilingual education have their roots in the often innovative decisions taken in Wales, both top-down and bottom-up. These experiences have in addition often been efficiently disseminated through English, both by researchers and activists, and in the case of media, between minority language media representatives in different countries.

One aspect of the glottonym issue is rather political in nature and connected to power relations. For example, Meänkieli in Northern Sweden received language status in the 1990s and was ratified for as an independent language for the FCNM (the Framework Convention for National Minorities) and ECRML (European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages) in 2000. Both before and after that, some speakers of this language form, which earlier was called a dialect of Finnish, “mixed language” etc., saw this as a dialect, a view generally shared by other Finnish-speakers, in Finland and in Sweden, and Swedish-speakers in Sweden and in Finland. By contesting or supporting the name of the language, it is possible to take a stand for or against the standardization and development of the language, including how it should be treated in educational terms, in administration etc.²³ This also clearly has an impact on how speakers as well as researchers are willing to identify with Meänkieli, or alternatively, to distance themselves from it. The traditional language use of the region, which is strongly connected to a regional identity for many, is endangered under the double pressure from Finnish and Swedish.

Similar ways of naming and taking a political stand were described in PP3 (Sorolla’s presentation), for Catalan and Aragonese, in which process not even a glottonym was used for Catalan, but “linguistic modality” and the “Aragonese language belonging to the Eastern Area”, mockingly called LAPAO from its acronym in Catalan. The naming thus becomes a political tool, which has repercussions on legislation, societal support, language cultivation, education and so on, and the very prestige of the language. A similar strategy has been used by the Turkish authorities and media, for Kurdish in Turkey, which is simply called “the other language”.

There are further problems connected with the naming of a language, when there are political and historical reasons to choose one rather than the other option. In some cases different glottonyms refer to the same language form, and in others, one glottonym refers to a host of varieties, sometimes for top-down reasons (for example Sami in Sweden was ratified for as one language in the CoE’s conventions, but the policy developing at present has turned

²³ See Lainio & Wandé (2015), for a discussion.

bottom-up and become taken to be for valid for several Sami languages). Sometimes one single glottonym is intentionally chosen for several, clearly differing varieties, like for Romani. In this case, it may also be preferred from the point of view of speakers and their NGO's.

Another dimension mirrored by the use of glottonyms used in the WSs is that despite them possibly objectifying and reducing the role of language practices, the abundant need to use the glottonyms shows that this is necessary. It would be difficult to discuss issues of, for example, Scots or Aranese, without using those very concepts here. They carry both connotations and denotations of significant weight, in order to make an understanding possible, invoking historical, political and societal matters, when discussing these forms of language. They could not in this type of discourse be covered by *linguaging*, *translanguaging* or *multilingual resources*, to pick some of the concepts suggested to replace the very notion of *language* and individual languages. Also the choice of alternatives, as shown in the case of Catalan – for example to use Aragonese for both Catalan and Aragonese, or *linguistic modalities* – or in the case of Meänkieli, Tornedalen Finnish – indicates that even if these concepts are objectifying the languages (sometimes, but not always, this concerns standard languages), they also allow for smaller state languages, minority, dominated or powerless languages and their speakers, to make a statement of empowerment and to promote their languages in a bottom-up direction.

All in all, the small number of entries used in all three WSs nevertheless turned out to be indicative and symptomatic for both the sub-themes, the variation of topics and geopolitical contexts.

4.3 From common to more unique concepts used

The total number of entries identified during the WSs, understood to cover or relate to issues pertaining to LD, was 573. A full list of these is given in PP3 and in Appendix. The variation of concepts used and attempts to classify them according to meaning, is briefly exemplified in the following.

One general way of trying to deal with the entries and many words used to discuss LD in the presentations and the summaries of these in the PPs, is to try to find how these sub-concepts to LD are used, whether in specialized ways as has been the attempt to separate them in two groups mentioned, glottonyms and specialized terms. A preliminary analysis of the concepts makes it possible to see some potential other differences between the words used. They can be roughly grouped into categories – both according to their meaning extensions and according to contexts in which they are used. Their borders, however, are not clear-cut, and the use of the concepts may both go from the general to the specific reference, and frequently from the specific to more general (PP refers to in which Position Paper the concept occurred):

- 1) General cultural-societal meaning, for example:
 - a. *Apartheid* (general meaning, political use; PP2);
 - b. *Census* (politics, social sciences; PP2);
 - c. *Motivation* (general meaning, but also in language acquisition studies/sociolinguistics, social science/identity formation; PP2);
 - d. *Diverse society* (also in social science, educational linguistics; PP2);
- 2) Used in research and/or theoretical discussions, with an overlapping meaning between different societal and/or theoretical fields
 - a. *Codification* (LPP, sociolinguistics; PP1, PP2);
 - b. *Diglossia* (sociolinguistics, LPP, social sciences; PP1, PP3);
 - c. *Economic vitality* (LPP for language vitality; PP2);
 - d. *English as an additional language (EAL)* (LPP, sociolinguistics, educational linguistics; PP2);
 - e. *Indigenous journalism* (LPP, educational politics, educational linguistics, rights perspectives/law, minority empowerment; PP1, PP2);
 - f. *Language maintenance and shift* (LPP, sociolinguistics; PP2, PP3);
 - g. *Legal framework* (rights perspectives/law, LPP, sociolinguistics; PP3);
 - h. *Standardization* (LPP, sociolinguistics, general use; PP2, PP3);
 - i. *Home language* (LPP, sociolinguistics, educational linguistics; PP2, PP3);
 - j. *Co-official language* (rights perspectives/law, LPP, sociolinguistics; PP3);
 - k. *Linguistic conflict* (LPP, rights perspectives/law, sociolinguistics; PP3);
- 3) Highly specialized words, used in research and/or theoretical discussions, but restricted to use in one or several subfields:
 - a. *Academic literacy* (educational linguistics; PP2);
 - b. *Autochthonous* (LPP, rights perspectives/law, sociolinguistics; PP1);
 - c. *Essentialist* (social sciences, sociolinguistics; PP2);
 - d. *Heteroglossia* (sociolinguistics, educational linguistics; PP1);
 - e. *High variety* (LPP, sociolinguistics; PP3);
 - f. *Immersion language teaching* (educational linguistics, sociolinguistics, LPP, general political use; PP2);
 - g. *Monolingual habitus* (social sciences, educational linguistics; PP2);
 - h. *Pluricentric* (sociolinguistics, LPP; PP1, PP2);
 - i. *Revitalization* (LPP; sociolinguistics, rights perspectives/law, educational linguistics; PP2, PP3);
 - j. *Territorial language* (rights perspectives/law, LPP; PP2)
 - k. *Voice* (LPP, sociolinguistics, educational linguistics; general meaning; PP2).

One problem with these attempts to classify the words is that one needs to use other, sometimes “fuzzy” words in the list or from these categories to describe them. This may

become circular, but it is also the result of the clustering of terms interconnected to each other. Another problem is the obvious difficulty of making clear-cut distinctions for them and their meanings. In this connection it is also to be noted, that it was not possible to conduct a corpus-based study, which means that isolated words are presented here, whereas meaning is created and better analysed in context.²⁴

The efforts to delimit and describe the different concepts referring to LD, directly or indirectly, serve as an introduction to the more important aspect of what happens with LD, in different contexts, and what this may result in, in an attempt to decrease the negative treatment of LD.

²⁴ There are attempts elsewhere to deal with similar challenges, for example by F. Grin (2006), *Gestion de la diversité, arbitrage des droits linguistiques et decentralization* (<http://www.unige.ch/traduction-interpretation/recherches/groupes/elf/conferences/grin/MONTREAL-CEETUM-POPO.pdf>)

Chapter 5.

Linguistic Diversity in policy and practice - Cases and studies in the workshops

5.1 Linguistic Diversity reflected in predefined themes

The contextual variation in the use of concepts needs to be taken into account when attempting to improve conditions of linguistically diverse societies. Similarly, it was pointed out repeatedly during the four events of the project that, equally in the case of research the contextual factors should be weighed in when studying the situation of a specific language, to the extent that methods too should be adapted to the contexts of different languages. Different types of theory bases and perspectives were recommended to be used, as were combinations or hybrid integrations of theories and perspectives, in order to bridge clashes in the first place between deep knowledge on individual cases, and general but assumedly shallower knowledge at a more societal level.

The use of the concept of LD thus has different extensions, depending on which *topical area* is addressed and discussed. In our case these areas have been language policy and socio-political issues/legislation, media and education. While LD was a framing concept for the project, discussions on its status and implementation in different contexts have been the method to reveal its promotion and situation in practice, as well as a way to understand which issues are related to LD.

Just as in the considerations chapter, the headings below are not to be considered as strict lines of division, since there are obvious overlaps between the three main topical areas. For example, there is a clear interdependency between policy issues (5.2) and educational challenges (5.4). This impossibility to separate the topical areas strictly is also illustrated by the fact that the invited presentations and discussions during the workshops seldom stuck to the preset topics identified as themes for the workshops. Instead, many contributions covered several of the topics and also included aspects of the other fields stated as the main targets for the three workshops; the presentations and discussions on LD were regularly multifaceted and *interdisciplinary*.

5.2 Language policies and sociopolitical dimensions

At one general *framing level*, LD is often taken to refer to the maintenance and shift of the richness of different languages at the societal level. This is connected to issues discussed in politics, language policy and planning (LPP), social sciences, sociolinguistics, educational

linguistics, and at a general, cultural level. This is also where legal aspects, language rights etc. are part of a regulating framework. This may furthermore include legislation targeting for example education or media, often as a part of other types of more specific regulations of such fields. Economic issues are also present, both as a condition for and a consequence of LD.

At another level, the practical *implementation* of those policies that are intended to maintain the language variation of a society, to fulfil its LPP either explicitly or implicitly, leads to discussions on how that can be achieved. Among other things, this is connected to the practical and regulated possibilities of for example maintaining or developing individual bilingual or plurilingual capacity, primarily through schooling, in order for individuals to function in increasingly multilingual societies and global, trans-border contacts. Media issues, both traditional and new media, are also easily connected to this.

In addition, also depending on in which *national polity or geopolitical context* the LD was discussed, there were differences in how a “normalized” understanding of LD had developed, and what aspect of its use was emphasized. This was directly connected to burning political issues – often with a historical dimension – and the debates on how to proceed with a national LPP, and what consequences this would have for education, media etc. This could also be strongly or loosely connected to the EU level discourse on LD. For example, there has been a stated change of focus for languages in the policy of the EC and EU, which increasingly stresses the aim to strengthening the economic value of some languages rather than others, in the labour market.²⁵ Other languages are downgraded as a consequence of this selection of languages. In this sense the process resembles that of choosing a standard language for national purposes, leading to other languages and varieties becoming downgraded or minoritized. One critique of this promotion of languages that are already strong (in terms of speakers and societal support) has been that “softer” and more culturally motivated reasons to promote and secure the use of other languages are undermined. These languages are then *minoritized*, sometimes even if their conditions in terms of numbers of speakers and societal support might suggest that they could withstand such a development. In this scenario, language politics often are based on party political preferences and ideologies. This corroborates the statement in PP3, that the national and geopolitical context of a state, its legislation, politics, decisions and discourses have by no means lost their importance. On the contrary, the sustainability of and threats to LD very much depend on the individual national situations and the way language policies and other political fields deal with these issues. The subsidiarity principle of EU cooperation strengthens the importance of the national level, also

²⁵ For example, in the Alfonsi resolution, EU directives, and in the NPLD European Roadmap for Linguistic Diversity, presented by Climent-Ferrando during WS3.

in matters that could reinforce agreed-upon, international rights perspectives.

