



# Valuing *All* Languages in Europe


Project co-ordinators:  
Joanna McPake and Teresa Tinsley

Project team: Peter Broeder, Laura Mijares, Sirkku Latomaa, Waldemar Martyniuk



**ECML**

ECML Research and Development reports series



*European Centre for Modern Languages*  
*Centre européen pour les langues vivantes*



Focusing its work on promoting innovative approaches in language education since 1995, the European Centre for Modern Languages (ECML) of the Council of Europe plays a significant role in disseminating good practice and assisting in its implementation in member states.

The ECML runs research and development projects within the framework of medium-term programmes of activities. These projects are led by international teams of experts and concentrate mainly on training multipliers, promoting professional teacher development and setting up expert networks. The ECML's reports and publications, which are the results of these projects, illustrate the dedication and active involvement of all those who participated in them, particularly the project co-ordination teams.

The overall title of the ECML's second medium-term programme (2004-2007) is "*Languages for social cohesion – Language education in a multilingual and multicultural Europe*". This thematic approach should enable us to deal with one of the major challenges our societies have to face at the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, highlighting the role of language education in improving mutual understanding and respect among the citizens of Europe.

\*\*\*

Set up in Graz, Austria, the ECML is an "Enlarged Partial Agreement" of the Council of Europe to which thirty-three countries have currently subscribed<sup>1</sup>. Inspired by the fundamental values of the Council of Europe, the ECML promotes linguistic and cultural diversity and fosters plurilingualism and pluriculturalism among the citizens living in Europe. Its activities are complementary to those of the Language Policy Division, the Council of Europe unit responsible for the development of policies and planning tools in the field of language education.

For further information on the ECML and its publications:

European Centre for Modern Languages

Nikolaipplatz 4

A-8020 Graz

<http://www.ecml.at>

---

<sup>1</sup> The 33 member states of the Enlarged Partial Agreement of the ECML are: Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", United Kingdom.

# **Valuing *All* Languages in Europe**

## **Project co-ordinators:**

**Joanna McPake and Teresa Tinsley**

## **Project team:**

**Peter Broeder, Laura Mijares, Sirku Latomaa, Waldemar Martyniuk**

European Centre for Modern Languages

© Council of Europe, 2007



## Table of contents

<b>Chapter 1: Valuing All Languages in Europe .....</b>	<b>7</b>
1. Europe's additional languages .....	7
2. 20 <sup>th</sup> century policy for additional languages: monolingual and separatist .....	8
3. 21 <sup>st</sup> century policy: plurilingual and comprehensive.....	9
4. Additional languages – a valuable resource for Europe .....	11
5. The VALEUR Project: challenges and opportunities for additional languages .....	11
<b>Chapter 2: VALEUR project: aims and methods.....</b>	<b>13</b>
1. Aims of the VALEUR project .....	13
2. History of the project .....	13
3. Data collection and analysis .....	13
<b>Chapter 3: A developmental perspective on additional language education.....</b>	<b>15</b>
1. A rose by any other name would smell as sweet.....	15
2. Armenia.....	15
3. Austria.....	16
4. Estonia .....	17
5. Finland .....	17
6. The Netherlands.....	18
7. Spain .....	19
8. Conclusions .....	20
<b>Chapter 4: Europe's additional languages.....</b>	<b>23</b>
1. Counting languages: what, how and why? .....	23
2. What is a language? .....	23
3. Methods for establishing the range of languages in use .....	24
4. Purposes of collecting data on languages in use .....	25
5. The VALEUR language map.....	26
6. Implications.....	28
<b>Chapter 5: Making provision for additional languages .....</b>	<b>31</b>
1. The rationale for making provision.....	31
2. Constructing the map .....	31
3. Contours of the provision map.....	32
4. A more detailed picture: three case studies .....	35
5. Making provision for additional languages .....	37

<b>Chapter 6: Good practice in supporting additional language learning .....</b>	<b>39</b>
1. Defining ‘good practice’ .....	39
2. Supportive structures.....	39
3. Developing teacher training and teaching materials.....	41
4. Recognising progression and attainment.....	42
5. Revitalising languages .....	43
6. Conclusions .....	44
<b>Chapter 7: Valuing all languages in Europe: policy in support of enhanced provision for additional languages .....</b>	<b>47</b>
1. Introduction .....	47
2. Council of Europe language education policy: guidance for future developments .....	47
3. Language education instruments in support of additional language learning .....	49
4. In conclusion .....	51
Appendix.....	53
<b>Bibliography .....</b>	<b>57</b>

# Chapter 1: Valuing *All* Languages in Europe

## 1. Europe's additional languages

'Plurilingual education promotes... a respect for the plurilingualism of others and the value of languages and varieties irrespective of their perceived status in society'

Council of Europe Language Policy Division website

The recognition that linguistic diversity is a valuable asset is the starting point for the VALEUR (Valuing All Languages in Europe) project, which focuses on Europe's *additional* languages. We have adopted this term to refer to all languages in use in a society, apart from the official, national or dominant language(s) (hereafter referred to as *dominant* languages). In other words, they include what are sometimes referred to as *regional or minority languages* – the languages of long-established communities (e.g. Saami in Finland or Basque in Spain); *migrant languages* – the languages of more recently established communities, immigrants and refugees (e.g. Panjabi in the UK, Turkish in the Netherlands, etc.); *non-territorial languages* – the languages of travellers and historically displaced groups (e.g. Romani and Yiddish, across Europe); and *sign languages* – the languages of deaf people and hearing people who communicate with them (e.g. the various sign languages in use in Europe).

Policy and practice relating to provision for the learning and teaching of additional languages have tended to develop separately and unevenly. While there has been renewed interest and increased support for provision for many of Europe's regional/ minority languages in recent years, particularly following the introduction of the *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages* (Council of Europe, 1992), awareness of issues relating to provision for the other groups is not as great, and developments have tended to be haphazard and disconnected.

For this reason we sought to adopt, in the VALEUR project, an inclusive term covering all Europe's additional languages, which would have shared validity across Europe. The term 'additional languages' was agreed during the course of the project and we discuss this further in Chapters 2 and 3. We believe that there is much to be gained in adopting the *inclusive* definition we propose, because, across Europe, individuals, families and communities using additional languages, as well as the dominant language(s) of the state in which they live, have important characteristics in common. They are, by definition, *plurilingual* – using two or more languages in their daily lives – and for this reason, have to make decisions about the best way to educate their children, in order for them to acquire formal competences in both or all their languages. Depending on the languages in question, and the area in which they live, plurilinguals may have the opportunity to educate their children wholly in an additional language; to educate them bilingually, in schools in which the dominant and the additional languages are both used as media of education; to give them the opportunity to study the additional language as a curricular subject (sometimes it may be presented as though it were a 'foreign' language); or to learn the language in after-school or weekend classes, offered by the education authorities or organised locally by the community concerned. Some children – perhaps the majority of those growing up plurilingually in Europe – do not have opportunities to study their additional languages formally at all; while even those who do may not encounter provision which meets their needs and aspirations, or which provides them with outcomes valued by the wider society in which they live. This should be a matter of concern for all involved in the development of language education across Europe, because additional languages, like the various dominant languages of Europe, represent a rich resource both for the communities which use them and for Europe as a whole.

## 2. 20<sup>th</sup> century policy for additional languages: monolingual and separatist

A historical analysis of European policy (from both the Council of Europe and the European Union) concerned with educational provision for additional languages can be categorised as a shift from a 20<sup>th</sup> century monolingual and separatist starting point to a 21<sup>st</sup> century plurilingual and comprehensive perspective.

Policies developed in the latter part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century can be characterised as *monolingual* – or *monolingualist* – in that they tend to assume that everyone has one ‘first language’ or ‘mother tongue’ and that everyone will therefore acquire second (and subsequent) languages in similar ways (through some kind of formal provision), and will have similar goals. This was as true for children whose ‘first’ language was (one of) the dominant language(s) of the state in which they lived as it was for those whose ‘first’ language was an additional language, although emphasis on the outcomes of provision differed. Those from additional language backgrounds were expected to achieve high levels of fluency in their ‘second’ languages – and the perception that many failed to do so was seen as a significant problem – while there was little or no interest in their retention or development of competences in their ‘first’ languages. In contrast, those whose ‘first’ language was (one of) the dominant language(s) were expected to develop high levels of formal competence (particularly high levels of literacy) in this language; acquiring high levels of competence in the ‘second’ language though seen as desirable was not essential. Effectively, monolingual policies tended to produce monolingual (or near monolingual) outcomes – only relatively small numbers of those from the dominant community would become highly competent in other languages, while those from communities in which additional languages were used often became more competent in the dominant language, retaining only residual competence in their additional language(s).

Policies of this period relating specifically to additional languages can also be characterised as *separatist*. Additional language education was seen as relating to many small, often isolated, languages or groups of languages whose learners had little or nothing in common with each other. We have already identified the principal categories established at this time – regional/ minority, migrant, non-territorial and sign languages – and note that not only was there a failure to link the needs and aspirations of learners of these languages to the wider context (a Europe which had always been multilingual, but where both the extent of linguistic diversity and of concomitant plurilingualism were rapidly increasing), but that in fact, policy concerning provision for these languages was often seen as the preserve of a disparate group of special interest bodies.

So, for example, responsibility for Europe-wide policy and provision for *regional/ minority languages* is shared by a number of organisations. The European Parliament established the *European Bureau for Lesser Used Languages* in 1982 to support linguistic diversity in Europe through the provision of information and advice; and the European MERCATOR Network in 1987, to conduct research into the status and use of regional/ minority languages. The Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe adopted the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages in 1992: this sets out a range of measures to facilitate and encourage the use of specific regional or minority languages in public life, including education.

In contrast, policy for *migrant languages* was variously determined by groups concerned with the mobility of labour forces across Europe, those concerned with the social integration of immigrants and refugees, or those involved in the development of multicultural/ anti-racist policy. One of the earliest (1977) European Economic Community directives supporting the teaching of migrant languages is concerned with the education of the children of migrant workers (Directive 77/486/EEC: Article 3). However, few countries adopted this approach, and evaluations conducted 20 years later (Bekemans and Ortiz de Urbina, 1997; Broeder and Extra, 1998) found very little effective provision. The former study identified greater support for ‘intercultural education’ for all students, intended both to support the integration of children of immigrant origin into host nation schools, and ultimately into European society; and also to tackle racism and xenophobia among the general population. The latter concluded that



considerably more attention had been paid to the development of provision to teach the language of the host country than to migrant languages.

*Non-territorial languages*, particularly Romani (in its many variant forms), tended to be treated as separate from regional/ minority or migrant languages, because their speakers are not associated with a particular country or region. Bakker (2001) provides a summary of policy statements from the 1980s onwards, in support of Romani culture and language, arguing for the teaching of Romani and Romani-medium education. Despite this, he also reports very limited educational provision for the language in the (pre-enlargement) EU member states, noting in particular that there appeared to be no secondary provision at all. Little or no policy attention was paid to the languages of the Jewish diaspora in Europe in the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, quite possibly contributing to the very rapid decline. In 1996, the Council of Europe issued a series of recommendations to protect Yiddish language and culture in Europe, but these do not include provision for teaching the language.

Policy in relation to provision for the learning of *sign languages* has been marginalised throughout the latter part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. There has been a long struggle to have sign languages recognised as languages, and therefore to be included in language policy initiatives, rather than in disability policies. Despite a European Parliament resolution in 1987 calling on member states to recognise sign languages, a subsequent resolution on linguistic and cultural minorities (1994) did not mention them. Although sign languages could be considered to be included (by virtue of the fact that they are not specifically excluded, unlike 'migrant' languages) under the Council of Europe's *Charter for Regional and Minority Languages*, none of the countries which have ratified the charter have included them in the list of protected languages.

### 3. 21<sup>st</sup> century policy: plurilingual and comprehensive

Around the turn of the century, a shift in policy focus can be discerned. Two documents, one published in 2003 by the European Union and the other by the Council of Europe, in the same year, are particularly significant in terms of the development of a more comprehensive and inclusive approach. The European Union's *Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity: An Action Plan 2004-2006* takes as its starting point the need for enhanced communication skills in an enlarged European Union of 450 million people from very diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Encouraging citizens to learn only the national languages of other member states (and *de facto*, only a small number of such languages) will no longer be sufficient to enable Europeans to live, work and trade with each other. Consequently the range of languages to be learned needs not only to include the 'smaller' national languages of member states, but also other kinds of languages, including regional/ minority and migrant languages, and the languages of major trading partners around the world (p. 9).