5.2.1 Studies and cases of language policy issues referred to in the workshops and position papers

Lewis (PP1) described how cultural diversity has been discussed within normative political theory during the last decades. One aim of this discussion is to better understand how society can plan for a fair and just society, with regard to LD as an extension of *cultural diversity*. The arguments for supporting severely threatened languages may take ecological, human benefit, scientific and aesthetic forms. In that discourse, however, these were seen as questionable starting points to justify the imposition of obligations, both for the speakers and the general public. These may be called “soft” values, and have to face the challenge of competing with more hard-core economic or instrumental values, such as direct benefits in the labour market. The tendency to strengthen this aspect is clear within the EU, where the economic dimension, linked with mobility, employability and profitability, was also pointed out by Nagy (PP1) in her account of EU level legislation on LD and minority languages. This is also reinforced by the decreased support for language learning in other than the main European foreign languages, as well as for other types of attempts to enhance LD.

In connection with discussions on *assimilationism*, which is a traditional and well-known fate of minorities, often directed from top-down, but also practiced across all levels of societies, it was mentioned that the reverse, attempts to separate or even isolate minority/indigenous communities need serious consideration. For example, as a concrete example Moring (PP1) mentioned the new Sami indigenous journalism education which has to strike a balance between the intended and necessary independence from mainstream values and views, the possibility to educate according to the community's own focus areas and its narrative on indigeneity, and the inclusion into mainstream society and its concerns. The possibility to do so, is also steered by regulations and principles of higher education, mostly created and functioning as a result of long-term adaptation to a mainstream situation, based on the conditions of its state language, and today also of English. This also concerns the scientific input into such an education and the creation of a social science connected to Sami philosophical traditions. Again a contextual factor was introduced: the clash between openness and a much needed stability of Sami values and traditions would be even more threatened by *superdiversity* as leading principle, for example, which is a phenomenon typical of extreme multilingual megalopolis conditions and promoted among leading researchers in such circumstances. For LD targeting Sami, this would severely threaten the basic Saminess and its language use.

The concepts of *top-down* and *bottom-up* as two conflicting views were repeatedly used as

metaphorical means to describe the process and development of language policies referring to LD, and the theoretical perspectives for studying these. Though they were often seen as separate entities, in for example a presentation on the advantages of *language management* (Dovalil, PP1; also by Darquennes, PP2), it was pointed out that one cannot manage without the other and, in addition, they should function simultaneously and in parallel for the two perspectives to be able to make their contributions in productive ways to LD.

5.2.2 *The role of the national context, some examples*

Below we will give additional brief examples from the five national geopolitical contexts of the Netherlands, Hungary, Spain, Sweden and Wales (the partners of the LEARNMe project), which have had an impact not only on the matters discussed, but also consistently influence the extent to which other LPP issues are given space at the national level. These five cases are all more or less directly connected to the international level, both through LPP measures taken in the EU and in the CoE, and to debates in the European Parliament. The connection is not only based on official documents published on LPP issues, but very much also on the monitoring mechanisms of the international treaties of the CoE. In addition to the five countries mentioned, also South Africa, providing another example of the role of geopolitical context, will be shortly introduced by referring to one of the presentations in WS2 (Stroud & Kerfoot).

The regionalization of LPP in the Netherlands

In similar ways as in Sweden (see below), the lack of a more extended education support for the retention and promotion of LD in the province of Friesland and for Frisian, is a recurrent topic. The responsibility of the LPP concerning Frisian has also been attempted to be shifted to the regional level, despite the legislation and ratification of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, requiring responsibility at state level. Connected to the lack of educational promotion of Frisian is the compensatory attempts in activities and research to remedy the ongoing language shift and lack of individual domain extension among young speakers. This has been done for example by experimenting with new media support and innovative use in the regional language, e.g. twitter days in Frisian for adolescents (Jongbloed, PP1). Though it has been a successful annual event and raises interest in the use of the language, its long-term impact is, thus far, not extensive. The availability and promotion of Frisian in new media is nevertheless identified as one key element in attempts to raise the interest in Frisian among young speakers. This is also part of a more general attempt to compensate for and enrich the use of the language, in order to achieve a more efficient language transmission. This is a phenomenon that has been appreciated also in the other

partner national and regional contexts for a host of languages. This is also a specific issue that has been pointed out as crucial in a wider sense, the support and promotion of ICT (Information and Communications Technology) for all European languages (Climent-Ferrando, PP3; the NPLD *European Roadmap on Linguistic Diversity*).

The new Constitution and novelties in language policy in Hungary

Traditional assimilationist policies, of the laissez-faire kind of LPP, have not had a very strong weight in Hungarian party politics; assimilationist policies have rather been seen as a natural monolithic consequence of nationalism and state-building efforts. However, the recent political turn to the right, towards conservative values similar to those in several participating countries of the LEARNME project, has led to changes both in the legal framework and in practice. In Hungary, the new constitution adopted in 2011 (“Fundamental Law”) recognizes the Hungarian language as the sole official language of the state. This declaration has rather a symbolic than practical significance since Hungarian has been the *de facto* state language before, as well. Hungarian Sign Language is also protected as part of the Hungarian culture. The *de jure* emphasis on Hungarian, nevertheless, does not mean that rights providing the use of other – minority – languages are diminished. Article XXIX states that “nationalities living in Hungary shall be constituent parts of the State. Every Hungarian citizen belonging to any nationality shall have the right to freely express and preserve his or her identity. Nationalities living in Hungary shall have the right to use their native languages and to the individual and collective use of names in their own languages, to promote their own cultures, and to be educated in their native languages.” The new terminology – „nationalities” and „nationalities’ languages” instead of „national/ethnic minorities” and „minority languages” – is a return to the traditional glottonym, which puts an end to the 20-year-old terminological distinction between national and ethnic minorities. (This differentiation rested primarily on whether a minority had a kinstate or not.) However, in practice there has been a regrouping in the status of minority languages: German, Croatian, Slovak, Romanian, Slovenian, Serbian belonging to the historical/ traditional/ big minority languages enjoy a higher level of state support. Some unfortunate formulations of the new Constitution lead to paradoxical implications. For example, since 85% of the Roma population is Hungarian speaking, in their case Hungarian is also protected as a nationalities’ language while at the same time it is the official state language.

Hungary’s language legislation has been praised as standard-setting in Europe, but anomalies in its implementation – especially in education, the judiciary and public administration – must be pointed out. Despite the well-established legal basis, organizational, infrastructural and material conditions of the enforcement of language rights in practice are often missing. Minority languages are taught almost exclusively as a school subject, and the

situation of minority teacher training is very poor.²⁶ The number of educational institutions providing national minority teacher training at all levels of education, has not changed and it is a general problem that the number of applicants is low. Minority languages can be used in civil, criminal and administrative proceedings only on paper, and Hungarian authorities fail to designate geographical areas where the number of persons belonging to a national minority could justify the implementation of commitments undertaken via the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages. There has been a lack of systematic language planning and language policy for Romani and Boyash languages. Due to the high degree of linguistic assimilation, people belonging to nationalities can be ambivalent about their language rights, and the linguistic majority is virtually unaware of the fact that languages other than Hungarian are used in the country. Therefore, it is of utmost importance to inform and raise awareness of these problems among the populations of the linguistic majority and minorities alike.

The officiality of languages in Spain at the European level, and the adverse political attempts to downgrade them in national political life and in mainstream media

Given its considerable relevance in demographic, socio-economic and political terms, the specific meaning of LD in Spain – as well as the way in which to manage it – has had some impact in other RML sociolinguistic contexts e.g. in France, Italy and Wales. Similarly it is sometimes mirrored in documents and debates at European level, for example in the European Parliament. Central to this understanding of how LD should be effectively protected are two underlying concepts originally developed in Catalan sociolinguistics and LPP theory. One of the concepts is *language minoritization*, i.e., the transformation of an otherwise socially viable language into a vulnerable minority language with restricted social functions in its own original territory. Its counterpart is *language normalization*, i.e., the process whereby a previously minoritized language (re)acquires all relevant social functions and domains and becomes viable once again (Lamuela 1996, Strubell-Trueta & Boix-Fuster 2011; Vila 2014).²⁷ Both processes should be regarded as affecting all aspects of language lives, from official status to education, mass media, presence in the socioeconomic sphere, the linguistic landscape, etc.

²⁶ B/6626. számú BESZÁMOLÓ a Magyarország területén élő nemzetiségek helyzetéről (2013. február – 2015. február) [B/6626. Report on the situation of the nationalities living in Hungary - February 2013 – February 2015]: 33. - <http://www.parlament.hu/irom40/06626/06626.pdf>

²⁷ Lamuela, X. (1994), *Estandardització i establiment de les llengües*. Barcelona: Edicions 62; Strubell i Trueta. M. & E. Boix i Fuster (eds.) (2011), *Democratic politics of language revitalisation: the case of Catalan*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan; Vila, X. (2014) 'Language policy, management and planning'. In: C. Fäcke (2014), *Manual of Language Acquisition*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Normalizing (or establishing) a language implies that speakers of that language should find themselves in a condition to use it naturally and without hindrance in all aspects of life, which in contemporary times this means that the language should move into a position equivalent to that of a state, standardized language. In many respects, the minoritization/normalisation conceptual pair is in fact a theoretical translation of the approach applied by the most successful examples of European language maintenance in contexts such as Swedish in Finland, Dutch in Brussels, German in Eastern Belgium and in Süd Tirol/Alto Adige, etc., and follows the wake of the many European languages that managed to achieve a stable status as national languages during the 20th century. In such a theoretical framework, promoting LD includes the need of previously minoritized languages to become fully accepted as official languages in the European formal platforms of cooperation, that is, EU, CoE and EP, and regulations concerning these, at least on an equal footing as state languages with their demographic weight, irrespective of not being the national language of a nation state.

The lack of implementation of international treaties and a poor educational policy in Sweden

Over the last 15 years, since Sweden ratified (in 2000) both the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, and the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (ECRML), Sweden has been criticized for a lack of fulfilment of some of its ratified undertakings (Lainio, PP3). In the first rounds, legal reconsiderations were required by the monitoring bodies of the conventions. Some of these legal frameworks have been remedied and improved, but the implementation still is inadequate. Also a new act has been introduced, the Act on National Minorities and National Minority Languages (2010) which clearly advances and promotes RMLs through the legislation. Despite this, in eight different reports from the Council of Europe from the two monitoring bodies of the above mentioned conventions, there is recurring and severe criticism from the Committee of Experts and the Advisory Committee of the Framework Convention, on the lack of fulfilment of most of the undertakings under Article 8, Education, of the ECRML. These are also ratified for at the lowest level of undertakings. In addition, the issue of education for primary school is not included under the new domestic Act on National Minorities and National Minority Languages. The efforts of the NGO's thus have been to attempt influencing this flaw in the Swedish LPP on national minority languages, which as such is still considered to have taken steps forward, very much due to the international pressure of the CoE, and to a high extent through the professionalization and internationalisation of the NGOs' work (see also Syrjänen-Schaal's, and, Rhodins presentations, both during WS2).

Welsh devolution

Changes in the constitutional arrangements in the UK since the referendum of 1997 has meant that explicit responsibility for LLP lies at the level of the Welsh government and elected National Assembly for Wales. However, many of the policy areas that influence LLP are still made at UK level ((such as broadcasting) or indeed at local levels (such as aspects of primary and secondary education). In some areas, such as Higher Education, Social Services and Health, where governance lies at Welsh level, new and progressive measures have been implemented in order to facilitate the use of Welsh language. Some aspects of these can be considered to be 'bottom up' as well as 'top down' as they focus on engagement with communities, professionals and service users. The Welsh Language (Wales) Measure 2011 created the role of the Welsh Language Commissioner and abolished the Welsh Language Board (established in 1993) transferring its duties to the Commissioner and to the Welsh Ministers. The Measure itself was the focus of much campaigning by civil society organizations. The principal aim of the Welsh Language Commissioner is to promote and facilitate use of the Welsh language by imposing standards (requirements) on organizations and as such rights for Welsh speakers. However, critics of LLP in Wales over the past decades point to the Census Results and other studies as evidence that LD in language acquisition and language use is not increasing in Wales.

Language policy and planning in higher education in South Africa – the role of the heritage from apartheid and the impact of colonial language attitudes

One typical example of how the national and geopolitical context has an immense impact on the sustainability of LD, is South Africa. The history of apartheid and colonialism, as well as the consequences of that for education, media and legislation, have repercussions on present-day LPP and attempts to come to grips with the past situations. The effects are felt not only at the level of higher education for example, but throughout the school system. However, since different levels of education are interconnected and dependent on each other, higher education suffers from the poor implementation of improvements at lower levels of education. This was demonstrated in the presentation of an officially bilingual university, the University of Western Cape (UWC; Stroud & Kerfoot, PP2) which, in reality, grapples with the effects of especially primary education and the practices of every-day work and study at the university. The heritage from colonial solutions and actions is still there despite immense steps forward in the multilingual approach of the national LPP and the official aims of the university. The heritage of the past permeates attitudes to different languages and varieties, even of English: the academic, standard variety is promoted and required to be used, whereas the local varieties of English used by students are downgraded or ignored. This in turn has a direct impact on the self-esteem and results of students.

The role of the national level, and the *nation state* and its *territorial restrictions*, was then found to still be of fundamental importance, both for the promotion of some minoritized languages, but possibly even more so in relation to the obstacles that prevent their potential to develop under supportive LPP conditions. In this, mainstream media were found to play a crucial role in several geopolitical contexts.

5.3 The focus target field of media and LD

During the workshops media issues and their relation to sustainable LD were repeatedly discussed, but with an intended focus on the topic during WS1. One topical and conceptual issue that was discussed was the contrasts between the conditions of majority media versus those of so-called minority language media: (English vs. Welsh, Spanish vs. Basque, Norwegian vs. Sami, among others). Both *content* and *linguistic issues* were discussed, for example that *mainstream media* tend to retain their *monolingualism* (impermeable media; cf. Jones, WS1 and PP1), whereas *minority media* are expected to be opened up for both the minority language and the mainstream, majority language (permeable media). This is achieved in different ways, either in a *parallel monolingualism*, or in the form of integrated multilingual use of resources from several languages. This can open up the media to a wider audience (by age, interests, language capacity), but what impact the different ways chosen to deal with the parallel use of the mainstream and minority language has, is not always clear and requires more research – does one way or the other lead to more sustained and extensive LD, and in that case, is that a result that is possible to generalize from one context to another? For example, there is already evidence (O’Connell, WS1 and PP1) from the field of audiovisual translation that broadcasting in a minority or minoritized language, by providing dominant language subtitles, can draw positive attention to linguistic diversity through this bilingual format. However, the negative side of this is that it can simultaneously undermine the weaker language by exposing the viewers once again to the dominant language. This is potentially all the more serious in the case of subtitling since written language requires complex cognitive processing which means that the dominant language will normally have a greater impact than the aural soundtrack.

Media issues in Wales

In the process of public broadcasters in Wales becoming online producers (media convergence; see Jones, PP1), the balance in the products is working for the dominance of the majority, English language. English-language content retains its *impermeability* (as a monolingual space, and does not allow Welsh-language material), whereas the linguistic *permeability* of Welsh-language media content produced by traditional broadcasters is increasingly more permeable as traditional broadcasters become online content producers

(allowing or even requiring English-language material). This was also followed by an increase in policy documents, revealing a higher degree of understanding for the needs of public TV broadcasting to a diverse audience, but a developing stricter adherence to parallel monolingualism in the online context, with less elaborate policy documents. For the retention of LD, in the long run, the question remains open, how the permeable Welsh products contribute to or hinder the use of Welsh in the media and beyond. The relation between policy and practice is thus a matter calling for research initiation in this respect.

Media issues for Sami in Norway

The role of minority language media cannot be overestimated as a crucial factor to, on the one hand, present and discuss minority/*indigenous* view-points and values, which sometimes may differ dramatically from those presented in mainstream media. On the other hand, minority media may function as prestige-raising, identity-supporting and stabilizing linguistic factors which, as a whole, contribute to the strengthening of such languages and their collective efforts. This was demonstrated by the role and function that the recently opened programme on Sami journalism in Northern Norway is foreseen to play (Moring, PP1, PP2). In the background there are decisions and legal frameworks facilitating this development, from a top-down perspective. The content and direction of the education is still decided upon from within the community. Moring also pointed out that common beliefs on the relationship between media in a language and its effects on it, are still to be proven. The relationship may affect the symbolic, economic, social framing, representation, culture formation language use and the re-/construction of a language. Jones added (PP1) that such conclusions are very much based on contexts of state nationalism, and may not always be adapted to minority media. She also pointed out that views on media may vary widely, for example, between academic and public debates on the policies and practices of media in a minoritized language.

Frisian in the Netherlands in new media

A step away from the traditional media are social media and the consumption of media by young audiences (Jongbloed, PP1). This has been identified in earlier debate on the problem of *language transmission*. Also since media habits are often formed in young age, they may have life-long effects, studies of the features of such habits may be used as a basis of evaluating the development of innovative promotional measures to retain and possibly increase the LD.

A conclusion about media's relationship to its functions for LD and for a language situation is that the 'effects' between media provisions in a specific language, especially in minoritized languages, are not clear, and need to be contextualized. One obvious consequence of this is that comparative case studies are needed. Nevertheless, the arguments that minority or indigenous media are needed for many reasons to support LD have been discussed in recent

years (for example, see earlier works by Jones (2007), Moring (2007), Cormack (2007)). The possibility of promoting and describing life events, news and relations, even world views, according to the particular indigenous or minoritized language ideologies, cultural values and understanding, is not available through mainstream media (Moring, WS1 and PP1, PP2). This has a strong influence on identity, self-esteem and the views on cultural heritage, for example. Similarly, minority media contributes to the extensions of linguistic genres and demonstrates the use and characteristics of a standard variety, which is also often the same variety that is used for the development of academic literacy, that is, the “language of education”. It also develops the language in relation to the creation and dissemination of specialized terminology/neologisms, and contributes to the linguistic requirements of changing, modern and global life circumstances.

Print media issues in the Basque Country

For print media the situation in the Basque Country was used as an example of how the increasing bilingualism in families tend to weaken Basque language newspapers (Amezaga and Arana, PP1, WS1), since the language competence of some family members may not reach a high enough level in order to enjoy Basque publications.

In this respect, the interconnectedness between a developed literacy and the media’s potential to fulfil its role is evident, and therefore the connection to the educational sphere is also clear: education and language promotion need media, and minority media needs education. Both depend on legislation and other LPP decisions. However, the role of the print media in creating social and communal language spaces was identified as an important factor, especially in the case of isolated speakers, for the diaspora but also in home territories where the percentage of speakers is low.

5.4 The focus target field of education and LD

The shared presuppositions on educational failures in several of the presentations summarize not only the views of the participating researchers and other participants, but are well-known from major, critical reviews both on traditional regional or minority languages in education, and migrant/migrant-background students. On the other hand there is the failure of LPP regarding the support to *multilingual students* in various educational systems (e.g., Cummins and Leung, both in PP2), and on the other the effects of that for *minoritized languages* in education at a more general level (Lainio, PP3). As a consequence, language shift processes are not successfully hindered or reversed (Stroud & Kerfoot, PP2). The large-scale macro picture is dependent on the practices and development at the local or even individual level. Conversely, the small-scale, micro situations are framed by economic, mainstream values,

attitudinal impact and legal regulations at a societal level, some of which may be included in active LPP decisions. The division and interconnectedness mentioned above have also been acknowledged in different types of research, and it was pointed out repeatedly that the study of education in relation to LD and LPP, which to some extent already combine theoretical efforts and hybrid perspectives, may need to complement each other even more. Also, the situation from one context may not be mirrored in another, which means that within the field of education the local and, possibly, national conditions influencing the outcome should be taken into account for the development of LPP. There seems to be a shared view also on the need for legislation to be in place in order to secure the legal and educational regulations. This is seen as a necessary condition, but is not considered to be sufficient on its own for a strong promotion of LD. Other factors, based on educational studies and including the understanding of how political and value interests may make a difference when conditions otherwise are similar, must be taken into account. A significant factor, the view that research results are too often ignored or regarded sceptically, was demonstrated in several of the presentations.

5.4.1 Studies and cases on education and LD

Canada and migrant communities

A recurrent topic of the presentations on LD and education, was the failure of the educational systems discussed to include the promotion and implementation of measures needed to give equitable possibilities and equal access to education for multilingual or potentially multilingual students²⁸. This was not restricted to students of traditional and historical minorities in the countries, but also included migrant background students (e.g. Cummins, PP2). One of the crucial reasons for this was the neglect of research evidence. He stated that:

“Over generations in contexts such as Canada, Ireland, and elsewhere, policy-makers have ignored the massive evidence that teaching L2s as subjects of instruction is ineffective for a large majority of students. By contrast, *bilingual/CLIL programs* show much better outcomes.”²⁹

²⁸ In the text of the White Paper we regularly followed the recommendations of the CoE, to use plurilingualism for individual capacity and multilingualism for societal level use of several languages. In the presentations ‘multilingualism’ was often used to refer to the individual level as well.

²⁹ While acknowledging this, it may still be necessary to take into account which are the L2s in any given context (one or several?), and how are they used in the surrounding society. This concerns inter alia English in a wide variety of contexts. For example, the use of English in Sweden and the

He also proposed that identity affirmation and literacy engagement as well as access to printed matters (books etc.) are similarly crucial for the educational success of multilingual students. This view was framed by this statement:

“Students who come from social groups whose identities (culture, language, religion, etc.) have been devalued and subordinated in the wider society experience disproportionate academic failure. The experience of these ‘internal colonies’ parallels that of ‘external colonies’”

Thus, *identity enhancement* and *literacy engagement* become key measures to facilitate the reduction of coercive power relations these students face and improve their access to education. In educational or pedagogical terms, the use of *cooperative learning* and *scaffolding* were stressed as recommendable. These views of Cummins received common acceptance and support.

England

Leung (PP2) described the shift from a more supportive educational policy in the UK during the 1960s to the 1990s, to a more assimilationist and mainstreamed LPP later on, which has had a direct impact on the planning of the educational and linguistic framework of the public school system in England. Today all students follow the same National Curriculum and are evaluated according to this, in and through Standard English (*equality of entitlement*). One consequence of this has been that there is no special pedagogical attention given to learners of English, who also are learners of content. Similarly, the teacher education system has removed English as second/additional language teacher training. In the so-called community schools that provide teaching outside the school day/week, the mother tongue may be taught, and the bilingual aspect of these students’ language and content learning may receive more attention. The result may be that an *institutionalized monolingualism* is created, whereas the alternative of more flexible principles, to base education on the *equality of treatment*, could promote multilingualism and LD. In similar ways as multilingual students, those students who do not master the Standard variety of English, will face educational thresholds.

South Africa

The latter point was also criticized by Stroud & Kerfoot (PP2), when discussing the difficulties of a bilingual South African university: the domestic English and the local practices

Netherlands is different from that of Hungary, Spain, Wales or Ireland. One could add that when formal instruction is the main source of language learning, Cummins’ statement is most accurate.

of using it, were perceived negatively, and also due to the low degree of competence in Standard English, the students' ability to cope with content in English, gets more burdensome. In this respect, the students have a double burden of inadequate academic literacy, since despite the formal and public image that the university is bilingual, it functions to a high degree in English, and the use of the different mother tongues of the students is downgraded or made inappropriate. One reason, in addition, is the low functional literacy level in the public school system. They add: "One important aspect of this is for *language policies and practices* for the *tertiary education* sector to address the mismatch between "the *monolingual ethos* and the ideology of *English-medium tertiary education* and the needs, identities and resources of *multilingual students*". To accomplish this, a crucial condition is the development of an understanding of language as *practice* that places at the centre people as *actors* engaged in "*linguaging*". An additional support in this process would be to increase the use of multimodal methods in teaching. One way of complementing and fulfilling this is to use translations of teaching material. The need to use and benefit from translations also in other contexts of minority language promotion, was stressed (and problematized) by O'Connell in WS1, who pointed out that the role of translation in LD needs to be studied closely: inward translation can enrich a minority language by introducing new ideas and terminology. But careless reliance on translation can result in further domination both from external perspectives and forms of expression. Stroud's & Kerfoot's presentation shares several dimensions with the papers of Cummins and Leung, where equity, empowerment and equal access to education are at the core.