The Council of Europe's draft guide to the development of language policy documents in Europe (Beacco & Byram, 2003) similarly redefines, more comprehensively, the range of languages Europeans should learn. No longer should emphasis be placed exclusively on the national language of the state in which one was living, plus one (preferably two) other national languages of other European countries, but instead on a much wider range of languages, 'encompassing the "mother" tongue, the national language(s), regional and minority languages, European and non-European languages, etc.' (p. 39)

This document also elaborates the concept of *plurilingualism* which had earlier appeared in the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*; crucially defining this as one competence, encompassing a range of languages in a variety of contexts, rather than seeing these as a range of separate (and potentially hierarchalised) language skills:

[...] as an individual person's experience of language in its cultural contexts expands, from the language of the home to that of society at large and then to the languages of other peoples (whether learnt at school or college, or by direct experience), he or she does not keep these languages and cultures in strictly separated

mental compartments, but rather builds up a communicative competence to which all knowledge and experience of language contributes and in which languages interrelate and interact. (p. 4)

What prompted the shift towards this new comprehensive vision of plurilingualism? One explanation is the growing challenge which English – the ‘global language’ – represents for all other languages in Europe. There have been arguments that English should become a Europe-wide ‘lingua franca’ given that it is, *de facto*, the dominant language in both high prestige domains, such as science, and in popular culture. Commentators are divided as to the advantages or disadvantages of this development. For example, Phillipson, who, over a decade ago, drew attention to the phenomenon of linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992), has recently written about the dangers which an English-only Europe represents for the maintenance of European cultural and social values (Phillipson, 2004). Others take a more positive view. Brutt-Griffler (2002), in seeking to provide a ‘unified theory of world English’, argues that the reason for the wide and rapid spread of English across the world lies not in imperialism or neo-colonialism, but rather in the emerging need for a ‘world language’ to facilitate wider communication across communities and nations. House (2003) has argued that it is necessary to make a distinction between ‘languages for communication’, a role for which English is well-suited, providing that the implications of a lingua franca in this context are well defined and understood, and ‘languages for identification’, for which a wide range of languages across Europe will continue to be required. Other commentators (Block and Cameron, 2002) call for a wider definition of communication which encompasses ‘trust’ as well as ‘truth’, in other words the ability to engage with the cultural values and expectations of interlocutors as well as transmitting factual information. Hagège (2006) develops this theme with particular reference to French, drawing attention to the cultural specifics associated with the French language which would be lost if English were to take over. By extension, he argues that we have a duty to protect all the world’s languages for similar reasons, echoing arguments set out by Skutnabb-Kangas (2000), who sees linguistic and cultural diversity as analogous to bio-diversity, and contends that they are equally necessary to the health of the planet.

It is now well-established that globalisation creates tensions between what appear to be opposing tendencies. If globalisation can be seen as creating a need for a world-wide lingua franca – along with the risk that this contributes to the endangerment and disappearance of other languages – it has also contributed to an exponential rise in linguistic diversity in parts of the world which were previously perceived as largely monolingual. So, as a result of the increased mobility associated with globalisation, Western European countries have, typically, shifted from being countries of emigration to countries of immigration over the last 50 years, with a significant increase in immigration over the last decade (Eurostat, 2005). This has led to what Vertovec (2006) has termed ‘superdiversity’ characterised by ‘an increased number of new, small and scattered, multiple-origin, transnationally connected, socio-economically differentiated and legally stratified immigrants’. He draws attention to the differences between the immigrant experience of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and that of the 21<sup>st</sup>. Whereas earlier generations were resigned to limited contact with their countries of origin, given the cost and scarcity of communications, current migrant populations are highly mobile, benefiting from low cost airlines and cheap new communications technologies such as the internet and mobile telephones. Plurilingualism is no longer simply a cultural legacy from the country of origin, maintained principally for affective reasons, but a necessity – and an asset – as workers move from country to country, maintaining links with multiple ‘home’ countries and with diasporas around the world.

There is a similar tension between global marketing, promoting world-wide consumption of commercial brands, cultural products, etc., and a re-evaluation of the local, both for the local population and for tourism (a major industry in much of Europe) where holiday-makers are increasingly looking for what is different or ‘exotic’ in comparison to their own lifestyles. Such trends are potentially positive for additional languages, in that they may come to be identified with what is distinctive about a local culture or community.

#### **4. Additional languages – a valuable resource for Europe**

These developments add weight to the argument that additional languages are a valuable resource for Europe. Lo Bianco (2001) identifies six dimensions to such a resource: intellectual, cultural, economic, social, citizenship and rights. A community, a nation, or a larger collective which invests in all its languages is therefore likely to see:

- *enhanced intellectual and academic achievement* of all children, particularly those brought up plurilingually: a vast body of research from around the world points to the fact that plurilingual children whose additional languages are ignored or devalued in an educational context may underachieve as a consequence, but those whose additional languages are supported both by positive attitudes and by educational provision which enables them to develop formal language and literacy skills often excel academically, outperforming peers who are monolingual in the dominant language;
- *enriched cultural activities in all arts fields*, drawing on the traditions and creative potential of many languages and cultures, and also on the rich possibilities of hybridity which a multicultural city or nation presents;
- *greatly increased possibilities for trade and investment*, not just in the relatively narrow sense of greater linguistic ability *per se* but also because of the network of social and cultural links between people who speak the same language, increasing ability to identify potential markets, understand cultural practices in relation to trade, and embrace the career opportunities of enhanced mobility;
- *heightened capacity to compete in the knowledge economy*, gathering information not only from dominant language sources but from the growing volume of information available via the internet and other sources in other languages, and also disseminating information multilingually;
- *improved social services*, catering for people in linguistically and culturally more appropriate ways, identifying needs and opportunities which monolingual staff may be unaware of, fostering a sense of inclusion and well-being;
- *greater opportunities for participation in public life, and for shaping democratic practices* by helping to break down the barriers which can be created by traditional monolingual political language practices, and by reflecting and drawing on the ideas and interests of everyone;
- *better strategies to combat prejudice, promote tolerance and mutual understanding*, through the valuing of other languages and the cultures they represent and by providing opportunities to address these issues multilingually.

However, the resource which additional languages represent is not always recognised. Consequently, provision to support the learning of these languages may not always be adequate to ensure that they thrive and that the resource can be exploited in these ways. In fact, the extent to which the potential of additional languages is overlooked is such that little is currently known about the nature of current provision or its outcomes.

#### **5. The VALEUR Project: challenges and opportunities for additional languages**

The VALEUR project aims to redress the information gap, by mapping the kinds of formal and informal provision available for children; describing, in broad terms, the outcomes of such provision; identifying existing ‘good practice’ in the field and also areas where further support is needed; and establishing priorities for future action and recommendations for different audiences.

Providers of additional language education today face a number of challenges and opportunities. We have identified a significant shift towards a more comprehensive and plurilingual policy stance, whereby all types of additional languages are beginning to be seen as legitimate elements within Europe-wide language education policies. As a result of this shift and the changing attitudes it represents, there are greater opportunities than ever before to argue for enhanced educational status for additional languages: for example, to place them alongside 'foreign' languages in the mainstream curriculum, to expand existing additional language medium education or bilingual education, drawing on the success of CLIL methods or to use technology to create communities of learners where these are widely dispersed.

However, we have also identified significant challenges. All languages, not just those considered additional, are threatened by the growing dominance of English. It may not be easy to achieve popular acceptance of the need for and value of 'plurilingualism', as conceptualised by the Council of Europe. Furthermore, current provision for additional language learning still largely reflects responses to earlier, 'separatist' policy which may have privileged (relatively speaking) some additional languages compared to others, but marginalised most from the mainstream curriculum. Thus much provision continues to be after made school hours, by teachers whose qualifications and expertise rarely receive formal recognition, with resources which are often inadequate or inappropriate. The question of whether provision is developing, or can be developed, to the extent of meeting the ambitious European goal of recognising and enhancing the plurilingualism of all citizens, is one which the VALEUR project seeks to address.

## **Chapter 2: VALEUR project: aims and methods**

### **1. Aims of the VALEUR project**

The overarching aim of the project has been to raise awareness of the resource represented by additional languages in use across Europe; and of the potential to capitalise on this resource in intellectual, cultural, economic, social, citizenship and rights contexts. More specifically, the project set out to map formal provision for additional language learning across Europe, to identify good practice and to make recommendations for providers and decision-makers, taking into account existing policy in support of plurilingualism and related instruments such as the European Language Portfolio.

### **2. History of the project**

VALEUR was one of 22 projects supported by the European Centre for Modern Languages (ECML) as part of its second medium term programme of initiatives to support Council of Europe language education policy, specifically on the theme of *Languages for Social Cohesion*. The second medium term programme began in 2004, and ended in autumn 2007.

### **3. Data collection and analysis**

The data collection methods adopted by the project were determined by the model developed by the European Centre for Modern Languages (ECML) to take forward projects in support of the implementation of Council of Europe language education policy. Typically, this involves establishing an expert group (in other words, the project team) which meets on a regular basis to refine the project and develop data collection approaches; and a participant group, made up of national representatives of Council of Europe member states which are signatories to the enlarged partial agreement supporting the work of ECML. The role of the participant group is to collect information and to work with the expert group in analysing and synthesising these data.

In the case of the VALEUR project, the expert group was made up of specialists in the field of additional languages from the Finland, the Netherlands, Poland, Spain and the UK. The group met on two occasions to refine the scope of the project and, specifically to develop two instruments. The first was to define criteria for selection of national representatives to take forward the project, and the second to design a proforma which participants were asked to complete before attendance at the project workshop, providing information about provision for additional language learning in their countries.

It was agreed that the national representatives should be leading practitioners of additional languages education (including teachers, teacher educators, examiners and course/ resource developers); key policy makers/ educational managers; or leading academics specialised in this and related fields (e.g. bilingualism, language policy and planning, multiliteracies). Such people would be the best placed to provide information about provision in their countries. ECML then invited each member state to nominate a representative who met these criteria. Of the 33 eligible member states, 21 nominated representatives for the project: Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, the Netherlands, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland and the UK.

Each nominee was sent the proforma which the team had developed, to complete before the project workshop, at which experts and participants were to meet for the first time. The proforma asked for a list of all 'additional' languages in use in the nominee's country, and for information about the kinds of provision available for children of school age to study these languages. In addition, participants were asked to say what kinds of outcomes provision led to (e.g. report, examinations, portfolio entry), to say what on what legislative or policy basis provision was made, and to give examples of good practice from their countries. (For an abbreviated version of the proforma, see Appendix A.)

Having completed their proformas, project participants met with the expert group at ECML in March 2006. The aim of this meeting was to explain the aims of the project to the participants and to investigate ways of expanding and refining the data collected. Because participants had different roles in their own countries, and as different countries have very different approaches to gathering and disseminating information about their education systems generally and, more specifically, about provision for additional languages, some participants were able to provide very extensive data sets, while others found it very difficult to provide the information we sought.

Furthermore, the concept of *additional languages* was not one with which many of the participants were familiar. As set out in Chapter 1, the project team adopted the term and its definition after extensive discussion within the team and with project participants. Originally, the term *community languages* was employed, as this is in widespread use in anglophone countries (although precise definitions vary). However, it became clear from these discussions that this term does not work well in other languages, as the meaning of the word 'community' has different connotations (in some cases quite negative). At the same time, there was agreement that an inclusive term which encompassed 'regional/ minority', 'migrant', 'non-territorial' and sign languages would be valuable. Eventually, the term 'additional languages' was adopted, in particular because it makes clear that the languages in question are used in addition to (not instead of) the dominant languages of Europe. These discussions led to reflections on the history and meaning of the range of terms used across Europe to refer to provision for additional languages – an outcome not anticipated in the original design of the project, but of considerable relevance. Some conclusions drawn from these discussions are reported in Chapter 3.

Following the workshop, participants were invited to revise and resubmit their proformas, in the light of these discussions. The proforma data were then analysed by the project team and preliminary maps of the additional languages in use across Europe and of provision were produced. In September 2006, 15 of the project participants were invited to take part in a Network meeting at which these maps were presented. (The number of participants in this second meeting was limited by ECML constraints.) For this meeting, participants were asked to prepare in advance an example of good practice relating to additional language provision, and to present these to the group. Discussions at this meeting were designed to produce a synthesis of the data produced by the project, leading to final versions of the language map and the provision map, and to a shared understanding of the range of activities which constitute good or interesting practice in the field.

The findings represented in this report are thus based on information gathered and refined by project participants in the course of 2006, and on an interpretation of their significance developed in collaboration between the experts and the participants. Findings relating to the language map are presented in Chapter 4, to the provision map in Chapter 5 and to good practice in Chapter 6.

At the end of the project, the experts reviewed the findings in relation to Council of Europe language education policy, and our conclusions are presented in Chapter 7 of this report.

## **Chapter 3: A developmental perspective on additional language education**

### **1. A rose by any other name would smell as sweet**

Few people would disagree with the basic premise underlying this line from Shakespeare, at least in Western culture. In a way, the idea expressed in it is central to the comparison presented in this chapter. Whether we like it or not, ‘*What’s in a name?*’ very often is *not* a rhetorical question. Though what is referred to may be the same thing, the terminology used to refer to it can tell us a lot about the speaker’s attitude.

The aim of this chapter is to trace the evolution of the terminology used since the 1970s for referring to ‘additional languages’ in the educational domain. The assumption is that changes in the terminology used will reflect changes in the status of additional languages – changes in goals, target groups and educational policies – as a result of the dynamics of a fast globalising Europe.

For the VALEUR network meeting of October 2006, nominated experts in the various countries prepared, for their country/region, a developmental profile of the key terminology used for referring to additional language education. In the instructions that accompanied the task, we defined these as ‘all languages currently in use in a society other than the official languages. This includes regional and minority languages, migrant languages, sign languages and non-territorial languages’ First, the experts for each country were asked to give, for each decade since 1970, the most commonly used key terms (with literal translations in English or French) for referring to the teaching of additional languages in their country. Secondly, they were asked to provide a short explanation of the background for the use (or avoidance) of a specific term, why it was renamed, etc. Finally, in order to enhance the reliability of the information provided, the experts were asked to provide a description or definition given in an official document that defines the key term for a particular period.

In this chapter, the terminology profiles for 6 countries are presented. The profiles are purposely presented as corresponding as closely as possible to the original texts provided by the experts (in order to maintain the “couleur locale” for each region/country).