Finland

Maybe as a type of exception of problems in the educational field, Björklund (PP2) presented the structure and results of language immersion programmes in Finland, for Finnish (majority) parents and their children, to learn Swedish (minoritized language). In the course of the development of the different variants of immersion programme, English has gone from being a subject to become the medium of instruction. One reason for the success of immersion programmes, which have been copied and developed from the original Canadian programmes in French, is possibly that the identities of the children are not under pressure, and they achieve a functional trilingualism, which opens up their possibilities also on a global labour market. The development of these programmes in Finland is based on the permissive LPP, which also aims at supporting the Swedish language.

Hungary

Bartha (PP2) made a detailed account on the changing language policy conditions in Hungary. New acts and a new constitutions have resulted in the rearrangement of more than a

dozen traditional languages into new groupings. Hungarian as an official language and Hungarian Sign Language receive special protective attention. In principle, she says, the new legal set-up does open up for the possibility of a positive LPP, but instead she notes that several functional principles prevent this from happening:

Despite the recent, fairly positive Hungarian legal provisions, language and educational policies deserve more critique than praise, according to Bartha:

- Bilingualism is regarded as harmful in language policy discourses.
- Unfounded emphasis on the negative effects of early language teaching re-shapes the recently established good practice.
- The planning of *foreign language acquisition* is governed from the 'top' sometimes in an unreasonable manner (e.g. backing the instruction of German as the first foreign language as opposed to English - see the arguments related to this decision).
- No comprehensive sociolinguistic viewpoint is represented in the instruction of the *first language*, the *minority* and *foreign languages*.
- Several misconceptions prevail, *language ideologies* are formulated and re-produced in the various areas of education regarding the new *multilingualism*, *the diversity of languages* and the degree of *standardization*.
- Professionally rather unfounded arguments hinder the establishment of a state-funded primary, secondary, higher education and *teacher training* in Romani and Boyash.
- The actual practice often contradicts international research trends and the related EC recommendations.

As a consequence of earlier more monolithically dominated and present, even though formally more flexible policies, language shift is clearly taking place among several of the linguistic minorities in Hungary.

Due to the contribution of education for socialization, learning and the individual's potential to become a responsible and active citizen in any society, as well as the role that language plays in this, the position of education remains crucial and is highlighted for LD in this WP's account.

Chapter 6.

Reflections on other studies and the added value of the LEARNME project

6.1 Reflections on other studies

Given their democratic and multilateral basis, language policy has historically been a relevant issue for contemporary European multinational institutions. Indeed, concern with some forms of linguistic diversity was already present at the inception of the European Market, at least as far as the use of official nation-state languages was concerned, but interest for multilingualism rapidly led the European institutions to assume a growing interest in the promotion of foreign language learning, as well as the protection of minoritized/minority autochthonous languages, and even immigrant languages (Swarte *et al.* 2014).³⁰ Linguistic diversity, for instance, is enshrined in article 22 of the [European Charter of Fundamental Rights](#) ("The Union respects cultural, religious and linguistic diversity"), and in article 3 of the [Treaty of the European Union](#) ("It shall respect its rich cultural and linguistic diversity, and shall ensure that Europe's cultural heritage is safeguarded and enhanced."), and promoted by a number of activities (European Commission 2015). Also the Council of Europe, the task of which is among other things, to promote peaceful relations and democracy, includes languages as one core aspect of European heritage and communication conditions:

“(4) all European languages are equal in value and dignity from the cultural point of view and form an integral part of European culture and civilisation.” (Council of Europe 2002)

Table 1 synthesises some of the most prominent initiatives taken during the last decades by the European Union and the Council of Europe respectively.

³⁰ Swarte, F. *et al.* (2014) 'Introduction: Minority Language in a multilingual Europe', *Us Werk* 63 1-9

Table 1. Some key elements of European language policy
(Language Rich Europe 2013:5)

European Union		Council of Europe	
1980s Incentive measures for multilingualism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - European Bureau for Lesser Used Languages - Erasmus - Lingua 	1950s–1990s Supporting languages for all (democratic citizenship)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unit credit scheme - Guidance on Communicative Language Teaching - Workshops – ICT, Autonomy, exchanges - Establishment of ECML in Graz
1990s Co-operation and support for mobility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maastricht Treaty (1992) 	1990s Regional and minority languages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (1992) - Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (1995)
1995–2004 Supporting the 'knowledge society'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - White Paper – Towards the Learning Society - Lisbon Strategy - Barcelona Council 	1995–2004 Intercultural communication Plurilingualism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR)
2001 Coherence, awareness raising, information European year of languages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - European Language Label - Eurobarometer 	2001 Coherence, awareness raising, information European year of languages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CEFR - European Language Portfolio
2000s Promoting mobility as a right Supporting quality in language learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Action Plan (2003) - Increased support through funded programmes 	2000s Planning, curricular development, assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CEFR - European Language Portfolio development
2005 Growth/social cohesion/ individual fulfilment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Framework Strategy for Multilingualism - Action Plan 	2003–11 Language policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Language Education Policy Profiles in 15 countries or regions
2007 Diversity an asset	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Multilingualism Commissioner - Lifelong Learning Programme - Communication – an 'Asset and shared commitment' (2008) 	2005 Languages of schooling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conferences and Reports



Reflection and research on linguistic diversity at a supranational, European level has been growing hand in hand with the awareness that language policy was an area of the EU or the CoE intervention. Two main approaches to the field may be distinguished.³¹ On the one hand, a substantial amount of work has been done both by experts and policy makers to consider the area of linguistic diversity from a normative approach,³² including most of initiatives of the Council of Europe Language Policy Unit³³ or the many language policy activities of the European Union (Romaine 2013)³⁴.

On the other hand, there is a growing amount of empirical, analytical research focused on linguistic diversity and multilingualism. Some of these research initiatives have been promoted by the very European institutions (e.g. Cullen *et al.* 2008).³⁵ Others have been born from academic environments and/or due to civic and cultural organizations. A short list of relatively recent examples of academic research on linguistic diversity include several projects such as, for example:

- The DYLAN (*Language Dynamics and Management of Diversity*)³⁶ Project, funded under

³¹ Here we are concerned with research dealing with linguistic diversity from a language policy, management and planning perspective; other approaches such as that of language technologies (e.g., Rehm and Uszkoreit 2012) will not be dealt with.

³² A non-exhaustive list might include:

- Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (1950)
- European Cultural Convention (1954)
- European Outline Convention on Transfrontier Co-operation between Territorial Communities or Authorities (1980)
- European Convention on Transfrontier Television (1989)
- Convention on the Participation of Foreigners in Public Life at Local Level (1992)
- European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (1992)
- Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (1995)
- Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (2005)
- Recommendations and resolutions of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe: Recommendation 1383 (1998) on linguistic diversification
- Recommendations, resolutions and declarations of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities
- Recommendation 222 on language education in regional or minority languages (2007)

³³ Language Policy Unit website < http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Domaines_EN.asp >

³⁴ Romaine, S. 'Politics and policies of promoting multilingualism in the European Union', *Language Policy* 12:2 (2013) 115-137

³⁵ Cullen, J. et al. (2008). *Multilingualism: Between policy objectives and implementation*. Brussels: European Parliament.

³⁶ Website of the DYLAN *Language dynamics and management of diversity* Project < http://www.dylan-project.org/Dylan_en/home/home.php > (last visit 27/10/2015)

Framework Programme 6 (FP6) of the European Union. With a strong focus on language policy regarding linguistic diversity, DYLAN embraced 20 research institutions in 12 European Countries, ran for five years (2006-2011), and has left a substantial legacy that keeps growing (Seidlhofer 2011, Hüning, Vogl and Moliner (ed.) 2012)³⁷.

- The LINEE *Languages in a Network of European Excellence*,³⁸ also supported by the European Commission, was, with a stronger focus on language education, identity and economy (LINEE 2010; Rindler Schjerve & Vetter (eds.) 2012)³⁹.
- The *Medium-sized Language Communities Project*⁴⁰, which put together a network of European researchers to analyse the challenges of the aforementioned languages in a context of globalization (Milian-Massana 2012, Vila (ed.) 2013)⁴¹.
- The *Poga - The Language Survival Network*⁴², which united researchers on linguistic minorities from Russia and several European Countries working on the area of threatened languages (Marten *et al.* (ed.) 2015)⁴³.
- The ELDIA Project *European Language Diversity for All*⁴⁴, funded under EU-FP7, designed to contribute to the study of multilingualism and the development of language policies with a focus on several Finno-Ugric languages (Laakso *et al.* 2013).⁴⁵

³⁷ B. Seidlhofer, *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011; M. Hüning, U. Vogl & O. Moliner (eds), *Standard languages and multilingualism in European history*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2012

³⁸ Website of the LINEE *Languages in a Network of European Excellence* < <http://www.linee.info/> > (last visit 27/10/2015)

³⁹ R. Sindler Schjerve and E. Vetter (eds.), *European multilingualism: current perspectives and challenges*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2012

⁴⁰ Website of the project *The Sustainability of Medium-Sized Language Communities* < <http://www.ub.edu/cusc/llenguesmitjanes/?lang=en> > (last visit 27/10/2015)

⁴¹ A. Milian i Massana, *Language law and legal challenges in medium-sized language communities: a comparative perspective*. Barcelona: Institut d'Etudis Autònoms, 2012; F.X. Vila (ed.), *Survival and development of language communities: prospects and challenges*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2013

⁴² Website of the *POGA - The Language Survival Network* < <http://saami.uni-freiburg.de/poga/en/index.htm> > (last visit 27/10/2015)

⁴³ H. Marten, M. Riessler, J. Saaraviki & R. Toivanen (eds.), *Cultural and linguistic minorities in the Russian Federation and the European Union: comparative studies on equality and diversity*. Cham: Springer, 2015

⁴⁴ Website of ELDIA Project *European Language Diversity for All* < <http://www.eldia-project.org/> > (last visit 27/10/2015)

⁴⁵ Laakso, J. *et al.* (2013) 'Summary of the Research Project ELDIA (European Language Diversity for All). Abridged version of the original English-language report written by Johanna Laakso, Anneli Sarhima, Sia Spoiliopoulou Akermark, Reetta Toivonen'

- The *MIME – Mobility and Inclusion in a Multilingual Europe* ⁴⁶, is directly involved with discovering ways in which transnational mobility and societal inclusion may be enhanced at the same time.

It should also be reminded that cultural and linguistic diversity are progressively regarded as the norm rather than the exception, and therefore more and more research all over the world include linguistic diversity as one of their by-default variables (Council for Exceptional Children 2015).

The amount and variety of research initiatives in the area of linguistic diversity in Europe and elsewhere during the last decades has grown exponentially, and any attempt to synthesise their results in a few paragraphs would probably be reckless. It is nevertheless possible to point out a handful of constants that appear once and again in the literature concerned, especially as far as linguistic diversity in Europe is concerned:

- *In Europe, there is support for LD:* In spite of multiplicity of views, there exists in Europe a widespread support for linguistic diversity and multilingualism, at least when defined in general terms, and both at societal level and at the individual level (i.e., *plurilingualism* in CoE terminology). Of course, this support should be understood in general and relative terms, and always in comparison to other societies — e.g., the US or China — where LD tends to be perceived quite generally as a hindrance to be removed⁴⁷, and language policies tend to be oriented to eliminate it. In this perspective, Europeans seem to be reasonably happy with a multilingual continent (Cullen *et al.* 2008: iii; LRE 2013).
- *There exists a large diversity of approaches vis-à-vis LD:* in spite of widespread support towards LD in general terms, the area is subject to a remarkable diversity of views. Indeed, European societies are widely different among themselves as far as how LD should be dealt with. This dissonance of opinions holds not only between geopolitical regions (e.g. Eastern vs. Central vs. Western regions, etc.) but also within them and, in many cases, even within each nation state. The diversity of views is rooted in ancient and recent local histories, political cultures, geopolitical location, etc., and affects all possible categories of language, including national languages, autochthonous minoritized/minority languages, sign languages, foreign languages, immigrants' and refugees' languages, etc. In many respects,

⁴⁶ Website of the *MIME – Mobility and Inclusion in a Multilingual Europe* < <http://www.mime-project.org/> > (last visit 27/10/2015)

⁴⁷ For example the fact that it is today forbidden in 31 states in the US to provide bilingual education in public schools (García *et al.* 2014).

this diversity is heavily dependent on nation states' legislation, since they use quite disparate terminologies (see below). Some of the areas of most notorious discrepancies among countries may be pointed out: the acceptance (or not) of a special role as a *lingua franca* for English, in what form, and in what direction (resisting or strengthening it?); the need of official recognition for autochthonous minoritized languages, and to what extent; the convenience (or not) of recognition of heritage languages; or the debates surrounding the half a century long tradition of providing foreign language instruction in at least two languages for all primary school children in areas such as the Nordic countries, a tradition that is now severely under pressure due to the monolithic position of English. In such a context, and not surprisingly, researchers tend to coincide in the view that that the European common language policy (e.g., the Barcelona 1+2 goal) is at best general, and indeed quite vague.

- *Researchers and public alike seem to support a (complementary) European approach:* discrepancies about how to deal with LD in general terms do not preclude that a significant number of voices see in positive terms the existence of a European approach towards LD. Indeed, even if common policies in this field may be hard to obtain, authors tend to point out that this European approach is an added value to the management of LD (Cullen *et al.* 2008: iv; LRE 2013). Some authors would favour European norms to be more binding for nation states, but this seems to be a sensitive point of political discrepancy as far as subsidiarity is concerned. Even in the case of a supranational juridical instrument such as the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, characterized by its high degree of discretion for nation states, «Implementation of the Charter has been limited, slow and uneven» (Cullen *et al.* 2008: vi). In any case, the major capacities of European institutions in the area of language policy lie in education and training programmes.
- *There is an increasing recognition of private, local and regional actors as language policy agents:* whereas neoclassical language policy tended to conceive language policy as something developed essentially by nation state central governments and 'implemented' on citizens, the available literature recognizes the relevance of other actors as far as language policy is concerned:
- "The state supports roughly a quarter of the initiatives identified by the study and a similar contribution is made by regional and local authorities, and by EU programs. Around a quarter of the initiatives are self-supported by the actors involved. The main actors involved at regional and local levels are: European agencies and centres; regional and local authorities; educational enterprises; professional associations; academic and research institutions; NGO's; commercial organizations." (Cullen *et al.* 2008: v)

- *There exists a significant degree of terminological confusion:* the field of LD is fraught with concepts that vary from one country to another one, and even within the different nation states there exist differences in interpretation. To cite but one example, authors refer more than once to the problems involved with the variation inherent to concepts such as *national language, official language, minority language, minoritized language, lesser-used language, immigrant language, heritage language, etc.*, to the extent that European institutions have been forced from time to time to clarify their understanding of some of these concepts, such as in the well-known cases of *multilingualism* (Commission of European Communities 2005) or *regional and minority languages* in the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (see Cullen *et al.* 2008).
- *Most actors agree that there is a need for more research in a new, changing scenario:* the awareness that Europe is in a process of rapid process of sociolinguistic change is widespread in the recent literature. Irrespective of whether this state of change is opposed to a (probably imaginary) past where things were much more stable, the fact is that authors tend to coincide in that current Europe is experiencing rapid mutations as far as languages are concerned, that these mutations are still poorly understood, and that more research is needed in order to deal with them satisfactorily, be that in terms of economic competitiveness, social cohesion, or the preservation of cultural heritage, to mention but a few. Increasing mobility is in fact often pointed out as a factor that is crucially modifying pre-existing conditions.
- *Research on LD is not only relevant for society, but also challenging for scientific knowledge:* there exists a growing consensus that the current sociolinguistic transformation of European societies is pushing researchers to question their traditional paradigms in areas such as linguistics, sociology of language, political sciences, educational linguistics, social work, language technologies, etc. The concept of *languages* can no longer be regarded as basically a synonym of *standard national languages*, and the implications of this change in perspective are enormous for areas such as language teaching and language learning, integration of immigrants, transnational communication, and preservation of cultural heritage, to mention just a few.

6.2 Reflections on the possible impact of research on language policy and practice

One of the starting points for the WP and indeed, the project, was that firstly, there is a gap

between the recommendations that researchers make, and the formulation and implementation of language policy issues. Secondly, researchers could and should have an impact on these issues. The complexity of the clarification of what LD is, how it works and how it is related to the implementation of LPP, may question these presuppositions. Nevertheless, it seems clear that sociolinguists and other researchers have had an impact on language policy issues. One example of this is Australian language policy, which at times has directly followed the recommendations of researchers (Clyne 2003; Lo Bianco 2004)⁴⁸, another is the development of language policies in developing, post-colonial contexts (Makoni & Pennycook 2007), and a third example, is that of the work on formulating the basic ideas of the ECRML, was influenced by the theoretical framework of Joshua Fishman and other sociolinguists in the 1980s and 1990s. In the context of the present project it is also clear that the so-called sociolinguistic surveys in Catalonia and the Basque Country, are crucial in the reformulations of language policies, in order to promote the languages in question.

Nevertheless, the considerations taken into account in LPP to a high extent depends on other matters, as well. Darquennes (PP3, final conference, Darquennes 2013)⁴⁹ points out that even if it may be concluded that research within for example applied linguistics has had an impact, there still is low degree of knowledge based on research, about how that impact has developed and functioned. This, however, is similar to the fact that it is in general seldom known, who among politicians, decision-makers and stakeholders, and for what reasons, take research – or for that matter – any other type of consideration – as a reason to change minds or decide about LPP matters in specified directions, for or against LD. Such inside matters may also remain outside the reach of research. Nevertheless, researchers need to discuss and evaluate LPP initiatives and their effects.

Over-arching and general statements on the content and effect of language policies in international bodies such as those of the EU and the European Parliament have occasionally been published. For example, the concept of linguistic diversity has been used in various contexts, most of which focus on teaching and learning of languages. In addition to the direct challenges of making more easily available and more efficient the learning and teaching of languages, other issues present hindrances. One conclusion connected to the development of environments that promote the learning and use of languages has been formulated as follows:

⁴⁸Clyne, M. (2003), *Dynamics of Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Lo Bianco, J. (2004), *A site for debate, negotiation and contest of national identity: Language policy in Australia*. Strasbourg: Language Policy Division, Council of Europe.

⁴⁹Darquennes, J. (2013), 'Current issues in LPP research and their impact on society. *AILA Review* 26 11–23.

“For ‘Building a language-friendly environment’, the main obstacles are: the lack of concrete actions to support **linguistic diversity**; failure by governments to recognize the highly contextualized and localized nature of languages; the lack of recognition of the factors that shape demand.”⁵⁰

This conclusion is supported by the present WP. The development is even worse today, compared to the mentioned report, since the potential of the creation of a EU body for the support of multilingualism and linguistic diversity was still an open matter then.

The LEARNME project has tried to systematically follow up the earlier views on linguistic diversity in vast areas of Europe. Despite the negative results, the situation in various contexts is changing, and at the local levels the international lack of progress is frequently contested among practitioners and NGOs, as well as occasionally by regional or local authorities. The input from the project also has the potential to raise the awareness of politicians and stakeholders, practitioners and researchers, both about the characteristics of missed opportunities and the possible solutions. Some of these issues were also discussed in the final conference in Budapest in September 2015.

6.3 Summary and added values of the closing Budapest conference

The Conference opening included the welcoming address of the Hungarian EU Commissioner for Education, Culture, Youth and Sport, Tibor Navracsics, as well as Ádám Kósa, MEP and László Lovász, the President of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Commissioner Navracsics in his talk reflected a clear understanding and care about the focused issues of the event, and inspired confidence amongst the audience, which gave the whole conference an energetic and supportive input.

The active presence of practitioners was enriching because their experiences showed those on the ‘research side’, that while theory is important, the multilingual situation ‘on the ground’ is very different from case to case, and thus hard to capture in general models. Teachers and school administrators made very clear what challenges they face working in multilingual contexts. Parents, teachers, community activists and youth groups offered concrete, practical perspectives on linguistic diversity based on their own experiences.

The conference reached its goals with regard to the range, variety and high quality of the contributions. Many of the presentations focused on bottom-up practical experiences, but

⁵⁰(http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/etudes/join/2008/408495/IPOL-CULT_ET%282008%29408495_EN.pdf):
<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/activities/committees/studies.do?language=en>

were underpinned by the necessary theoretical backgrounds and methodological approaches. It was helpful to start the conference with mainly general/theoretical contributions from the LEARNMe White Paper Team, and follow this up with concrete accounts of research and educational projects, as well as with community initiatives that efficiently presented the challenges of multilingualism in everyday life.

For Western-European participants, it was particularly fruitful to experience Central European perspectives and learn of the work with different geographic/demographic emphases, such as from Hungary, Finland, the Baltic States, Serbia etc.

Another important aspect was the example of how projects on linguistic diversity can include both 'classical' minority languages and other types of minority language. In this case the focus was on sign language, but the same can be achieved for recent migrant languages – the conference touched on this in a number of presentations. The conference made it possible to open up a discussion on theoretical matters of crucial importance for the LEARNMe project and to discuss face-to-face some of the challenges confronting minority languages all over Europe. A collection of impressive case studies of 'bottom up approaches' was presented – sessions with participants/researchers gained a high level of attention (such as Hungarian Sign Language fieldwork). Ethnographic approaches highlighted the ethical considerations in/with researching language communities.

The presence of sign languages (both from the researchers' and the practitioners' perspectives) as a minority or 'lesser used language' was extremely fruitful. The conference showed clearly that sign language users face similar types of challenges as those using small / minority languages. The point that researchers and users of both sign and small spoken languages have much in common and can learn a lot from each other was clearly made during the conference. The Conference was a great opportunity to understand the members of the Hungarian Sign Language community, and their situation, needs and views on minority language issues (especially language policy and educational) in a comparative, cross-national view.

6.4 Added values of the LEARNMe project

The added value of the project can be summarized as follows:

- The project is a multifaceted attempt to describe the relationship between LPP and its practice, and points to the highly contextualised characteristics of the understanding and promotion of LD.
- It attempted to discuss the conceptual challenges of LD, and compare that to the use, "misuse" and development of LD and similar key words.
- The wide range of cases presented during the workshops and the final conference, within

crucial areas such as media, education, legislation and LPP highlights both peculiarities and common characteristics of LPP and thus LD.

- The attempt to combine opposing ideological and theoretical views, top-down and bottom-up, and other approaches to the study of LD, further opens up for the combination of views and methods, in order to achieve a more cohesive understanding of both research and practice of LPP.
- The inclusion of practitioners and views “on the ground”, as well as the development of research on Sign language enrich both the theoretical and methodological findings and thus our very understanding of LD.