### **2. Armenia**

In the 1970s in the former USSR, the term ‘national languages’ (*azgain lezu*) referred to all languages other than Russian that were spoken within the USSR. The term ‘national language’ was, by implication, not supposed to have an ethnic meaning. In the 1980s, the need arose to distinguish between national languages (such as Armenian), and the languages spoken by ethnic minorities, which were referred to as ‘national minority languages’ (*azgain pokramasnitian lezu*). After Armenia became independent, the term ‘national’ was used to refer to Armenian as the state language, the official language of Armenia. For the other languages spoken in Armenia, the terms ‘national minority language’ and ‘mother tongue’ (‘native language’) came into use.

Since the beginning of the new millennium, a host of different terms have come to be used to refer to these languages, including ‘minority language’, ‘home language’, ‘mother tongue’, ‘native language’, ‘second language’, ‘language of communication’, ‘diaspora language’, ‘migrant language’, and even ‘dialect’. This extraordinary diversity of terms is the result of different sociolinguistic situations – each reflecting a contrast with the national (state, official) language, the language of education, on the one

hand, and with additional languages on the other. At the same time, the diversity of international terminology also affects Armenian practice. There is a growing tendency nowadays to avoid this confusion by adopting the terminology used in the main European legal documents on language issues such as these – The European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages and the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. These restrict the terminology to ‘minority or regional language’, ‘non-territorial language’, and ‘migrant language’. However, the use of these terms is not very widely practised as yet. The traditional, very vague notion of ‘native language’ in the sense of ‘language of ethnic origin’ still remains the most widespread in non-legal (non-official) discourse.

### 3. Austria

In the Austrian censuses of the 19<sup>th</sup> century the key term ‘vernacular’ (*Umgangssprache*) was used for all languages (except sign languages). It is defined as “the language [...] which is usually spoken in the private domain (family, relatives, friends, etc)” (*die Sprache [...], die gewöhnlich im privaten Bereich (Familie, Verwandte, Freunde usw.) gesprochen wird.*) (cf. Bauer 2003: 23).

In all official documents, the term ‘minority language’ (*Minderheitensprache*) has also been used for a long time, in the Austrian State Treaty (*Staatsvertrag* (1955), for instance, or in the Laws on Minority Schools for Burgenland (1994, amended in 1998), and for Carinthia (1959, amended in 2002) (*Minderheiten-Schulgesetz für das Burgenland/Kärnten*). The term ‘minority language’ (*Minderheitensprache*) almost exclusively refers to one of the six officially recognized traditional ethnic groups (Burgenland-Croatian, Slovenian, Hungarian, Czech, Slovak and Romani).

Since the introduction of the Austrian Law on Ethnic Groups (*Volksgruppengesetz*, federal law of 7 July 1976, amended in 2002), the term ‘ethnic-group language’ (*Volksgruppensprache*) has come into use, which is similar to or almost synonymous with ‘minority language’ (*Minderheitensprache*). The term ‘autochthonous ethnic groups’ (*autochthone Volksgruppen*) is now also used in the Austrian Constitution (Article 8, amended in 2000).

‘Mother tongue’ (*Muttersprache*) has also been one of the most common expressions for migrant languages in schools since the early 1970s: some schools offered ‘additional mother tongue instruction’ (*Muttersprachlicher Zusatzunterricht*), which until the 1990s was based on bilateral treaties between Austria and Turkey, and Austria and Yugoslavia. Since 1992 ‘children with non-German mother tongues’ (*Kinder nichtdeutscher Muttersprache*) have been able to attend new ‘mother tongue instruction’ (*muttersprachlicher Unterricht*), not only in Turkish and the languages of former Yugoslavia, but also in a variety of the major migrant languages spoken in Austria. In some (academic) contexts, the term ‘language of origin’ (*Herkunftssprache*) is used instead of ‘mother tongue’ (*Muttersprache*). It highlights the migratory process experienced by families when going from their country of origin to another country (cf. Çinar 1998). The antonym of this term is ‘target language’ (*Zielsprache*), which is usually German. Both expressions are still in use today. The terms ‘first language’ or ‘L1’ (*Erstsprache*) are now gradually replacing ‘Mother tongue’ (*Muttersprache*) in schools, as a result of which German is called ‘second language’ or L2 (*Zweitsprache*); the school subject is still called ‘mother-tongue instruction’ (*muttersprachlicher Unterricht*).

Finally, it should be noted that in 2005, Austrian Sign Language (*Österreichische Gebärdensprache*) was recognized as an independent language in the Austrian Constitution. It had already been accredited before in several regional laws.



## 4. Estonia

In the 1970s and 80s, Estonia was a part of the former USSR. Basically, there were two types of school. First, there were Russian-language schools working on the basis of Russian curricula (common in many republics of the former Soviet Union). In these schools, the language of instruction was Russian. Estonian language lessons were included in the curriculum, but not in all Russian-language schools. Secondly, there were the Estonian-language schools, in which the language of instruction was Estonian and where Russian was a compulsory subject for all students from the first grade onwards.

The Language Act made Estonian the 'state language' (*riigikeel*) and every other language became a 'foreign' language. The term 'minority language' disappeared, and the languages previously referred to as such became 'foreign languages'. According to the National Minorities Cultural Autonomy Act, people belonging to the national minorities have the right to create and support educational and cultural institutions where the language of communication is the national minority language.

In 2002, the expression 'mother tongue instruction' (*emakeele õpetus*) came into use. According to the Elementary Schools and Upper Secondary Schools Act, every language can be the 'language of instruction' (*õppekeel*) in elementary and lower-secondary schools. The language of instruction is the language in which at least 60% of the lessons in the curriculum are taught. As of 2007, the Estonian language is the language of instruction at upper secondary level in state schools and municipal schools. However, schools are obliged to offer elementary school pupils whose mother tongue is not the language of instruction the opportunity to learn their mother tongue and to learn about their national culture with the objective of preserving their ethnic identity. The reason for allowing this possibility is the growing number of pupils whose mother tongue is different from the language of instruction.

## 5. Finland

Finland got its first (Chilean) refugees in 1973. After this, instruction in additional languages started in Finland. Before 1973, this type of instruction was not part of the curriculum. This service for refugees was provided until 1987. The term used at the time was 'home language' (*kotikieli*). At the beginning of the 1980s, in a memorandum about the teaching of refugees (Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, 1983), the terminology was explained:

*"Kotikielellä tarkoitetaan kieltä, jota lapsen kanssa päivittäin puhutaan hänen kotonaan ja lähiympäristössään. Käsite kotikieli on otettu käyttöön siksi, että äidinkieli-käsitteen käyttö ei kuvaa mm. seka-avioliitoissa ja pitkään maassa asuvien pakolaisperheiden kielitilannetta."*

"A home language is a language that people in the child's home and close environment speak to him/her. The concept of home language has been adopted, since the concept of mother tongue does not describe the language situation, for example, in mixed families or in refugee families that have lived in the country for a long period."

*"Kotikielen opetuksen tavoitteena on oppilaiden itsetuottamuksen vahvistaminen niin, että he ovat ylpeitä rodustaan, kulttuuristaan ja kansallisuudestaan."*

"The aim of home language instruction is to strengthen the pupils' self-confidence so that they can be proud of their race [sic!], culture and nationality."

In 1986, a study group in the Ministry of Education produced a memorandum about this type of instruction. They suggested that instruction should be given to all children whose "mother tongue" was not Finnish or Swedish. The definition also included children speaking Saami and Romani as well as returning migrants, i.e. those Finnish (or Swedish-speaking) children who had lived abroad and acquired a language the maintenance of which would otherwise be threatened. In addition, the study group suggested

that this should be called ‘mother tongue instruction for children speaking a foreign language [as their mother tongue]’ (*vieraskielisten lasten äidinkielen opetus*). The subject became part of the national core curricula for comprehensive schools (= grades 1-9) and for upper secondary schools in 1994 and in 1996, respectively.

Throughout the 1990s, the terminology was re-evaluated in various contexts. In particular, the ethnocentric connotations of the expression ‘pupils who speak a foreign language as their mother tongue’ (*vierasta kieltä äidinkielenään puhuvat oppilaat*) met with a lot of criticism. In speech and sometimes also in print, expressions such as ‘pupil’s own language’ (*oppilaan oma kieli*) and ‘pupil’s own mother tongue’ (*oppilaan oma äidinkieli*) were used instead, particularly towards the end of the 1990s.

At the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the national core curricula were reformed, and the subject was renamed: ‘instruction in immigrants’ mother tongues’ (*maahanmuuttajien äidinkielen opetus*). The reason for this lies in the structure of the curriculum: under the heading ‘mother tongue and literature’ (*äidinkieli ja kirjallisuus*), there are separate syllabuses for Finnish, Swedish, Saami, Romani and sign language as mother tongues. In the draft version of the curriculum, ‘mother tongue of immigrants’ was a separate section under the same heading, but in the final meeting (National Board of Education and Ministry of Education) it was moved from the curriculum proper to appendices. Thus it became a mere recommendation rather than being part of the curriculum.

## 6. The Netherlands

The official language in the Netherlands is Dutch. The second official language is Frisian. In the province of Friesland, elementary education is officially bilingual and learning Frisian is compulsory; in secondary education, Frisian is compulsory in the first 3 grades. Gorter, Riemersma & Ytsma (2001) deals with the political and educational status of Frisian, commonly still referred to as a ‘regional minority language’ (*regionale minderheidstaal*).

In 1967, a number of Spanish parents (migrant workers) took the initiative to organise Spanish lessons for their children who were growing up in the Netherlands. These initiatives were taken over by the Dutch Ministry of Education in the early seventies. In the 1974 law, the perceived deficiencies of children with low-socio-economic status (SES-children) in all elementary schools were tackled by the Ministry of Education. Elementary schools with many low-SES children received additional funding to organize what was called ‘Education in own language and culture’ (*onderwijs in eigen taal en cultuur - OETC*), later on (in 1991) renamed ‘Own language education’ (*eigen taal onderwijs - ET*). Note that education relating to the child’s own culture was dropped.

‘Own language education’ (*eigen taal onderwijs*) was introduced as a subject and/or medium of instruction for the following target groups: children who have at least one parent of Moluccan or Mediterranean origin (originating from one of the eight Mediterranean countries with bilateral labour agreements with the Netherlands), and children of at least one parent with recognised refugee status. The measure was intended as a temporary facility, with a focus on first/second generation children of immigrant or refugee origin. It took a deficit perspective by excluding higher attaining groups like the Chinese, and Antillean and Surinamese children, who are more or less fluent speakers of Dutch.

In the 1990s, educational policy in the Netherlands was characterised by a growing tendency towards decentralisation. A new law in 1998 used the expression of ‘Education in Allochtonous Living Languages’ (*Onderwijs in Allochtone Levende Talen, OALT*) to refer to additional language education in elementary schools. The new law sought to combine the deficit perspective with a cultural perspective, allowing for auxiliary goals of ‘allochtonous language education’ for younger children (grades 1-4) within the curriculum and for older children (grades 5-8) as part of extra-curricular provision. The responsibility for public information about goals and facilities, needs-assessment, budgeting and inter-school cooperation fell to municipalities. ‘Allochtonous groups’ (both parents and organisations) were seen as actors rather than just target groups for the implementation of a municipal educational policy.

At the end of the millennium came growing recognition that Dutch society was permanently multilingual and enhanced valuing of individual plurilingualism. Several language surveys (by Broeder & Extra 1998, Extra et al. 2002) brought to the surface the vitality of 'the other languages of the Netherlands'. More than 144 languages were identified and it was found that 30% of elementary/ secondary school children used another language at home, instead of or in addition to Dutch. However, in 2004, the Dutch government abolished 'Education in Allochtonous Living Languages' (*Onderwijs in Allochtone Levende Talen, OALT*) in elementary education and secondary education. The government decided rather that priority should be given to those 'modern foreign languages' (*moderne vreemde talen*) that act as 'neighbouring languages' (*buurtalen*) for the Netherlands, i.e. in order of priority: English, German and French. Early bilingual education (English-Dutch in particular) was promoted. In addition, secondary education was permitted to incorporate 'new school languages' (*nieuwe schooltalen*), to be taught as modern foreign languages, open to all pupils: Arabic, Italian, Russian, Spanish and Turkish. With the authorisation of the Dutch Ministry of Education, other allochtonous migrant languages, such as Portuguese, New Greek, Chinese, Papiamentu could also potentially be taught as modern foreign languages, as part of the core curriculum.

Since 2004, there has been a bottom-up development led by groups of parents and migrant organisations starting their own language classes outside the formal education system. Turkish, Polish and Spanish language groups in particular, are in the forefront of this development.

## 7. Spain

Spain as a country with a new influx of immigrants since the 1990s is still in the process of developing a terminology for immigrants and immigration (see Broeder & Mijares 2003). The terminology used with regard to migrant languages comes from the only programme devoted to the maintenance of these languages in schools: the ELCO programme. ELCO, which literally means 'instruction in the language and culture (of the country) of origin' (*enseñanza de lengua y cultura de origen*), reflects similar programmes developed in Northern Europe in the 70s for Spanish emigrant children with the support of the Spanish government. This aimed to provide immigrant children with the necessary language instruction for re-integration into their parents' countries of origin. This objective has now been transformed and adapted to a new way of looking at the education of immigrants and the instruction of new languages. The languages involved are Portuguese - Portuguese ELCO was adopted in 1987 - and, since 1995, Arabic. The most widely used term in Spain, originating from this programme, is 'language (of the country) of origin' (*lengua de origen*).

At a national level, three different educational laws have been passed since 1990. None of these laws specifically mention additional languages, nor the value of teaching these languages as a way of promoting and maintaining language diversity. Rather, pupils speaking these languages are mainly regarded as being deficient in the school language(s) and planned language instruction is oriented towards the learning of the language or languages of the school. The educational chapter in the latest national integration plan (now in process of consideration) refers to the necessity of maintaining the languages (of the country) of origin through agreements with the governments of the immigrants' countries of origin.

In the Spanish educational context (among teachers and parents), the term 'mother tongue' (*lengua maternal*) is widely used to refer the languages spoken by foreign pupils who do not speak Spanish. Other terms such as 'migrant languages' (*lenguas inmigrantes*) or 'ethnic minority languages' (*lenguas habladas por las minorías étnicas*) are not used at all in the educational sector. These terms are now starting to be used by academic scholars. In the media and in everyday discussions, the other terms are used only to illustrate the lack of Spanish language skills among immigrant children. It should be noted that we do not find any of these pejorative uses when the languages used by the pupils are prestigious languages such as English, French or German.

## 8. Conclusions

In this contribution, the aim was to unravel developmental perspective shifts in the value assigned to additional language education. The focus was on the evolution of key terminology with the assumption that the 'name' would somehow reflect developmental trends.

Whereas regional/minority languages appear relatively well defined, especially following the publication of the respective European Charter, there is less consensus regarding a term to describe the wider range of languages existing in a society. As we have seen, sometimes these may, by extension, be referred to as 'minority' or 'ethnic minority' languages. However, seen from an international perspective, the term 'minority' is clearly a misnomer when applied to languages such as Arabic, Turkish or Mandarin. Similarly the term 'minority' has a legal definition in some countries which does not apply to all groups in question. The descriptor 'ethnic' carries with it assumptions about race and ethnicity which do not necessarily correlate with linguistic competence.

'Mother tongue' is a term which clearly has a great deal of currency and appears in many cases to have positive connotations. A child's mother tongue may be seen to carry with it a certain respect and certain rights even if, in reality, educational processes favour the dominant language. There are also less positive connotations associated with the idea of a 'mother tongue' which is not the dominant language. From a monolingual perspective, it may carry with it an implication of split loyalty, or a sense of deficiency vis à vis the norm. How does the term 'mother tongue' fit within a plurilingual framework which emphasises holistic linguistic competence rather than mastery of a number of discrete languages? When we speak about a 'mother tongue', we cannot assume that the language in question is necessarily a child's dominant language, or their L1, or that it is necessarily used/spoken by (both) their parents, or that it is the normal language of communication for them outside the school. None of these may be true. Similarly, there are many plurilingual children whose 'mother tongue' is the dominant language, but whose additional language(s) need(s) recognising in some way. In an increasingly diverse and complex society, the term 'mother tongue' does not provide us with the inclusiveness and comprehensiveness we are seeking.

The term 'migrant' languages is one which appears in many national and European discourses about multilingualism. Given European policies to favour mobility of citizens across our continent, it is clearly a category which deserves consideration at a policy level. Many European countries have experienced recent notable influxes of migrants, both from within Europe and from further afield, and these bring with them linguistic diversity on a scale previously unknown. However, the term 'migrant' or 'immigrant' language is frequently generalised to include other circumstances too, and perhaps used as a means of eschewing responsibility for developing children's plurilingual abilities. The word 'migrant' carries with it the sense that people will return to their country of origin, or move on somewhere else, and that therefore the host country bears no responsibility for ensuring children can maintain their languages. (In fact, in a situation in which children's parents are genuinely migrants, the need for them to maintain their language of origin will be of crucial importance to them, alongside acquiring the language of the host country.) But in many cases so-called 'migrant' languages are the languages of settled communities, with second and third generation citizens using them for different purposes in their daily lives. For such people, the term 'migrant' or 'immigrant' is insulting and appears to question their rights as citizens. Similarly, it casts the language in a role linked only to immigrant communities, rather than including a sense of its wider usefulness and value.

In the UK a favoured term is 'community languages', since the 'community' is where the languages are used and learnt. The term avoids making assumptions about mother tongues, ethnicity or immigration status and includes languages which may be learnt formally (for example, for religious purposes) as well as those acquired by children through everyday interaction. The term has been criticised on the grounds that it creates an unequal divide between 'modern foreign languages' which are taught at school, and 'community' languages which are not seen as the responsibility of the education system. Some also question the implication that speakers of the same languages necessarily form identifiable, homogeneous communities. However, the term finds favour with teachers of these languages. At a meeting of 40 or so 'community languages' teachers in the UK, held during the course of the VALEUR project, the overwhelming majority preferred this term to others suggested. However, the term 'community

languages', as we have noted, is not one which transfers readily into other languages and other contexts. Although we have chosen the term 'additional languages' as the most inclusive expression available to us, and the one likely to have the most widespread acceptance, we recognise that such terms must be subject to negotiation and acceptance by those who will use them, including a broad constituency of interest groups from policy-makers to individual speakers.

The changes in terminology which we have highlighted in this chapter reflect changing political and social circumstances over the past few decades, and the response of different nations to growing linguistic diversity. The pace of change looks set to quicken still further in the coming years and, as mobility becomes a growing reality for increasing numbers of European citizens and their children, so plurilingual education becomes not just an ideal to facilitate a vision of a future European society, but a necessary response to current reality.



## Chapter 4: Europe's additional languages

### 1. Counting languages: what, how and why?

Establishing the number of languages in use within a given geographical area – a city, a country, a continent, or the entire world – is a seemingly simple question, but in fact presents significant challenges to knowledge, logistics and politics. A clear definition of the term 'language' is required, as is a systematic and rigorous approach to data collection. Members of the populations from whom these data are collected need to be informed of the purposes for which it will be used, and convinced that these purposes are beneficial, not prejudicial. Very few, if any, language counting exercises can be said to meet these criteria.

### 2. What is a language?

The difficulty of establishing a precise definition of the term 'language' is well established. While linguists have developed formulae to attempt to answer this question on technical grounds, it is generally acknowledged that the boundaries between one language and another tend to be established on the basis of politics rather than linguistics. There are examples both of multiple names for what linguists might consider to be a single language, and of one 'umbrella term' for what linguists might consider to be several different languages. For example, the notion that 'Dutch' and 'Flemish' are different languages is well established, on the basis that one is spoken in the Netherlands and the other in Belgium. Linguistically, however, the differences between the two are small, and they might, in other circumstances, have been considered variants of the same language. At times in the history of the Balkans, the languages currently known as 'Serbian', 'Croatian' and 'Bosnian' have been named separately or singly ('Serbo-Croat'), depending not on changes to linguistic definitions of the term 'language' but on the shifting of national borders. Conversely, the language widely known as 'Chinese' consists of many different 'dialects' which are not mutually intelligible; a similar situation pertains with 'Arabic'.

The concept of 'one nation, one language' emerged in Europe in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The development of this idea – and its spread across much of the rest of the world as a consequence of European colonisation – problematises for many people the question of which language(s) they speak. For example, before the 1606 'Union of the Crowns' which saw Scotland and England joined politically under a single monarch, Scots defined their language as 'Scottis' and the language of their southern neighbours as 'Sudron' (i.e. the language of the south), closely related, but different to their own. As political power moved southwards to London, ambitious Scots needed to be able to speak 'English', learned the language ('elocution' teachers were a common feature in Scotland from this period onwards, well into the 20<sup>th</sup> century) and described themselves as 'English' speakers (McPake & Arthur, 2006). Today, when formally asked which language(s) they speak, Scots overwhelmingly reply that they speak 'English', the prestige language in the UK, even though some estimates indicate that 60% or more of the population habitually speaks 'Scots' (Macafee, 2000).

Similar phenomena are found around the world, and among diasporic communities living in Europe. For example, many people of Pakistani origin living in the UK report that they speak 'Urdu', the national language of Pakistan and the prestige language for this community, and they send their children to Urdu classes to learn the language and become literate in Urdu in order to have access to Pakistani literature and media. But at home, the majority speak Punjabi or Mirpuri, languages related to Urdu but significantly different from it. In some cases, the same phenomenon can be observed among people who speak languages completely unrelated to the prestige norm for their community: those of Moroccan origin

living in Spain often report that they speak 'Arabic' and send their children to Arabic language classes. But for many, the language used at home is one of the Tamazight languages (often referred to as 'Berber'), languages of Saharan Africa which are not related to Arabic at all. The low status of these languages in Morocco, and campaigns to promote Arabic as the 'national' language of that country mean that speakers of Tamazight languages may be reluctant to identify themselves as such.

### **3. Methods for establishing the range of languages in use**

Difficulties of defining what a language is, of naming languages and of establishing which language(s) people speak all add to the problem of collecting reliable data about the range of languages in use in any given context. Where countries collect this data as part of a Census exercise, there has been considerable debate about the precise wording of the question designed to elicit the information. Questions used in the Canadian Census are often cited in this context: they ask what language(s) the respondent habitually spoke at home as a child, and whether s/he can still hold a conversation in that language today. These questions have the virtue of focusing respondents on the language(s) of family use and on continuity of use over a lifetime. This approach is widely regarded as the question most likely to produce the kind of information Census officials, and other public services are looking for as they seek to chart both the plurilingualism and the multilingualism of that country, although it is still possible that respondents report prestige languages for their community rather than the variety they actually use, or that they do not report certain languages at all, perhaps because they do not see the relevance of this information for officials, or because they fear the consequences of providing such information.

In Europe, questions about languages in use are rarely asked in national censuses. When this information is needed, it therefore has to be acquired from other sources, such as more limited sample-based or local surveys, conducted by a range of interested organisations. For example, schools and municipalities conduct language surveys of pupil populations, in order to access government funding to support pupils learning the language used as the medium of instruction in school as a second (or other) language, to identify potential demand for additional language provision, and to ensure that educational provision more generally is culturally appropriate and relevant.

The quality of the data collected in such surveys varies considerably. Aside from the inherent difficulties of collecting information about the languages people speak, discussed above, school or municipality staff are not always well informed about languages issues. A common assumption is that people who are 'bilingual' speak only one other language in addition to the national language (an assumption clearly supported by the common but misleading preference of the term 'bilingual' over 'plurilingual'); it is also often assumed that this other language must be the 'first language' or 'mother tongue' of such a person. Thus surveys typically ask people to identify their 'first language' or 'mother tongue' (singular), failing to recognise that plurilinguals may speak more than one other language, and that they may not regard any of these as their 'first language' – this is particularly the case among second or third generation immigrants, who may speak the national or dominant language at home as well as in the wider community, but acquire additional languages for particular purposes – such as communicating with relatives in the country of origin, cultural activities or religious observance. Thus, such surveys typically under-represent the extent of plurilingualism or multilingualism in a given community. Naming of languages in these surveys can also be very approximate, when officials are unfamiliar with the linguistic characteristics of distant parts of the world but are required to fill in forms on behalf of the populations they serve: thus numerous surveys of this kind list non-existent languages such as 'Indian' or 'Nigerian' because officials are unaware that these are multilingual societies.

In order to establish a national picture, it may be necessary to synthesise findings from a range of local surveys. However, syntheses present a number of problems, as two recent attempts in the UK reveal. In the late 1990s, linguists and geographers from the University of London sought to map the languages of the city, arguing (and subsequently demonstrating) that this information would be of value to public service bodies of various kinds and to businesses seeking to locate in areas where the languages they



needed would be available (Baker & Eversley, 2000). They drew largely on information provided by the 32 local education authorities (municipalities) serving the London area. However, this information was collected in different ways and at different times: while some authorities collected such information annually, via an authority-wide survey, others collected it biannually or less frequently, using data collected by schools each of which had evolved their own methods of data collection (including, in some cases, 'educated guesses'). Thus the representation of the languages of London's schoolchildren, in fact drew on an ad hoc collection of data, of very variable quality, going back five years in some cases. Even so, the picture which emerged, of over 300 languages, with concentrations of particular language communities in different areas of the capital represented a considerable increase on previous estimates (which had suggested around 150 languages) and a degree of detail welcomed by the public and commercial bodies whose interest the authors had originally hypothesised.

A similar exercise, covering Scotland, England and Wales, in 2005, found widely varying practices of data collection (including many areas which collected no data at all), leading to the conclusion that the information which it was possible to collect was necessarily a considerable underestimate of both the number of languages in use and of the number of speakers of each (CILT, 2005). However, just over a year later, the Scottish Executive published the results of its first national census of the languages spoken by Scottish schoolchildren, collected at around the same time. The difference in the findings of the two exercises indicates the extent of under-representation inherent in synthetic approaches: where the CILT survey had found 104 languages spoken by at least 11,000 pupils, the Scottish Executive survey found 137 languages, spoken by at least 21,000 pupils (Scottish Executive, 2007).

#### **4. Purposes of collecting data on languages in use**

The purposes for which data on language use are collected have an important bearing on the extent to which the findings can be regarded as reliable or comprehensive. A lack of clarity about what kind of information is really sought can produce surprising results: for example, according to the US Census, more people speak Spanish than define themselves as ethnically 'Hispanic', a perplexing finding for the statisticians, until they realised that some 'Anglo' Americans reported themselves as Spanish speakers because they use Spanish to speak to their domestic staff (Crawford, 2002). Although this is an interesting finding, it was not what the Census Bureau was looking for. More typically, as we have seen in the discussion above, people often fail to report all the languages they use because these are not the prestige variety for their communities, or because they do not think that the survey is concerned with their languages: McPake (2002) found that schoolchildren in Edinburgh were twice as likely to report speaking Scots if specifically asked this question, than they were if asked to list the languages they knew, without prompts.