Having said this, the result of the described added values still depends on the success of disseminating these conclusions and the summary of the findings. This will be an integrated part of the upcoming attempts to raise awareness in wider contexts. There is a need to reach at least the following identified target groups/targets:

- The European Commission, European Parliament and the Council of Europe, their lower and medium level offices, as well as other international organisations, to reach also their different target groups.
- International and national networks/groups of researchers to strengthen the impact of research findings on the development of LD.
- State, regional and local level authorities in at least the participating partner countries.
- International and national NGOs, which seem to become increasingly important in the field of LPP.
- Other organisations dealing with and participating in LPP.
- Networks and groups of, and even key individual practitioners.
- Media, where one challenge will be to raise interest before raised awareness is achieved, especially among mainstream media.

Chapter 7.

Concluding remarks and some ideas for the future treatment of Linguistic Diversity in theory and practice

The views and recommendations of this White Paper (WP), have been discussed and distilled from three workshops and the final conference between 2013 and 2015, in which researchers, teachers, students, media representatives, politicians, practitioners and legal experts participated. This understanding is summarized in the WP. Thus, the aim of the project to contribute to a reconceptualization of Linguistic Diversity is largely achieved, but this is not to be seen as a final solution, rather as a contribution to an ongoing dialogue.

The three workshops shared several starting points, as outlined in the three Position Papers, and their framework was stable throughout the series of workshops, even if each of them had its own main focus. Despite the broad representation of different geopolitical contexts, mainly from Europe --- from Northern Europe to the Mediterranean and from the Irish and British Isles to Eastern Europe -- but also from elsewhere such as North America and South Africa, there seem to exist underlying principles and views that many of the researchers share. These include:

- There is inadequate societal and political follow-through on political declarations regarding the promotion of LD;
- There is a lack of decisive action to improve LD, including through adequate funding;
- Possibilities exist for various international and national actors to avoid implementation of international agreements, through the lack of accountability and also through the principles of subsidiarity;
- Though this may not be a viable solution, the lack of sanctions softens the need and willingness to fulfil international agreements and conventions;
- An underlying view is that there still are deeply rooted misunderstandings and negative attitudes towards multilingualism and LD which could partly explain the first points;
- A knowledge, time and implementation gap exists between what, in academic/scientific terms, could be called 'established knowledge', and the willingness to implement such widely accepted insights;
- This leads to political rather than scientifically informed decisions on many aspects of LD;
- There is a failure of the educational systems to fulfil their tasks according to the recommendations of researchers and other key players in the field of education;

- There is a lack of a fusion between top-down and bottom-up perspectives, to promote the aims of LD;
- There nevertheless is a consistent contestation of assimilationist politics and language policies, among the speakers of dominated/minoritized language communities, and among researchers involved in the research of these dimensions;
- There is also a willingness to find new solutions and to develop old concepts so that they can be extended to new realities;
- There is sometimes a mix, sometimes a clash but also cooperation between disciplines and methods, between quantitative and qualitative ones;
- There are advanced insights based on a national linguistic and geopolitical contexts, which are seldom transferred to more generalized, and internationally adapted knowledge; in this respect, the use of English may either be a threshold or possibility, for achieving such a bridging of knowledge to a wider audience;
- At the same time, there is a strong need for researchers to look outside their own, defined area and field of research, both with regard to other cases, and other theoretical approaches; this also includes the need to become acquainted with other languages that communicate research results;
- In the European context, there is a growing view, that the established willingness to promote and research Linguistic Diversity has been weakened, both due to a general politically more acute climate in which such issues are discussed at national levels, and as a consequence of this, heightened resistance at European level, against the creation of structures intended to improve both the situation of and cooperative research on Linguistic Diversity;
- There are many questions within LD research, and it should be possible to ask and answer such questions via research, but without systematic political guidance.

In addition to this, one should reflect on the reasons for the discrepancy between research-based views and policies, as well as the mismatch between political aims/legislation and the fulfilment or implementation of these. As a recommendation for future research in the field it would be worthwhile to systematically try to track down where and why these discrepancies prevail. The following aspects could be included in such studies:

- Whether and how there is a systematic existence between on the one hand supportive and promotional international regulations and agreements and on the other articles in the same legal documents that limit, oppose or downgrade these regulations; for example, , e.g. between the Articles 21 and 22 of the European Charter of Fundamental Rights, and on the other hand Article 51 and of the same Charter.
- To what extent and how national non-fulfilment of international regulations and agreements is based on political, knowledge-based or attitudinal factors, separately or as

combinations of them.

- Attempts to compare the outcome of international and national policies in relation to the possibility of formulating or using sanctions in case of breaches of regulations and agreements on LD.
- To more precisely try to identify and describe what type of research findings are ignored when formulating and developing LPP and when is this most likely to happen in the process.
- How well are international and national pieces of legislation as well as research findings known by key politicians and authority representatives, with regard to LD, and specifically to matters pertaining to educational access and equity.

Results of such attempts to clarify the failure of LPP related to LD, could improve some of the already existing attempts to remedy the situation, but also open up for an intensified discussion on the effects of research on and politics within the fields of LD.

Appendices

Appendix 1. List of theoretical concepts ,WS 1-3, PP3

(Comments from PP3 used below.)

The authors of the PP1 identified a number of theoretical concepts drawn on numerous disciplines that were used in the presentations and discussions of the first LEARNMe Workshop. This list of concepts was tentative. The terms were collated in the First Position Paper so that they could be revisited in the next stages of the project and re-evaluated in the process of producing the White Paper.

The authors of the PP2 repeated the same operation and produced a comparative list of theoretical concepts used in either one or two of the Workshop. Thanks to the experience obtained with the PP1, this second list was much more comprehensive —e.g., it included many more glottonyms.

The authors of the PP3 followed basically the same procedure of PP2, and prepared a list of key terms used by the speakers during their presentations. The list was produced on the basis of the summaries and slides provided by the authors themselves.

The three lists are included in the following table. When comparing them, the readers should keep in mind that the terms presented in PP1 were less exhaustive and more exploratory than those in PP2 and PP3, so straightforward comparisons are not possible. Besides that, some terms may have been used during the presentation and discussion but not included in the list, due to the methodological differences in compiling the lists. Although a full transcript exists for WS1, the exercise of *post hoc* cross-referencing of terminology has not been undertaken.

		ABT 2013	STK 2014	BCN 2015	
1	Academic failure/success (2)		2		Specialised term
2	Academic literacy (2)		2		Specialised term
3	Academic registers (2)		2		Specialised term
4	Academic writing (2)		2		Specialised term
5	Acquisition (of language) (2) (3)		2	3	Specialised term
6	Additional language (2)		2		Specialised term
7	Adult and continuing education (3)			3	Specialised term
8	Agency (2)		2		Specialised term
9	Allophone (3)			3	Specialised term



10	Analphabetism (3)		3	Specialised term
11	Apartheid (language policy) (2)		2	Specialised term
12	Aquisition policies (3)		3	Specialised term
13	Arabic / Darija (3)		3	Glottonym
14	Aragonese / "Fabla" (3)		3	Glottonym
15	Aranese (Occitan) (2) (3)		2 3	Glottonym
16	Armenian (2)		2	Glottonym
17	Assimilationism (1)	1		Specialised term
18	Asturian Galician (3)		3	Glottonym
19	Asymmetric (language situation) (2)		2	Specialised term
20	Autochthonous (1)	1		Specialised term
21	Bable / Asturian (3)		3	Glottonym
22	Basic protection rights (2)		2	Specialised term
23	Beás/Boyash (2)		2	Glottonym
24	Belarusian (2)		2	Glottonym
25	Biculturalism (3)		3	Specialised term
26	Bilingual (3)		3	Specialised term
27	Bilingual arrangement (subtractive/additive- recursive/dynamic) (2)		2	Specialised term
28	Bilingual community (2)		2	Specialised term
29	Bilingual education/classes (2) (3)		2 3	Specialised term
30	Bilingual family (3)		3	Specialised term
31	Bilingual model (3)		3	Specialised term
32	Bilingual pedagogy (2)		2	Specialised term
33	Bilingual programs (2)		2	Specialised term
34	Bilingual strategies (2)		2	Specialised term
35	Bilingual teaching (convergent/immersion/multiple) (2)		2	Specialised term
36	Bilingual teaching (transitional/maintenance/polydirectional) (2)		2	Specialised term
37	Bilingual university (2)		2	Specialised term
38	Bilingualism (3)		3	Specialised term
39	Bottom-up approach (1)	1		Specialised term
40	Bulgarian (2)		2	Glottonym
41	Castilian (3)		3	Glottonym
42	Castilian homogenization (3)		3	Specialised term
43	Catalan / Valencian / Catalan-Valencian (2) (3)		2 3	Glottonym



44	Catalan-medium education (3)			3	Specialised term
45	Celtic language (3)			3	Glottonym
46	Census (language data) (2)		2		Glottonym
47	Chuvash language (3)			3	Glottonym
48	CLIL (Content- and language integrated learning) (2)		2		Specialised term
49	Code switching (1) (2)	1	2		Specialised term
50	Codification (1) (2)	1	2		Specialised term
51	Coercive power relations (2)		2		Specialised term
52	Collective Rights (1) (2)	1	2		Specialised term
53	Colonialism (2)		2		Specialised term
54	Committee of experts (3)			3	Specialised term
55	Commodification (1)	1			Specialised term
56	Communication pattern (3)			3	Specialised term
57	Communicative boundaries (2)		2		Specialised term
58	Community groups (3)			3	Specialised term
59	Community language (2)		2		Specialised term
60	Compensatory policies (2)		2		Specialised term
61	Competence			3	Specialised term
62	Complementary schools (2)		2		Specialised term
63	Comprehensive input (2)		2		Specialised term
64	Compulsary language learning			3	Specialised term
65	Conjunction model (2) (3)		2	3	Specialised term
66	Constitutional rights (2)		2		Specialised term
67	Contact languages (3)			3	Specialised term
68	Co-official language (3)			3	Specialised term
69	Cooperation (3)			3	Specialised term
70	Cornish (3)			3	Glottonym
71	Corpus (language) (2)		2		Specialised term
72	Corpus planning (3)			3	Specialised term
73	Covert (LPP) (2)		2		Specialised term
74	Crimean Tatar / Tatar (2) (3)		2	3	Glottonym
75	Critical authorship (2)		2		Specialised term
76	Critical literacy (2)		2		Specialised term
77	Croatian (2)		2		Glottonym
78	Cultivation (of language) (2)		2		Specialised term
79	Cultural affairs (3)			3	Specialised term
80	Cultural citizenship (2)		2		Specialised term
81	Cultural diversity (3)			3	Specialised term
82	Cultural heritage (3)			3	Specialised term



83	Cultural identity (2)		2	Specialised term
84	Cultural rights (2)		2	Specialised term
85	Curriculum (2)		2	Specialised term
86	Defenceless (3)		3	Specialised term
87	Democracy (2)		2	Specialised term
88	Dialect (3)		3	Specialised term
89	Diasystem (3)		3	Specialised term
90	Diglossia (1) (3)	1	3	Specialised term
91	Distance (tuition) (2)		2	Specialised term
92	Diverse society (2)		2	Specialised term
93	Diversity within diversity (1)	1		Specialised term
94	Domestic language (2)		2	Specialised term
95	Dominant language (2)		2	Specialised term
96	Dual /bilingual (instruction) (2)		2	Specialised term
97	Dutch (3)		3	Glottonym
98	Dutch-medium education (3)		3	Glottonym
99	EAL (English as an Additional language) (2)		2	Specialised term
100	Economic life (3)		3	Specialised term
101	Economic vitality (2)		2	Specialised term
102	Education (pre-school, primary/preliminary, secondary, tertiary, technical, vocational, higher education, adult) (2) (3)		2 3	Specialised term
103	Education measures (3)		3	Specialised term
104	Education planning (3)		3	Specialised term
105	Educational access/progress/disadvantage (2)		2	Specialised term
106	Educational linguistics (2)		2	Specialised term
107	Educational spaces (2)		2	Specialised term
108	Educational success (2)		2	Specialised term
109	Elfdalians (3)		3	Glottonym
110	Emerging literacy (2)		2	Specialised term
111	Empowerment (2)		2	Specialised term
112	Endangered language (2) (3)		2 3	Specialised term
113	English (3)		3	Glottonym
114	English-medium classes (2)		2	Specialised term
115	Epistemological access (2)		2	Specialised term
116	Equal access (2)		2	Specialised term
117	Equal citizenship (2)		2	Specialised term