Nicholas (1994) studied the politics underlying language survey exercises conducted in many UK educational institutions in the 1980s and early 1990s, a period characterised by a rapid rise in immigration to the UK and a growing awareness of the different needs and aspirations of a multilingual student population. He pointed out that those who conducted such surveys often did so with the intention of countering the view that linguistic diversity represents a problem (to be solved insisting on the use of the dominant language by everyone, at all times), aiming instead to raise awareness of the potential benefits and to increase the self-esteem of plurilingual students, often cast as linguistically deficient. However, he found that the results of such surveys depend on the respondents' perceptions of the uses to which the data will be put. If conducted in an institutional context where respondents feared that the information would be used prejudicially, they were less likely to provide detailed information about their linguistic backgrounds, or indeed to respond at all. This issue is of particular significance in a wider European context: fear of negative consequences is one reason why few European countries include questions on ethnicity, language or other cultural phenomena (e.g. religion) in their censuses. Because pre-war authorities had kept detailed records of this kind, Nazis were quickly able to identify people of Jewish, Romani and other 'non-Aryan' backgrounds in the countries they controlled, and thus to initiate the Holocaust. Nicholas therefore argues – and demonstrates, through a survey which he conducted in the

college where he worked – that those conducting surveys, and the authorities on whose behalf they are instigated, must engage proactively with the population to be surveyed, demonstrating a commitment to raising awareness of the benefits of linguistic diversity for society and to supporting the development of plurilingualism for the individual.

## **5. The VALEUR language map**

### ***Caveats***

The preceding discussion sets out the reasons for extreme caution in any attempts to count the languages in use in a given area. The most accurate picture would be provided by a comprehensive census, conducted over the entire area at the same time (and at regular intervals timed to fit likely patterns of change), using well-formed questions to provide an answer which is detailed and precise in its definition of its definition of ‘language’ and of its interpretation of ‘plurilingualism’. It would be accompanied by actions to raise awareness of the value of plurilingualism and a commitment to help plurilinguals develop their competence in all the languages they use.

In the absence of suitable Europe-wide data, it was necessary for the VALEUR team to establish as accurate a picture as possible of the languages in use in the 21 countries participating in the project. As described in Chapter 2, each participant was asked to provide the most comprehensive data available from their own country, and this information was pooled to provide a project-wide language map. All the caveats set out in the previous discussion need to be applied to this information:

- it is a synthetic picture, based on information collected by a range of different bodies, for different purposes, at different periods of time;
- data presented by countries are themselves, in many cases, the product of synthetic exercises, and therefore subject to the same limitations;
- the quality of the internal validity and reliability of the different data collection methods involved varies considerably;
- much of the data collection is deliberately limited in scope: for example, some countries collect information only about established ‘minorities’, failing to include recent arrivals, groups which are not thought to have achieved the required ‘critical mass’, or, possibly, to represent groups whose existence is politically controversial;
- even in the case of countries which set out to collect comprehensive data, it is still typically the case that more detailed information is available about ‘regional/ minority’ languages than ‘migrant’ or ‘non-territorial’ languages; and that very few countries collect information about sign languages, particularly sign languages other than those regarded as ‘indigenous’<sup>1</sup>.

### ***Number of languages in use***

Nevertheless, we hold that the language map produced by the VALEUR project is the most comprehensive picture yet produced of the languages in use across Europe. Eurobarometer (2006) suggested that some 60 languages in addition to the official languages of European states are in use, but our data, based only on the 21 participating states, indicates that at least 440 spoken and at least 18 sign languages are in use, in addition to the dominant languages. For the reasons set out above, this is certainly a considerable underestimate. We can perhaps hypothesise, on the basis of the difference between the synthetic and comprehensive surveys conducted in Scotland, that better data collection might identify an

---

<sup>1</sup> Spain was the only country participating in the project to list sign languages from other parts of the world as being in use within Spain, although, given the extent of mobility across Europe and migration from elsewhere, this must be the case in other countries too.

increase in the region of 33%. Thus, for our 21 participant countries, a more accurate figure might be in the region of 600 languages.

### ***Range of languages***

The additional languages identified by the VALEUR project participants range (alphabetically) from Abron, a language originating in Ghana and now also spoken by people living in Ireland and Spain; to Zulu, a South African language now also spoken in Finland, Ireland, Poland, Spain and the UK. Geographically, they range from languages of the far north of the northern hemisphere, such as Inuktitut, originating in Greenland but also spoken in Spain; to languages of the southernmost inhabited parts of the southern hemisphere, such as Maori, originating in New Zealand and now also spoken in Spain and the UK. An east to west analysis produces many different languages spoken in the Pacific islands (but separated by the international date line) such as Xârâcùù, from New Caledonia, also spoken in France; and Tongan, from Tonga but also spoken in the UK.

Of the languages listed, nine are major 'world' languages, spoken by over 100 million people worldwide as their first or main language: Arabic, Bengali, English, Hindi, Japanese, Mandarin Chinese, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish; while 26 are spoken by fewer than 1000 people around the world: these include some of Europe's most endangered languages, such as Cornish (UK), Livonian (Latvia) and Wilamowicean (Poland); and endangered languages from other parts of the world, including Ingrian (originating in Russia but also spoken in Latvia), Tangoa (originating in Vanuatu but also spoken in the UK) and Wayana (originating in Suriname and also spoken in France).

### ***Most widely-spoken languages***

The languages most widely spoken across the 21 participating states (according to population estimates which must be treated with the same caution as the data on the languages themselves) are Polish and German (17 states); French, Arabic and Russian (16); Spanish and Turkish (15); Romani (14); English and Mandarin (13). Most of these languages can be defined as 'European' languages (linguistically, seven can be defined as Indo-European while, depending on definitions of where Europe's easternmost borders are set, between six and eight can be termed geographically European). English is not the most widespread additional language (though it is well-established through surveys such as those conducted by Eurobarometer, that it is the most widespread *foreign* language learned by EU citizens). In contrast, around 270 languages are spoken in only one country in each case.

### ***Most multilingual countries***

The three states reporting the highest number of additional languages in use were the UK (288), Spain (198) and Ireland (158)<sup>1</sup>. While the UK has a long history of immigration and these findings are not therefore unexpected, the large number of languages in use in Spain and Ireland represent a very significant change in the course of about a decade. For most of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, they were countries of emigration rather than immigration, but their own economic resurgence, coupled with global shifts in patterns of migration, have brought about this marked change in a very short period of time.

Despite the fact that high levels of multilingualism are typically associated with western European states, while eastern European states are, in many cases, currently countries of emigration, it is nevertheless the cases that all of these countries, also among the smallest participating in the project, are also multilingual:

---

1. Although Germany participated in this project, a detailed picture of the languages of Germany as a whole could not be generated because of the federal organisation of the country. Any German participant in ECML projects can represent only the *Land* of which s/he is a member, not the country as a whole. If it had been possible to present a picture for Germany as a whole, it is likely that a high number of languages would have been reported here too.

for example, Latvia, with a population of 2.3 million people, reported 26 languages in use; Slovenia (2 million) reported 24 languages; and Estonia (1.3 million) reported 18 languages in use.

## 6. Implications

Our ‘snapshot’ of the languages in use across the 21 countries participating in the VALEUR project makes clear – despite the likely flaws in data collection discussed above – that the extent of linguistic diversity in Europe is considerably greater than was previously believed. These findings have very significant implications for languages policy and planning, at local, national and Europe-wide levels. In concluding this chapter, we outline some of the implications for provision for additional learning in the compulsory schooling sector, before presenting in the following chapters, our findings relating to current provision.

### *The linguistic consequences of mobility*

The linguistic consequences of mobility need more extensive consideration than has hitherto been the case. The principal of labour force mobility is central to much of the economic planning of the European Union, but this is often envisaged in terms of unencumbered workers, fluent in their own ‘national’ language plus two other ‘national’ languages of the EU, moving freely from one state to another. The reality is more complex. Even workers without children are likely to have family ties to their country of origin which mean that they will want to retain contacts and be well-placed to return to work there in future. This means that they need to maintain high levels of competence in their ‘first’ language in addition to developing these in other languages as required.

When mobile workers also have spouses and children, and when their work requires them to move, successively, to a number of different countries, these concerns are multiplied. Although the material conditions of the children of a German finance worker who has successively been based in Paris, London and Madrid may be very different from those of a Portuguese fish-packer who has worked in La Coruña, Grimsby and Sassnitz, their linguistic experiences, moving from one education system, each with a different medium of instruction, may be very similar. Their own career aspirations may involve a return to the family’s country of origin – but how successful are they likely to be there, having been educated elsewhere and having perhaps had limited scope to develop the language of that country? And what opportunities will they have had to maintain the languages they acquired in the course of their education, when they move on to another country? Are these languages even recognised as likely to be part of their repertoire? How much more complex is the situation for workers whose origins are outside the EU and speak languages from other parts of the world, or for those who, in addition to ‘national’ languages, speak regional/ minority languages? What of those mobile workers whose children are deaf, learning a series of sign languages in addition to the national languages of the countries in which they have lived?

Currently, most policy and provision is based on the assumption that ‘migrant workers’ move only once and are at least semi-permanently settled in the area where they are currently living. The emphasis is therefore on providing them with linguistic skills in the dominant language of that area, failing to recognise that other linguistic needs and aspirations have a legitimacy beyond an attachment to ‘cultural heritage’ often seen as irrelevant to the concerns of education providers.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. For this reason, the influential ‘Swann Report’ setting out the parameters for provision for additional languages in England, in the 1980s, saw this issue as solely a concern for families and the relevant linguistic communities, not for educational bodies in wider English society (Department for Education and Science, England, 1985).

### ***Making provision for additional languages as well as ‘foreign’ languages***

Such experiences conflict with the espoused views of both the European Union and the Council of Europe that plurilingualism is an asset which all Europeans should cultivate. The arguments for this are well rehearsed, but tend to be based on the assumption that most Europeans start out monolingual and need to learn other languages ab initio. Discussion of how best to achieve Europe-wide plurilingualism thus focuses on issues such as the best age to start to learn a ‘foreign’ language, when to introduce a second ‘foreign’ language, how to define progression in ‘foreign’ language learning, and how to ensure that learners achieve desired goals within the relevant educational structures and determined time-frames. There has only been very limited policy attention to the maintenance and development of the languages which children have acquired outside the school system, or to devising of diagnostic approaches which would allow systems to establish proficiency levels when a new student arrives and to identify appropriate goals. Our review of current provision in the following chapters is intended to initiate such discussion.



## **Chapter 5: Making provision for additional languages**

### **1. The rationale for making provision**

The principal aim of the VALEUR project is to establish the extent to which plurilingual children across Europe have opportunities for formal study of their additional languages– that is, to become literate in these languages, and to develop the sophisticated communication skills they need to study at advanced levels and to pursue successful careers. These skills do not come ‘naturally’ to monolingual children, but require many years of language and literacy education at school. The same is true for plurilingual children, in relation not only to the dominant language of the society in which they live, but also to their additional languages.

Providing opportunities for formal study of additional languages is not simply about respecting children’s rights to an education which reflects and supports their cultural heritage, or ensuring that Europe’s increasingly multiethnic societies are socially inclusive – although these rationales are certainly important. Equally significant is the need to capitalise on unrealised linguistic assets, both for the individual and for wider society. It is obvious that someone who speaks two or more languages benefits by being able to communicate with a wider range of people than someone who speaks only one, but research has shown that plurilinguals also have cognitive advantages which can translate into educational gains, in terms of creative thinking and certain verbal and non-verbal skills (Baker, 1996; Bialystok, 2001). Moreover, they find it easier to learn additional languages (Cenoz & Valencia, 1994; Sanz, 2000) and those who become literate in their other languages can develop certain advanced literacy skills more quickly than those literate in only one language (Kenner, 2004; Bialystok et al, 2005)

Wider society benefits too: the more languages Europe’s citizens speak, the greater the opportunities for trade, participation in the global knowledge economy, cultural exchange, tourism, responsive public services, diplomacy, and aid and development. In this context, the arguments for supporting additional languages are no different from those put forward by a wide range of national European organisations, including the Council of Europe and the European Union, in support of plurilingualism for all. It is widely recognised that all European citizens benefit as individuals from an ability to speak more than one language, and that Europe benefits too, for all the reasons set out above. If Europe’s additional languages are included in mainstream languages education policies, the opportunities for increased diversification in the languages which Europeans can use, including all of the major world languages, and many others of cultural or strategic significance, are greatly enhanced.

### **2. Constructing the map**

In Chapter 1, we noted the recent shift in European languages education policy, towards an acknowledgement of the potential benefits of formally supporting additional language competences. To what extent does this reflect actual or proposed changes to provision for additional languages by educational authorities across Europe?

In the early stages of the development of the VALEUR project it became clear that the Europe-wide picture was very patchy: detailed information was available for some countries, and for some languages, while little or nothing was known in other cases. For this reason, the project set out to construct a ‘map’ of provision in the 21 countries which participated in the project, focusing both on officially supported and on independently organised provision for children of ‘school age’ (i.e., depending on the age at which compulsory schools begins and ends in each country, this covers the period from around age 4 to around age 19).

Each of the participants was asked to complete a proforma listing *regional/ minority, migrant, non-territorial* and *sign* languages in use in their country, and the kinds of provision available in each case, classified as

- *mainstream core provision*, made by state-funded or municipality-funded schools, during the school day;
- *mainstream extra-curricular provision*, made by the state or municipalities, but outside the school hours;
- *complementary provision*, independent of the state or municipality, usually organised by communities out of school hours.

They were also asked to distinguish between sectors – depending on different countries’ educational systems, these broadly comprised *primary, middle* and *secondary* phases. An abbreviated version of the proforma is included as Appendix A.

In Chapter 3, we noted that asking the question, ‘how many languages are spoken across Europe?’ seems relatively straightforward, but that answering it is a complex and, ultimately, inexact science. Establishing the extent of provision for the study of additional languages is similarly challenging. Many countries do not collect this information in a systematic way, particularly when provision is largely or wholly independent of officially funded education. In addition, provision for different languages – or different sets of languages – may be the responsibility of a variety of different bodies, and even different government ministries. The capacity of our informants to gather all the relevant information was limited by a range of factors including gaining access to the information, and time to gather it if this was not publicly available, discrepancies in data provided by different bodies, and political considerations relating to the languages which should be included. For example in some countries only the languages which had official minority language status were considered relevant, while others aimed to provide a comprehensive picture of provision for all languages in use. Thus, as with our language map, presented in Chapter 3, the provision map must be regarded as a partial ‘snapshot’ of provision in the 21 participant countries, developed over the course of 2006. A more extensive data collection exercise, with parameters agreed by all, would provide a more detailed and accurate picture. Nevertheless, our snapshot represents a more complete picture than has existed hitherto, and for this reason we set out the broad contours of the provision map here, in the hope that this will stimulate an interest in a more comprehensive survey.

### **3. Contours of the provision map**

#### ***Numbers of languages for which provision is made***

Our data concerning the number of languages in use across Europe identified at least 440 spoken languages, and at least 18 sign languages. But formal provision is made for only around a quarter (24%) of these languages: our participants were able to name 97 spoken languages and 12 sign languages for which provision of various kinds were made.

#### ***Types of provision***

The nature of the provision differed according to the educational traditions and systems of each participant country, the language in question, and the age of the pupils. Four broad types of provision were identified, with some variations within each type:



*Table 5a: Types of provision for additional language learning*

<b>A: Languages of school education</b>		<b>B: Languages as mainstream curriculum subjects</b>		<b>C: Languages as extra- curricular subjects</b>	<b>D: Languages as part of intercultural education</b>
Monolingual additional language as medium of instruction	Bilingual additional language + dominant language as media of instruction	Additional language as 'mother tongue'	Additional language as 'foreign language'		

Type A: Languages of school education

In the first type of provision, additional languages are included as languages of school education: in other words, they are used as media of instruction for some or all curricular subjects. In some cases, schools operate exclusively or almost exclusively through the medium of the additional language. This is typical of provision for some regional/ minority languages in certain countries: for example, Hungary has Slovak and Serbian medium schools, Slovakia has Hungarian, Ukrainian and Ruthenian medium schools, and the UK has Gaelic and Welsh medium schools. This form of provision is also used with sign languages in several countries, including Finland, Estonia and Latvia.

More commonly, additional languages are used as one of two (and occasionally three) media of instruction within a school, usually meaning that some subjects are taught through the medium of the dominant language and some through the medium of the additional language. This tends also to be more typically the case where regional/ minority languages are the additional language in question: for example, Armenia has schools which teach in Armenian plus Russian, Yezedi, Kurdish or Assyrian; while Latvia has schools which combine Latvian with Belarusian, Romani, Yiddish, Estonian, Russian, Lithuanian, Polish or Ukrainian. There are a few examples of schools where other types of languages are taught in this way, however: Hungary has one bilingual Hungarian-Chinese school and one Hungarian-Romani school; and several other countries noted that, where there is demand, bilingual schools with any additional language plus the national language would be established. This is the case in Estonia, where bilingual schools operating in Estonian plus Russian, German, French, English, Finnish, German or Hebrew are already in existence (though, from 2007, all upper secondary education must through the medium of Estonian). Austria has one trilingual school, where German, Italian and Slovene are all used as media of instruction, in addition to a number of bilingual schools using German plus Burgenland-Croatian, Slovene, Hungarian, Czech, Slovak, English or Italian.

Type B: Languages as mainstream curriculum subjects

In the second type of provision, additional languages are taught as mainstream curriculum subjects, either as 'mother tongues' or as 'foreign languages'. In the former case, provision is usually restricted to children who already have some familiarity with the language in question: typically, they are orally quite fluent, but need to acquire literacy skills. Such provision is usually made where there are significant numbers of children with similar language backgrounds, but can be found for all types of additional language. For example, in the Czech Republic, Ukrainian, Vietnamese and Romani are taught as 'mother tongues'; and in Estonia, there is provision for Ukrainian, Russian and Hebrew.

In a number of countries, additional languages are, effectively, taught as 'foreign' languages. The approach to teaching and assessment is modelled on provision for foreign languages (i.e. languages from elsewhere, which everyone is assumed to be learning *ab initio*). Although provision may target children with existing competence in the language, those who have not had the opportunity to learn the language outside school may, in at least some cases, study the language alongside additional language speakers. This model of provision has been adopted in the UK where over 20 languages can be studied as 'foreign'

languages in secondary schools: these include languages such as French, German and Spanish which may be foreign languages for the majority of those who study them, but additional for some; but also languages such as Urdu, Turkish, Punjabi, Polish or Farsi, which are likely to be additional languages for most of the pupils concerned. Similarly, in the Netherlands, nine languages, including Arabic, Turkish, Chinese and Papiamentu can be studied at secondary school; and in France, some 50 languages can be studied to Baccalauréat level.

#### Type C: Languages as extra-curricular subjects

The third type of provision consists of ‘mother tongue’ classes for children from the relevant linguistic backgrounds, offered outside school hours – either after school or at weekends. This provision is sometimes funded locally, by the school or the municipality, or nationally, by the ministry of education; or it may be funded independently of the formal education system, by parents or community groups. In some cases the government of the country of origin is involved in organising or subsidising provision. In some countries, such as Finland, the municipality is obliged to make such provision where four or more children with the same additional language are attending school in the area: a teacher and a location for the classes are found, and the children are transported after school to the place where the class is taking place, if not in their own school. In the UK, there is extensive provision of this kind, but set up on an *ad hoc* basis, sometimes supported by the municipality but more often organised independently by parents or communities, where there is demand, and where teachers and premises can be found to fulfil it.

Type C provision caters for a wider range of languages than Types A or B, including many of the ‘migrant’ languages participants identified as being taught in their countries: in total, 91 languages were named in this category, compared to 35 languages for which Type A provision is made and 55 for Type B. However, Type C provision is the type where participants were least able to provide a comprehensive picture, because often there are no official statistics concerning extra-curricular provision, particularly where this is organised independently of the state or the municipality. So it is likely that there is provision for a more extensive range of languages those which participants were able to identify.

#### Type D: Languages as part of intercultural education

Type D provision concerns intercultural education where some provision for learning additional languages is made for *all* pupils, in the context of programmes (which may be described as ‘intercultural’, ‘multicultural’ or ‘anti-racist’, or be seen as part of the democratic citizenship agenda) aiming to foster greater mutual understanding among pupils from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. In this type of provision, the focus is on enabling children who do not come from backgrounds associated with the additional language to acquire some knowledge of the language, although this is rarely more than the most basic words and phrases. Children familiar with the language may be used as a language teaching resource, with the aim of highlighting and valuing their plurilingualism and, more generally, the cultural diversity of the classroom. Such activities may also contribute to language awareness programmes, drawing attention both to multilingualism in the community and to different characteristics of a range of other languages. However, this kind of provision rarely supports in any significant way the linguistic development of those who already use this language, as the focus is on informing others. At best, it may contribute to a more favourable school ethos in which additional language learners themselves - and, crucially, their parents - value their languages more highly than might otherwise have been the case, and therefore become more committed to improving their competence.

VALEUR participants were not specifically asked about such provision, but a number – including Estonia and Hungary - noted its existence. It is likely, in fact that Type D provision is quite widespread because, as noted in Chapter 1, including a focus on linguistic diversity in intercultural education programmes was one of the ways in which European Union countries claimed to have fulfilled their obligations under the 1977 directive to support the teaching of migrant languages. Potentially, a very wide range of languages will be included in such provision, as the specific languages chosen as examples are likely to reflect the linguistic make-up of the class concerned. But, as we have already noted, the impact of such provision in terms of developing linguistic competence among those already using the language in question is probably limited.

### ***Variation in provision***

Our mapping exercise thus enabled us to develop an emergent typology of provision for additional languages. It is important, however, to reiterate that our map is patchy, partly because of a lack of comprehensive information, but also because provision itself is patchy. No country offers all types of provision, in all the additional languages in use. Variation is linked to national legislation concerning recognition and support for minority groups, and associated educational provision. In many countries, such provision is limited to communities with a long-standing presence and tends to ignore or exclude groups which have arrived more recently and groups with no territorial base. Other countries make no public commitment to supporting the learning of additional languages although there may be extensive informal arrangements to supply this provision.

## **4. A more detailed picture: three case studies**

To illustrate the ways in which different kinds of legislation and policy, coupled with different educational systems and traditions, lead to different types of provision for additional language learning, three national case studies are presented here: Spain, Poland, and Finland.

### ***Spain***

In addition to Castilian ('Spanish'), Catalan, Basque and Galician are now officially recognised languages of Spain. Educational legislation concerning these languages is highly developed but applies only in the regions where these languages have official status. In those regions, provision varies, ranging from monolingual education in the regional language, with Castilian as a subject, to bilingual education in the regional language plus Castilian. However, outside these regions there is no instruction for these languages in public schools. Apart from these languages, Type A provision (education in the medium of the additional language) is available only in English, currently only at pre-school and primary level, in bilingual schools. However, although the English-speaking population of Spain is growing rapidly, this provision is principally aimed at children from Spanish families, to enable them to acquire high levels of competence in English as a language of global communication.

Type B provision (additional languages as mainstream curriculum subjects) is offered regionally, for some other languages long-established in Spain, such as Aranés and Bable (spoken in the Aran Valley on the border with Andorra, and in Asturias, respectively), mainly at pre-school and primary level.

Spain has only recently become a country of immigration. Although there are now around 200 languages in use in Spain, there is no official recognition for them, except in the case of Arabic and Portuguese, where legislation concerning instruction for these languages has been developed through co-operation agreements with Morocco and Portugal. As a result, Type B provision is available for these languages in a small number of primary schools, and Type C provision (additional languages as extra-curricular subjects), co-ordinated by the Moroccan and Portuguese embassies who provide resources, including teachers and teaching materials in use in schools in the countries of origin. After-school provision for other languages may be organised independently of the state, by the communities themselves, but there is no systematic collection of information about such provision.

### ***Poland***

Since the introduction of the *Law on the system of education* in 1991, pupils have the right to receive instruction in/on their 'mother tongue' in order to maintain their national, ethnic, religious and linguistic

identities. Currently Type A provision (education in the medium of the additional language) is available at all levels in bilingual schools operating in Polish plus Belarusian, German, Lithuanian or Ukrainian.

Type B provision (additional languages as mainstream curriculum subjects) is available for a wide range of different languages either as 'mother tongues' or as 'foreign languages'. Within the first category, the following languages are available, at all levels of instruction: Belarusian, German, Hebrew, Kashubian, Lemkian, Ruthenian, Lithuanian, Polish Sign Language, Slovak, Ukrainian and Yiddish. In the second category, English, German, Russian, French, Spanish, Portuguese, Swedish, Czech, and Slovak are taught as second or foreign languages at all levels of instruction.

Type C provision (extra-curricular) is also available for a number of languages, including Romani, Armenian, Belarusian, German, Kashubian, Lemkian, Ruthenian, Lithuanian, Polish Sign Language, Slovak and Ukrainian.

### ***Finland***

The Finnish education system has recognized since 1987 that instruction should be given to all children whose 'mother tongue' was not Finnish or Swedish. This includes children of long-established linguistic communities, such as Saami, Romani and Russian, but also children born elsewhere who have come to live in Finland. Research findings demonstrating the educational advantages of plurilingualism are understood to underlie a national commitment to maintaining competence in additional languages as well as ensuring that all children living in Finland are competent in Finnish and Swedish.

Provision varies depending on the language community in question. For example, provision for Saami is perhaps the most extensive, as this language is associated with a particular geographical area, with concentrations of pupils sufficient to justify both monolingual and bilingual Saami-medium schools (i.e. both varieties of Type A provision), at primary and secondary level. There are also monolingual and bilingual schools using Finnish Sign Language as the medium of instruction, and bilingual schools operating in Russian.

With regard to migrant languages, the *Development Plan 2003-2008* aims to ensure that pupils of migrant origin become functionally bilingual, retaining and developing their additional language competence, while also acquiring Finnish and Swedish. The precise nature of provision varies, depending on the number of pupils and certain other factors. Where four or more pupils from the same additional language background are attending school in the same municipality, the municipality has an obligation to provide after-school classes in the additional language. Where there are larger numbers of pupils, and commitment from the additional language community, other types of provision can evolve. For example, one Helsinki school includes an Estonian stream, where pupils of Estonian descent are educated bilingually in Estonian and Finnish, with resources provided by the Estonian government.