118	Equal opportunities (2)		2	Specialised term
119	Equality of entitlement (2)		2	Specialised term
120	Equality of treatment (2)		2	Specialised term
121	Equitable educational outcomes (2)		2	Specialised term
122	Essentialist (2)		2	Specialised term
123	Ethnic diversity (2)		2	Specialised term
124	Ethnic minority child (2)		2	Specialised term
125	Ethnography (1)	1		Specialised term
126	Ethnolinguistic diversity (2)		2	Specialised term
127	Ethnolinguistic groups (2)		2	Specialised term
128	Euskera / Basque / Basque language (3)		3	Glottonym
129	Family transmission (3)		3	Specialised term
130	Finnish (2)		2	Glottonym
131	Fluency (language) (2)		2	Specialised term
132	Foreign language (2) (3)		2 3	Specialised term
133	Foreign language immersion (2)		2	Specialised term
134	Fragmentation (1)	1		Specialised term
135	Framework Convention for Protection of National Minorities (3)		3	Specialised term
136	Freedom of choice (3)		3	Specialised term
137	French (2) (3)		3	Glottonym
138	Frenchification (3)		3	Specialised term
139	French-medium education (3)		3	Specialised term
140	Functional illiteracy (2)		2	Specialised term
141	Functional multilingualism (2)		2	Specialised term
142	Gagauz (2)		2	Glottonym
143	Galician (3)		3	Glottonym
144	Generation (first and second) (2)		2	Specialised term
145	Geolinguistic regions (1)	1		Specialised term
146	German (2)		2	Glottonym
147	Global migration (3)		3	Specialised term
148	Global private spaces (1)	1		Specialised term
149	Globalization (2)		2	Specialised term
150	Greek (2)		2	Glottonym
151	Heteroglossia (1)	1		Specialised term
152	High variety (3)		3	Specialised term
153	Higher education (2)		2	Specialised term
154	Historical minority language		3	Specialised term
155	Holistic language practice (1)	1		Specialised term
156	Holistic perspective (3)		3	Specialised term



157	Home language (2) (3)		2	3	Specialised term
158	Homogeneity (ethnic) (2)		2		Specialised term
159	Human Rights (1) (2)	1	2		Specialised term
160	Hungarian (2) (3)		2	3	Specialised term
161	Identity (2)		2		Specialised term
162	Identity affirmation (2)		2		Specialised term
163	Identity claim (2)		2		Specialised term
164	Identity devaluation (2)		2		Specialised term
165	Identity enhancement (2)		2		Specialised term
166	Ideological narratives (2)		2		Specialised term
167	Ideologies (1)	1			Specialised term
168	Illiteracy (3)			3	Specialised term
169	Immersion (early/delayed/late) (2)		2		Specialised term
170	Immersion (one-way/two-way/dual) (2)		2		Specialised term
171	Immersion (total/partial) (2)		2		Specialised term
172	Immersion education (3)			3	Specialised term
173	Immersion language teaching (2)		2		Specialised term
174	Immigrant (student) (2)		2		Specialised term
175	Immigrant language (3)			3	Specialised term
176	Impermeable Linguistic Frameworks (1)	1			Specialised term
177	Implementation (of policies) (2) (3)		2	3	Specialised term
178	Inclusive pedagogies (2)		2		Specialised term
179	Independent schools (2)		2		Specialised term
180	Indigeneity (1) (2)	1	2		Specialised term
181	Indigenous group (3)			3	Specialised term
182	Indigenous journalism (2)		2		Specialised term
183	Indigenous media (2)		2		Specialised term
184	Indigenous rights (2)		2		Specialised term
185	Individual bilingualism (2)		2		Specialised term
186	Individual language (3)			3	Specialised term
187	Initial (language) (2)		2		Specialised term
188	Institutional monolingualism (2)		2		Specialised term
189	Institutional multilingualism (2)		2		Specialised term
190	Institutional practices (2)		2		Specialised term
191	Integration (3)			3	Specialised term
192	Integration (of pupils) (2)		2		Specialised term
193	Intercultural education (2)		2		Specialised term
194	Interculturality (3)			3	Specialised term
195	Intergenerational language transmission (3)			3	Specialised term



196	Intergroup relations (2) (3)		2	3	Specialised term
197	International conventions (2) (3)		2	3	Specialised term
198	Internationalisation (3)			3	Specialised term
199	Interpersonal relations (2)		2		Specialised term
200	Intra-group relations			3	Specialised term
201	Irish / Gaelic (1) (3)	1		3	Glottonym
202	Italian (3)			3	Glottonym
203	Judicial authorities			3	Specialised term
204	Karaim (2)		2		Glottonym
205	Knowledge (creation/mediation/production) (2)		2		Specialised term
206	Krymchak (2)		2		Glottonym
207	L1 (first language) (2)		2		Specialised term
208	L2 (second language) (2)		2		Specialised term
209	L3 (third language) (2)		2		Specialised term
210	Laissez-faire policy (2)		2		Specialised term
211	Language planning (3)			3	Specialised term
212	Language (2)		2		Specialised term
213	Language (social) construction (2)		2		Specialised term
214	Language academy (3)			3	Specialised term
215	Language acquisition (2) (3)		2	3	Specialised term
216	Language activism (2)		2		Specialised term
217	Language as practice (2)		2		Specialised term
218	Language assessment (2)		2		Specialised term
219	Language attitudes (3)			3	Specialised term
220	Language awareness (2)		2		Specialised term
221	Language backing (2)		2		Specialised term
222	Language border			3	Specialised term
223	Language census			3	Specialised term
224	Language choice			3	Specialised term
225	Language combination			3	Specialised term
226	Language community			3	Specialised term
227	Language community (2)		2		Specialised term
228	Language competence (1)	1			Specialised term
229	Language confidence (3)			3	Specialised term
230	Language conflict (3)			3	Specialised term
231	Language cultivation (3)			3	Specialised term
232	Language death (2)		2		Specialised term
233	Language deficits (3)			3	Specialised term
234	Language development (2)		2		Specialised term



235	Language diversity (3)		3	Specialised term	
236	Language domains (2)	2		Specialised term	
237	Language education (3)		3	Specialised term	
238	Language education curriculum (3)		3	Specialised term	
239	Language enhancement (2)	2		Specialised term	
240	Language equality (1)	1		Specialised term	
241	Language extension (2)	2		Specialised term	
242	Language facilities (3)		3	Specialised term	
243	Language group (3)		3	Specialised term	
244	Language heritage (2)	2		Specialised term	
245	Language immersion (2)	2		Specialised term	
246	Language infrastructure (3)		3	Specialised term	
247	Language innovation (2)	2		Specialised term	
248	Language issues (3)		3	Specialised term	
249	Language knowledge (3)		3	Specialised term	
250	Language law (2)	2		Specialised term	
251	Language learning (2) (3)	2	3	Specialised term	
252	Language maintenance (2) (3)	2	3	Specialised term	
253	Language management (2)	2		Specialised term	
254	Language model (3)		3	Specialised term	
255	Language of instruction (2) (3)	2	3	Specialised term	
256	Language of instruction (3)		3	Specialised term	
257	Language of significance (2)	2		Specialised term	
258	Language pedagogies (2)	2		Specialised term	
259	Language policies (2) (3)	2	3	Specialised term	
260	Language practices (3)		3	Specialised term	
261	Language preference (3)		3	Specialised term	
262	Language proficiency (2) (3)	2	3	Specialised term	
263	Language programmes (3)		3	Specialised term	
264	Language promotion (3)		3	Specialised term	
265	Language protection (3)		3	Specialised term	
266	Language regime (3)		3	Specialised term	
267	Language repertoires (2)	2		Specialised term	
268	Language retention (2)	2		Specialised term	
269	Language rights (1) (2) (3)	1	2	3	Specialised term
270	Language secessionism (3)		3	Specialised term	
271	Language shift (2) (3)	2	3	Specialised term	
272	Language shift reversion (3)		3	Specialised term	
273	Language teaching (3)		3	Specialised term	
274	Language transmission (2)	2		Specialised term	



275	Language use (1) (2) (3)	1	2	3	Specialised term
276	Language variety (2)		2		Specialised term
277	Language vitality (1) (2) (3)	1	2	3	Specialised term
278	Languages in contact (3)			3	Specialised term
279	Languaging (1) (2) (3)	1	2	3	Specialised term
280	Legal context (3)			3	Specialised term
281	Legal framework (3)			3	Specialised term
282	Legal measures (3)			3	Specialised term
283	Legal status (3)			3	Specialised term
284	Legislation (3)			3	Specialised term
285	Legislative competencies (3)			3	Specialised term
286	Legislative framework (3)			3	Specialised term
287	Length of residence (2)		2		Specialised term
288	Leonese (3)			3	Glottonym
289	Lesser-user languages (1)	1			Specialised term
290	Levels of LPP (macro/meso/micro) (2)		2		Specialised term
291	Lingua franca (3)			3	Specialised term
292	Linguistic rights (3)			3	Specialised term
293	Linguistic community (3)			3	Specialised term
294	Linguistic conflict (3)			3	Specialised term
295	Linguistic deiversity (3)			3	Specialised term
296	Linguistic diversity (3)			3	Specialised term
297	Linguistic emigration (3)			3	Specialised term
298	Linguistic identity (2)		2		Specialised term
299	Linguistic input (2)		2		Specialised term
300	Linguistic laboratory (3)			3	Specialised term
301	Linguistic law (3)			3	Specialised term
302	Linguistic modality (3)			3	Specialised term
303	Linguistic output (2)		2		Specialised term
304	Linguistic project of the center (2) (3)		2	3	Specialised term
305	Linguistic protection (3)			3	Specialised term
306	Linguistic regime (3)			3	Specialised term
307	Linguistic repertoires (2)		2		Specialised term
308	Linguistic representation (1)	1			Specialised term
309	Linguistic self-confidence (3)			3	Specialised term
310	Linguistically heterogeneous (3)			3	Specialised term
311	Literacy (basic/emergent) (2)		2		Specialised term
312	Literacy engagement (2)		2		Specialised term
313	Literacy skills (2)		2		Specialised term
314	Literacy support (3)			3	Specialised term



315	Local textual practices (2)		2		Specialised term
316	Low variety (3)			3	Specialised term
317	LPP (language policy and planning) (2)		2		Specialised term
318	Macro-linguistics (1)	1			Specialised term
319	Macro-sociolinguistics (2)		2		Specialised term
320	Macro-structure (2)		2		Specialised term
321	Main language (2)		2		Specialised term
322	Mainstream class (2)		2		Specialised term
323	Mainstream curriculum (2)		2		Specialised term
324	Mainstream education (2)		2		Specialised term
325	Mainstream journalism (2)		2		Specialised term
326	Mainstream school (2)		2		Specialised term
327	Majority language (2) (3)		2	3	Specialised term
328	Majority speaker (2)		2		Specialised term
329	Mandatory (instruction) (2)		2		Specialised term
330	Manx (3)			3	Glottonym
331	Marginalization (2)		2		Specialised term
332	Marginalized communities (2)		2		Specialised term
333	Meaning-making (2)		2		Specialised term
334	Meänkieli (2)		2	3	Glottonym
335	Media(tiza)tion (2)		2		Specialised term
336	Medium Languages (1)	1			Specialised term
337	Methodological approaches (1)	1			Specialised term
338	Methodology of diversity (2)		2		Specialised term
339	Micro- and Macro Approaches (1)	1			Specialised term
340	Micro-interaction (2)		2		Specialised term
341	Micro-sociolinguistics (2)		2		Specialised term
342	Migrant (student) (2)		2		Specialised term
343	Migrant groups			3	Specialised term
344	Migrant settlement			3	Specialised term
345	Minimalist interpretation (LPP) (2)		2		Specialised term
346	Minorities (3)			3	Specialised term
347	Minoritization (1)	1			Specialised term
348	Minoritized language (1) (3)	1		3	Specialised term
349	Minority language (1) (2) (3)	1	2	3	Specialised term
350	Minority language community (3)			3	Specialised term
351	Minority language digital media (2)		2		Specialised term
352	Minority language medium (2)		2		Specialised term
353	Minority schools (2)		2		Specialised term
354	Minority speaker (2)		2		Specialised term