### ***Lessons from the case studies***

Each of these brief case studies illustrates the ways in which provision varies, on the basis of the history and geography of additional languages in each country, and, consequently, as a result of the kinds of educational legislation put in place to support such provision. The case of Spain illustrates how a country has developed provision which supports plurilingualism for children growing up in areas where languages other than Castilian have traditionally been spoken. Because immigration on a large scale is a new phenomenon, consideration of how to extend such provision to more recently arrived languages is not yet on the agenda. Poland has a similar history with regard to recognition of multilingualism, and has developed various types of provision for different linguistic groups, depending on geographical presence and official minority status. Finland, in addition to making provision for additional languages with a long presence in the country, recognises the educational benefits to be gained from supporting the plurilingualism of pupils whose origins are elsewhere in the world and has established a principled basis for ensuring a minimum level of provision, with scope for more extensive provision where this can be supported locally.

## 5. Making provision for additional languages

Generally speaking, it would seem to be the case across our participant countries that provision for 'regional/ minority' languages is more extensive than for other kinds of languages. This undoubtedly reflects their longer established status in the various countries and the fact that these languages often have a strong regional presence, making provision relatively simple to organise. Recognition of the historical and cultural importance of these languages will, in many countries, have been strengthened by a commitment to implementing the *European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages*. In contrast, 'migrant' languages, of more recent date, often more widely spread but perhaps less concentrated in any given part of a country, are not always recognised as being present. Even where they are well-established, other factors, such as lack of critical mass, the fact that a number of different languages may all be in use in the same area, even in the same school, or the perception that they are 'transitory' (even in areas where speakers of the language may be the second or third generation to be born there) may hinder provision. Provision for non-territorial, and, in some cases, sign languages, may also be affected by such obstacles.

It seems clear, then, that the policy shift we have identified, towards recognition of the importance of supporting *all* additional languages, in order to enable as many children as possible to take advantage of the benefits of their incipient plurilingualism, has yet to make significant impact in terms of provision. It may be that it is too early to expect large-scale developments in this field, particularly given some of the logistical hurdles which have to be overcome to make provision for 'migrant' and other types of additional language, in some circumstances. Possibly, there is a need for another Charter, along the lines of the *European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages*, which raises awareness of the benefits of plurilingualism for the individual and for wider society, and encourages countries to make a formal commitment to support for all additional languages, recognising that this is likely to vary on the basis of numbers and the kinds of resources required and available.

It is also important to look at existing examples of good practice in this context, learning from the experience of different countries around Europe where solutions to some of the difficulties outlined here have been identified. This is the focus of Chapter 6.



## **Chapter 6: Good practice in supporting additional language learning**

### **1. Defining ‘good practice’**

In the preceding chapter, we presented the very wide range of provision for formal learning of additional languages. It was noted that there is more extensive provision is organised for regional or minority languages than for other types of additional languages. But how effective is this provision? With the help of the project participants, we sought to identify the characteristics of ‘good practice’ in this context, and to compile a selection of case studies. However, defining ‘good practice’ presents a number of difficulties. The meaning of ‘good’ depends on who defines it: is practice good from the participant’s perspective or from the observer’s viewpoint? Furthermore, providing too strict a definition beforehand could result in some interesting cases remaining unnoticed. For these reasons, project participants were first asked to give examples of what in their opinion comprised ‘successful or interesting practice’, with the aim of gradually arriving at a shared concept of ‘good’ practice.

A working definition of ‘good practice’ as both effective and replicable emerged. Participants were then asked to provide examples from their own contexts which met these criteria. In addition, they were to give information about the aims, activities, funding, achievements, evaluation and transferability of the example they had chosen. This enabled participants to identify a wealth of examples of good practice across Europe.

Our discussions revealed that achieving good practice depends on a number of factors. Structures to support provision must be in place, and resources – including trained teachers and appropriate materials – need to be available. A systematic approach to recording learners’ progression and attainment is required. In some circumstances, a commitment to the revitalisation of languages which have been suppressed and are at risk of dying out, and an understanding of how to undertake initiatives of this kind, are crucial to success. These issues are explored in more detail in the following sections.

### **2. Supportive structures**

It is now well-established that bilingual education, where the curriculum is delivered in two languages or CLIL (content and language integrated learning), where one or more subjects are delivered in a language other than the usual medium of instruction, are efficient ways of developing children's plurilingualism (Eurydice, 2006). CLIL has typically been developed for pupils who speak the dominant language of the area where they live, as a way of enhancing their study of foreign languages: recent reports show that CLIL, focusing principally on the teaching of English, is now available in most European countries, and is expanding rapidly (Eurydice, 2006). However, in the course of the VALEUR project, it emerged that both bilingual education and CLIL provision is offered also in additional languages in certain circumstances.

Bilingual education is available in a number of countries. In Slovakia, for example, there are schools operating through the medium of Hungarian, Ukrainian, Ruthenian and German. In Poland, there are fully bilingual curricula for both German and Lithuanian, and in Finland, there are schools where instruction is given in both Russian and Finnish. Typically, this provision focuses on the languages of neighbouring countries, often in schools located in border regions. For example in Slovenia, a nine-year bilingual education programme is offered in Hungarian and Slovenian in the region of Premurkje, near the Hungarian border (see Novak-Lukanovič, 2006). Such provision may receive official support, sometimes

from ministries of education in both (or all) the bordering countries, but is also dependent on a very high level of commitment from the teachers involved in the initiative.

***Julius Kugy Klasse, Austria***

In an Austrian school near the Italian and Slovenian borders, an innovative trilingual teaching project has been developed. Since 2000, pupils of the Bundesgymnasium für Slowenen (Zvezna gimnazija za Slovence) have been able to choose the so called 'Julius Kugy classes' where they are taught in several languages. Pupils in these classes come from Austria, Slovenia and Italy. The language of instruction varies from subject to subject: Slovene is the prevailing medium of instruction, while certain subjects are taught in German (Geography, Mathematics) and Italian (Physical Education, Biology). Each of these three languages is also taught as a subject, and English is taught as a foreign language. The 'Julius Kugy classes' are systematically evaluated and teachers receive support and scientific supervision, as well as further training in the fields of quality development and intercultural learning. They invest a lot of time and effort in the programme, above and beyond their normal teaching commitments.

***Estonian-Finnish bilingual class, Finland***

In Helsinki, Finland, there has been an Estonian-Finnish bilingual class within a regular primary school since 1996 (Ribelus, forthcoming). The aim of the programme is to develop active bilingualism and strong identity among the pupils. Both Estonian and Finnish are used as media of instruction, with different subjects taught in different languages. The younger the pupils are the more they are taught in Estonian, and when the pupils grow older the amount of Finnish increases. The Estonian Ministry of Education has donated teaching material to the school; no other extra resources have been available. The initiative to establish bilingual classes came originally from teachers of Estonian, and the prerequisite for developing the programme has been the continuous activeness and commitment of the main teachers of the classes. They have been willing to make extra arrangements and plan their teaching, for example, to suit combined classes (grades 1 and 4, grades 2 and 6, grades 3 and 5 together) when needed. Successful cooperation between teachers of Estonian and Finnish and other school subjects has been of importance as well.

In other cases, the government of the country of emigration supports the teaching of their language alongside the official language of the host country (see also Eurydice, 2004), and programmes can be based on inter-governmental agreements.

***Arabic for pupils of Moroccan origin, Spain***

This is the case with an ELCO (Enseñanza de la Lengua y Cultura de Origen – Teaching of the Language of Culture and Origin) programme in which Arabic has been taught for Moroccan children in Spain since 1995. Provision in Arabic is based on the Moroccan school curriculum, and teachers are supplied from Morocco. In the academic year 2005-6, 3647 children and 51 teachers participated in the programme, principally in Madrid and Barcelona, and also in Extremadura and Andalucía. An evaluation of the programme's impact will be published in 2007.

***Spanish-English bilingual school, UK***

The Spanish government, for its part, supports provision of Spanish in London, Lisbon and Rome. For example in London, a bilingual school was established already in the late 1970s, when numbers of Spaniards, mainly from Galicia, settled in England, to cater for the educational needs of their children. Over time, as the Spanish economy has developed within the EU, there has grown a demand to learn Spanish by non-Spanish and professionally mobile families, whose children now make up around 25 per cent of the school's student body. The rest of the pupils are of Spanish and Latin American origin. The school has over 400 pupils, aged between 5 and 18. They receive a full curriculum taught in English and



Spanish, but the proportion of English to Spanish varies according to the needs of the pupils. Each subject is taught bilingually, with a lesson in English reinforcing the subject matter taught in Spanish, and vice versa. Children at the school achieve a good standard of general education and excellence in both languages.

Where there is no official form of financial support, it is still possible for schools with committed staff to support additional language learning, by involving parents and drawing on community-based resources. Awareness-raising initiatives in particular can benefit from this approach.

#### ***Language of the Month, UK***

An initiative taken by a primary school on the outskirts of London, Language of the Month, has shown how it is possible to cater for over 40 languages within a single school. Every month, all pupils learn some simple phrases of a 'Language of the Month' chosen from one of the 44 languages spoken by the pupils. In this way, the school shows respect for its pupils' linguistic background, and, as a consequence, the parents become more actively involved in school activities. So far, materials have been produced for 34 languages, based on the children themselves demonstrating some key words and phrases in their language. The free, downloadable web-based materials -

(<http://www.newburypark.redbridge.sch.uk/langofmonth/index.html>) -

are used throughout the school of 700 children, and they have been in use in other schools in the United Kingdom and abroad as well.

### **3. Developing teacher training and teaching materials**

Teacher training is a core area for future improvement and a crucial feature of good practice. Recognised qualifications for teachers as well as teacher education have been developed for teachers of, for example, Occitan in France, Hungarian in the Slovak Republic, Kashubian in Poland and Finnish Sign Language in Finland. Support for teachers is also important, since teachers of additional languages may in some cases feel very isolated. Local, national or Europe-wide associations and networks through which teachers of additional languages can work in cooperation therefore provide valuable support. Examples include the UK Federation of Chinese schools which aims to promote Chinese language education and Chinese culture in over 100 member schools, catering for over 13,000 pupils (see <http://www.ukfcs.info/>); and there are moves to establish a Europe-wide network for teachers of Arabic.

Materials are also an important factor in ensuring effective provision. The Ministry of Education in the Czech Republic recognised the value of additional languages when it supported publishing and distributing textbooks and dictionaries for Vietnamese, Ukrainian and Russian. In France, materials to support the teaching of Occitan have been developed. These include teacher manuals, pupil materials, and web-based resources. A DVD is in preparation, and there is a journal which can be accessed from the site. Work is also under way to support the teaching of Assyrian in Armenia, including the production of textbooks, for the first two grades of school. This was a multinational initiative, involving experts in Armenian in Sweden and Iraq as well as Armenian Assyrian speakers, who found that the experience enhanced motivation for learning a language which had been left unsupported for a long time.

In addition to traditional materials, teachers of additional languages often make use of the resources on the web.

#### ***Modersmål, Sweden***

Sweden provides an excellent example of how such resources can be made available, through the virtual resource centre, Modersmål, developed through a Nordic cooperation scheme (<http://modersmal.skolutveckling.se/projekt/>).

This website brings together materials for teaching 29 additional languages, currently, each housed in a separate 'room' on the site, where teachers of these languages can go not only to download materials but also to take part in discussion fora and to seek support from online advisers.

## **4. Recognising progression and attainment**

A serious commitment to supporting additional language learning requires systems to record progression and attainment, although we found that in all countries, the number of languages for which accreditation exists is only a small fraction of those spoken. Some countries offer examinations within the mainstream system for certain additional languages. In the United Kingdom, for example, examination syllabi cater for some 20 additional languages, using the same model as for 'foreign' languages. Additional languages can thus be timetabled and taught in secondary schools alongside languages such as French and German. In 2003, around 23000 students sat general level examinations and around 5000 sat advanced level examinations in languages such as Bengali, Gujarati, Panjabi, Turkish and Urdu (CILT, 2004). In Ireland, several additional languages, including Polish, Lithuanian and Latvian, have recently been examined for the first time. All of these can nowadays be part of the school-leaving certificate. In the Netherlands, the achievements of students in additional languages such as Turkish, Arabic, Spanish, Russian and Italian can be evaluated by national exams. In Germany, an exam can be taken in Turkish as one of the compulsory foreign languages. In Hungary, Beash Roma pupils can take an exam in Beash Romani, equivalent to the national examination. In other countries, national examinations can be sat in languages other than the dominant language. For example, in Finland, it is possible to take the national matriculation exam (i.e. the year 12 school leaving examination) in both Northern Saami and Inari Saami.

Some countries have developed systems to enable pupils to gain recognition of skills acquired in different circumstances – in mainstream classrooms, in extra-curricular classes, or through informal learning.