355	Minority status (3)		3	Specialised term	
356	Modern languages (2)		2	Specialised term	
357	Moldovan (2)		2	Glottonym	
358	Mono-centricity (1)	1		Specialised term	
359	Monoglossia (2)		2	Specialised term	
360	Monolingual (3)		3	Specialised term	
361	Monolingual ethos (2)		2	Specialised term	
362	Monolingual habitus (2)		2	Specialised term	
363	Monolingual norms (2)		2	Specialised term	
364	Monolingualism (1)	1		Specialised term	
365	Monoliterate (2)		2	Specialised term	
366	Mother tongue (3)		3	Specialised term	
367	Mother tongue instruction (3)		3	Specialised term	
368	Mother tongue tuition (2)		2	Specialised term	
369	Mother-tongue transmission (2)		2	Specialised term	
370	Motivation (2)		2	Specialised term	
371	Multicultural setting (2)		2	Specialised term	
372	Multidimensional approach (1)	1		Specialised term	
373	Multilingual strategy (3)		3	Specialised term	
374	Multilingual repertoires (2)		2	Specialised term	
375	Multilingual semiotic resources (2)		2	Specialised term	
376	Multilingualism (1) (3)	1	3	Specialised term	
377	Multimodal repertoires (2)		2	Specialised term	
378	Multimodality (2)		2	Specialised term	
379	Multiple languages (2)		2	Specialised term	
380	Multiplicity of interpretation of language equality (1)		2	Specialised term	
381	Nation state (2)		2	Specialised term	
382	Nation/al (1)	1		Specialised term	
383	National curriculum (2)		2	Specialised term	
384	National identity (2)		2	Specialised term	
385	National language (2)		2	Specialised term	
386	National level (3)		3	Specialised term	
387	National minorities (2)		2	Specialised term	
388	National minorities rights (3)		3	Specialised term	
389	National minority (3)		3	Specialised term	
390	National minority language (2)		2	3	Specialised term
391	National school (3)		3	Specialised term	
392	National territory (3)		3	Specialised term	
393	Native (language) (2)		2	Specialised term	



394	Native bilingual (3)			3	Specialised term
395	Native language (3)			3	Specialised term
396	Natural language (2)		2		Specialised term
397	Naturalization (2)		2		Specialised term
398	Neighbourhood migration (3)			3	Specialised term
399	New media (2)		2		Specialised term
400	Non-dominant languages (2)		2		Specialised term
401	Non-essentialist (2)		2		Specialised term
402	Non-official (1)	1			Specialised term
403	Non-standard (1)	1			Specialised term
404	Non-territorial language (3)			3	Specialised term
405	Non-university education			3	Specialised term
406	Normalization (1) (2) (3)	1	2	3	Specialised term
407	Normalization law (3)			3	Specialised term
408	Normative policy (1)	1			Specialised term
409	Norwegian (2)		2		Glottonym
410	Objectification (2)		2		Specialised term
411	Occitan (2) (3)		2	3	Glottonym
412	Official languages (1) (2) (3)	1	2	3	Specialised term
413	Official national language (2)		2		Specialised term
414	Official status (3)			3	Specialised term
415	Old minority languages (1)	1			Specialised term
416	Optional language education (3)			3	Specialised term
417	Overt (LPP) (2)		2		Specialised term
418	Parallel monolingualism (1)	1			Specialised term
419	Parental push (2)		2		Specialised term
420	Pashtu (2)		2		Glottonym
421	Pedagogical (2)		2		Specialised term
422	Performance (reading) (2)		2		Specialised term
423	Permeable linguistic frameworks (1)	1			Specialised term
424	Picardian dialects			3	Glottonym
425	PIRLS (Progress in International Reading Literacy Study) (2)		2		Specialised term
426	PISA (Program for International		2		Specialised term
427	Pluralism (liberal/corporate) (2)		2		Specialised term
428	Pluricentric (1)	1			Specialised term
429	Pluricentricity (1)	1			Specialised term
430	Plurilingualism (1)	1			Specialised term
431	Policy impact (2)		2		Specialised term
432	Political context (3)			3	Specialised term



433	Politics of difference (2)		2	Specialised term
434	Politics of universalism (2)		2	Specialised term
435	Polylogue (2)		2	Specialised term
436	Portuguese		3	Specialised term
437	Power (2)		2	Specialised term
438	Practical measures (3)		3	Specialised term
439	Practices (local/social/linguistic) (2)		2	Specialised term
440	Pre-school education (3)		3	Specialised term
441	Prescriptive (grammar) (2)		2	Specialised term
442	Prestige (2)		2	Specialised term
443	Print access (2)		2	Specialised term
444	Proficiency (linguistic) (2)		2	Specialised term
445	Promoting (legislation/LPP) (2)		2	Specialised term
446	Protected language (3)		3	Specialised term
447	Protecting (legislation/LPP) (2)		2	Specialised term
448	Protective language policy (3)		3	Specialised term
449	Public administration (3)		3	Specialised term
450	Public services (3)		3	Specialised term
451	Public sphere / public life (3)		3	Specialised term
452	Public sphericules (1)	1		Specialised term
453	Public use (language) (2)		2	Specialised term
454	Qualitative analysis (3)		3	Specialised term
455	Quantitative analysis (3)		3	Specialised term
456	Reading comprehension (2)		2	Specialised term
457	Reading engagement (2)		2	Specialised term
458	Recognition (3)		3	Specialised term
459	Recognized language (3)		3	Specialised term
460	Reconciliation processes (2)		2	Specialised term
461	Reconstruction of language (2)		2	Specialised term
462	Regional language (3)		3	Specialised term
463	Regional minority languages (1) (2)	1	2	Specialised term
464	Relevant language (3)		3	Specialised term
465	Research evidence (2)		2	Specialised term
466	Resemiotization (2)		2	Specialised term
467	Revitalization (2) (3)		2 3	Specialised term
468	Right to develop (a language) (3)		3	Specialised term
469	Right to learn (a language) (3)		3	Specialised term
470	Right to use (a language) (3)		3	Specialised term
471	Roma (Gypsy) (2) (3)		2 3	Glottonym
472	Romani (2) (3)		2 3	Glottonym



473	Romanian/ Rumanian (2)	2		Glottonym
474	Russian (2)	2	3	Glottonym
475	Rusyn (2)	2		Glottonym
476	Ruthenian (2)	2		Glottonym
477	Sami (2)	2	3	Glottonym
478	Scaffolding (2)	2		Specialised term
479	School language (of instruction) (2)	2		Specialised term
480	Schooling (3)		3	Specialised term
481	Schooling trajectory (3)		3	Specialised term
482	Scots (3)		3	Glottonym
483	Scottish Gaelic (3)		3	Glottonym
484	Second language (3)		3	Specialised term
485	Second language immersion (2)	2		Specialised term
486	Self-confidence (3)		3	Specialised term
487	Self-representation (2)	2		Specialised term
488	Serbian (2)	2		Glottonym
489	SES (Socioeconomic status) (2)	2		Specialised term
490	Slovak (2)	2		Glottonym
491	Slovene (2)	2		Glottonym
492	Social group (2)	2		Specialised term
493	Social inclusion (2)	2		Specialised term
494	Social integration (2)	2		Specialised term
495	Social life (3)		3	Specialised term
496	Social network (3)		3	Specialised term
497	Social reference (3)		3	Specialised term
498	Socialization (2)	2		Specialised term
499	Societal discrimination (2)	2		Specialised term
500	Societal multilingualism (2)	2		Specialised term
501	Sociolinguistic change (2)	2		Specialised term
502	Sociolinguistic dynamics (3)		3	Specialised term
503	Sociolinguistic effects (3)		3	Specialised term
504	Sociolinguistic impact (3)		3	Specialised term
505	Sociolinguistic outline (3)		3	Specialised term
506	Sociolinguistic practices (1)	1	2	Specialised term
507	Sociolinguistic role (3)		3	Specialised term
508	Space and time (2)	2		Specialised term
509	Spanish (2)	2		Glottonym
510	Spanish language (3)		3	Glottonym
511	Spanish-medium education (3)		3	Specialised term
512	Speaker (3)		3	Specialised term



513	Specific legislation (3)		3	Specialised term
514	Spoken language (2)		2	Specialised term
515	Stable (bilingualism) (2)		2	Specialised term
516	Standard (language) (2)		2	Specialised term
517	Standard language (3)		3	Specialised term
518	Standardization (2) (3)		2 3	Specialised term
519	State language (3)		3	Specialised term
520	State language policy (3)		3	Specialised term
521	State languages (1)	1		Specialised term
522	State legislation (3)		3	Specialised term
523	State level (3)		3	Specialised term
524	Status (of language) (2)		2	Specialised term
525	Status languaging (3)		3	Specialised term
526	Structural problem (legislation/LPP) (2)		2	Specialised term
527	Structured policy (3)		3	Specialised term
528	Student assessment (2)		2	Specialised term
529	Superdiversity (1)	1		Specialised term
530	Sweden Finnish speakers (3)		3	Specialised term
531	Swedish (3)		3	Glottonym
532	Swedish Sign Language (2)		2	Glottonym
533	Tamazight / Berber (3)		3	Glottonym
534	Target language (2)		2	Specialised term
535	Teacher education (3)		3	Specialised term
536	Teacher training (basic/further) (2) (3)		2 3	Specialised term
537	Teaching materials (3)		3	Specialised term
538	Telugu (2)		2	Glottonym
539	Territorial language (2)		2	Specialised term
540	Territoriality (1)	1		Specialised term
541	Territoriality (vs. personality) (3)		3	Specialised term
542	Theory of learning (2)		2	Specialised term
543	Theory of teaching (2)		2	Specialised term
544	Top-down approach (1)	1		Specialised term
545	Tornedalians (3)		3	Specialised term
546	Traditional language (3)		3	Specialised term
547	Traditional practice (3)		3	Specialised term
548	Traditional presence (3)		3	Specialised term
549	Transborder contacts (2)		2	Specialised term
550	Transculturalism (1)	1		Specialised term
551	Transfrontier exchange (3)		3	Specialised term
552	Transfrontier relations (3)		3	Specialised term



553	Translanguaging (1) (2)	1	2		Specialised term
554	Translation (1)	1			Specialised term
555	Transnational communities (1)	1			Specialised term
556	Transnational identity (2)		2		Specialised term
557	Transnationalism (1)	1		3	Specialised term
558	Trilingual education (2) (3)		2	3	Specialised term
559	Trilingualism (3)			3	Specialised term
560	Ukrainian (2) (3)		2	3	Glottonym
561	Ulster Scots (3)			3	Glottonym
562	Unbalanced bilingualism (3)			3	Specialised term
563	Unique (minority language) (2)		2		Specialised term
564	Valencian (catalan) (3)			3	Glottonym
565	Validation (of language and culture) (2)		2		Specialised term
566	Variety (of language) (2)		2		Specialised term
567	Vehicular (language) (2)		2		Specialised term
568	Voice (power-related) (2)		2		Specialised term
569	Walloon dialects (3)			3	Glottonym
570	Welcoming class (2)		2		Specialised term
571	Welsh (1) (2) (3)	1	2	3	Glottonym
572	Written illiteracy (3)			3	Specialised term
573	Yiddish (2)		2	3	Glottonym