#### ***Language Ladder, UK***

In the United Kingdom, a scheme known as the Language Ladder has been developed as one of the outcomes of the National Language Strategy for England. It aims to introduce a voluntary recognition scheme to complement existing national qualification frameworks and relate them to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). The Languages Ladder includes the use of 'can do' statements and offers discrete skills assessment so that learners may, for example, focus on developing speaking skills. The approach includes opportunities for self-assessment, teacher assessment and external assessment. The scheme is intended for use with both children and adults. Currently, the Language Ladder offers accreditation in 23 languages, including Arabic, Greek, Polish, Portuguese, Somali, Swedish, Tamil and Yoruba, and more may be made available in future. (See <http://www.assetlanguages.org.uk>)

#### ***The European Language Portfolio in multilingual classrooms, Netherlands***

The European Language Portfolio (ELP) has been validated for multilingual classrooms in the Netherlands (See [www.taalportfolio.com](http://www.taalportfolio.com).) The ELP is a document that belongs to the pupil. Pupils can report in their portfolios what they have learnt at school but also which language activities they have undertaken outside the classroom and what they have learnt from these, assessing their competence against CEFR descriptors. Such activities may include, for example, their contacts with family or friends

in foreign countries and the speaking of a language at home which differs from the language spoken at school. All languages reported in the ELP are valued equally. In this way, the portfolio allows plurilingual pupils to obtain recognition for language competences not acquired formally.

In a study of the piloting and implementation of this ELP (Aarts & Broeder 2006), it was found that plurilingual pupils had positive attitudes towards it. They were able to profile themselves in a positive way, because their language knowledge was considered an asset rather than a source of problems. In addition, working with the ELP allows teachers to improve their understanding of their multilingual classrooms, and in particular to appreciate the richness of plurilingual pupils' language experiences.

## **5. Revitalising languages**

Even when a language has been suppressed for a long time and may be almost on the verge of disappearing from the linguistic map, it is still possible to attempt to reverse the decline and revitalise the language, as several case studies show. Opportunities for children to study the language formally are known to be a key factor in combating language loss, and the VALEUR project provided a number of examples of initiatives of this kind, in relation to languages with a history of suppression and those which have not been standardised or lack a written form.

### ***Kashubian revival, Poland***

In Poland, there has been a dramatic revival of the Kashubian language, involving teacher training, materials development and widespread provision of language classes and bilingual education (Wicherkiewicz, 2006). In the communist era, Kashubian was considered as a distinct 'dialect' of Polish; until 1989, use of the word 'language' in connection with Kashubian was prohibited. Since then, the linguistic status of Kashubian has changed significantly, and it is now officially recognised as a regional language. A corresponding shift in public perspectives has also occurred over the past decade or so: Kashubian is no longer considered 'rural' and 'backward' but rather a source of local identity and pride. Kashubian was introduced into schools in 1991, and currently, is being taught to almost 6000 children by over 120 qualified teachers. There are plans to launch an early immersion programme for kindergarten, based on the model of Sorbian in Germany.

### ***Inari Saami revival, Finland***

Immersion for pre-school children has also been used in Finland, to safeguard the survival of Inari Saami and to revive the language. Inari Saami, with its 350 mainly elderly or middle-aged speakers, is the only Saami language spoken in Finland that is used entirely within the borders of Finland, mostly in the municipality of Inari. The language has been seriously endangered for some time. In 1997, the first language nests were started, based on the model of Maori language nests in New Zealand. In language nests, children and teachers speak only Inari Saami during the day, from the child's first day and in all situations. Most of the children starting in the language nests have little or no language proficiency in Inari Saami to start with. They begin to understand the language quickly and also use it actively (Pasanen, 2004). Currently, there are two Inari Saami teaching groups in the primary school, as a result of the work done in language nests. The number of young speakers of Inari Saami has grown, and as a side effect of the language nest activities, adults have started to use the language much more than before. To begin with, language nests were funded in part by a grant from the Finnish Cultural Foundation, and currently, they are financed locally.

### ***Burgenland Romani revival, Austria***

Different histories and status of languages require different approaches. In Austria, speakers of the Burgenland Romani realised that the language was disappearing. Loss of the language was also seen as a symptom of identity loss. At the beginning of the 1990s, a project called Codification and didactical implementation of Burgenland-Roma was initiated by young Burgenland Roma. The aims of the project are to counter identity and language loss, to raise young Romas' self-esteem by valuing their language and culture, and to contribute to their socio-economic integration via education, in order to avoid marginalisation. The first step was to codify the language in order to make textbooks and other teaching materials. Then the language started to be taught at schools as an extra-curricular activity. Monolingual and bilingual journals were published, and daily broadcasts on local radio were started at the end of the 1990s. Since 2003, Burgenland Romani has been regularly used in regional public radio, and since 2004, lessons in the language have been given in primary and secondary schools in the Oberwart region. The project aimed to maintain a living linguistic environment, encouraging people to sing in Romani, and to build connections between children and grandparents. Over a decade, the internal and the official status of Burgenland Romani has changed dramatically: from an almost unknown isolated oral intra-group variety virtually disowned by its speakers it has turned into the group's primary identity marker and the most prominent variety of an officially recognised Austrian minority language. Nowadays Romani is taught in several schools, there are four journals in Romani, the language is heard daily on the radio, and there are computer games as well as textbooks available in Romani. A well-equipped 'RomBus' tours the region with books, CDs, and DVDs, helping older speakers to maintain the linguistic culture and enthusing and empowering younger learners.

### ***Somali Literacy Projects, UK***

Although Somali has a long history as an oral language, the written form of the Somali language was introduced in Somalia in 1972. Plans for mass literacy campaigns were disrupted first by droughts in the early 1970s and then by political disruption, leading to civil war, from 1977 onwards. Somali refugees and asylum seekers have joined some very long-established Somali communities (typically descended from Somali seamen in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries) across Europe. Literacy levels among these groups are low, for the reasons set out above, and Somali literacy projects have been established in different parts of the UK to enable children and adults alike to develop competence in reading and writing the language. (See Arthur, 2003, for an account of one of these programmes). Recognising that promoting literacy in Somali has made an important contribution to the identity and status of Somali communities in the UK, there has been a campaign to introduce Somali as a subject which can be taught and examined in schools, leading, in 2006, to its inclusion in the languages included in the Languages Ladder (see above).

## **6. Conclusions**

The value of the VALEUR project's work in identifying examples of good practice lies firstly in demonstrating that additional language learning can be supported effectively in different ways, reflecting local needs and aspirations, national education systems, and the histories and status of the languages themselves. For many communities, working in isolation from each other, identifying ways in which provision for their particular additional languages can best be made can seem a gargantuan task, each time starting from first principles and, often involving the re-invention of many wheels. In providing examples of different approaches to this task across Europe, it is our hope that others will find inspiration and some practical ideas for taking their own work forward.

Secondly, despite the very different contexts in which provision for additional language learning is made across Europe, we have sought to identify some areas of common ground, which all those working in this field need to take into account. For example, there is a need for well-trained teachers and well-designed

materials in all contexts, and for approaches which enable learners' progression and attainment to be recorded – and celebrated. It is also evident that many of these successful case studies are the results of collaborative efforts of involving a range of parties. It is essential that any initiative starts from the language community itself: without their interest and support, little can be achieved. A key group of actors are also the teachers: their commitment is essential to projects such as the trilingual school in Austria and the Language of the Month in England. Financial support from official bodies, for example to start a project, is sometimes needed, but several of the case studies show that good will and commitment are key driving forces. However, it is essential to realise that a project that depends heavily upon the goodwill of teachers and parents can be very fragile. Wider recognition of the value of all the languages in use in Europe, combined with support at policy level is needed to ensure that this fledgling area of language education achieves its true potential. In our final chapter, we consider ways in which policy at European level can support the future development of provision for additional languages.



## **Chapter 7: Valuing all languages in Europe: policy in support of enhanced provision for additional languages**

### **1. Introduction**

We began this report by setting out the rationale for supporting additional language learning, and a review of European policy supporting such provision. In the course of the report we have: provided a snapshot of the languages in use across Europe; charted, through changing terminology, changing attitudes towards additional languages; mapped the extent of existing provision for additional language learning; and provided examples of good practice. In this final chapter, we return to the question of policy, focusing in particular on current Council of Europe language education policies and their associated instruments, in order to consider ways in which provision for additional language learning might be taken forward.

### **2. Council of Europe language education policy: guidance for future developments**

In 2005, the heads of state and government of the member states of the Council of Europe outlined an action plan laying down the principal tasks for the Council in the coming years (Council of Europe, 2005). With regard to education, the plan calls on member states to build a more human and inclusive Europe by ensuring social cohesion, promoting democratic citizenship in Europe, protecting and promoting cultural diversity and fostering intercultural dialogue.

It is obvious that language education plays an important role in pursuing all these goals. Programmes of intergovernmental co-operation in the field of language education have been carried out by the Council of Europe for over fifty years now. The focus on effective communication skills, characteristic of projects leading to the development of “Threshold Level” specifications for a number of languages in the 1970s and driven by increasing opportunities for interaction and mobility in Europe in the 1980s, is still important, but increasing emphasis is now placed on addressing the new challenges to social cohesion and integration brought about in the 1990s, a period that witnessed the rapid enlargement of the Council of Europe, and subsequently of the European Union. Language skills are seen as essential to enable individuals to benefit from opportunities in employment and mobility, but they are also necessary for active participation in the social and political life of the multilingual societies which make up today’s Europe.

The important role the Council of Europe attaches to language education has, over the last decade, led to the drafting of a number of resolutions and recommendations. The most important are:

- *Recommendation No. R (98) 6 of the Committee of Ministers on Modern Languages* emphasising intercultural communication and plurilingualism as key policy goals and proposing concrete measures for each educational sector and for initial and in-service teacher education;
- *Recommendation 1383 (1998) of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe on Linguistic Diversification* stating that ‘Europe’s linguistic diversity is a precious cultural asset that must be preserved and protected’ and that ‘there should therefore be more variety in modern language teaching in the Council of Europe member states; this should result in the acquisition not only of English but also of other European and world languages by all European citizens, in parallel with the mastery of their own national and, where appropriate, regional language’;
- *Recommendation 1539 (2001) of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe on the European Year of Languages* calling upon the Member States to ‘maintain and develop further the

Council of Europe's language policy initiatives for promoting plurilingualism, cultural diversity and understanding among peoples and nations' and to 'encourage all Europeans to acquire a certain ability to communicate in several languages, for example by promoting diversified novel approaches adapted to individual needs ...';

- *Recommendation Rec (2005)3 of the Committee of Ministers on teaching neighbouring languages in border regions* urging the governments of Member States 'to apply the principles of plurilingual education, in particular by establishing conditions that enable teaching institutions in border regions at all levels to safeguard or, if need be, introduce the teaching and use of the languages of their neighbouring countries, together with the teaching of these countries' cultures, which are closely bound up with language teaching'.

These Recommendations form the basic set of principles for a coherent approach to language education that seeks to enhance and develop the linguistic repertoires of social agents, as education for awareness of language diversity and intercultural communication.

The priority which the Council of Europe accords to education for citizenship and intercultural dialogue in the 21<sup>st</sup> century is reflected in the educational goal of enabling citizens living in multilingual European societies to interact in a number of languages across linguistic and cultural boundaries. The language policies proposed and promoted attach particular importance to the development of plurilingualism – the lifelong expansion of the individual's linguistic repertoire. Each individual plurilingual profile is made up of different languages and language varieties at different levels of proficiency in terms of various competences and skills. It is dynamic and changes in its composition throughout the life of an individual.

The constant development and the flexible and effective use of a rich individual plurilingual competence is possible because different languages are not learned in isolation but can influence and support each other both in the learning process and communicative use. The task for policy makers is however to ensure the harmonious development of learners' plurilingual competence through a coherent, transversal and integrated approach to language education that takes into account all the languages in learners' plurilingual repertoire and their respective functions. This includes promoting learners' consciousness of the value and the functionality of their existing language repertoires and potential to develop and adapt those repertoires to changing circumstances.

This brief review of languages education policy in support of the Council of Europe's principal goals – social cohesion, democratic citizenship, protecting and promoting cultural diversity, and intercultural dialogue – makes clear that additional languages have a key role to play, along with the dominant languages of the 47 Council of Europe member states. From the perspective of an individual the arguments set out here are directly related to and can be derived from more general human rights, such as the right to full personal development, the right to good quality education, the right to participate in society but also the duty of becoming a responsible citizen. At state level, language education policy is to be considered part of social policy, and from this perspective supporting additional languages should be viewed as working towards responsible use of human capital, contributing to wise management of migration, ensuring social cohesion, and promoting the ideals of an intercultural citizenship.

However, the VALEUR project has demonstrated that provision for additional language learning is still under-developed and under-resourced in comparison to 'foreign' language learning. How can we move from supportive policy to effective implementation? We suggest here that the tools which the Council of Europe has designed to support 'foreign' language learning can be just as effectively deployed to support additional language learning. In the next section we focus on the potential of five key language education instruments to enhance existing provision for additional languages.



### **3. Language education instruments in support of additional language learning**

Three documents developed by the Council of Europe are of particular significance: the Appendix to Recommendation No. R (98) 6 of the Committee of Ministers on Modern Languages; the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) and the European Language Portfolio (ELP). Together with the Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe and the newly developed Autobiography of Intercultural Encounters they may be used as a set of instruments for the implementation of the proposed measures with regard to additional languages.

#### ***Appendix to Recommendation No. R (98) 6 of the Committee of Ministers on Modern Languages***

We noted above that this recommendation identified intercultural communication and plurilingualism as the key goals for language learning. The Appendix to this recommendation specifies comprehensively, for each educational sector, the way plurilingualism may be established as an overarching aim in a coherent concept of language education in all the member states of the Council of Europe. All of the proposed measures are as valid for additional language learning as for ‘foreign’ language learning, and the list provides a good starting point for discussion of an inclusive vision of language learning in a linguistically diverse society. These measures are set out in full in the Appendix to this report.

#### ***Guide for the development of language education policies in Europe: from linguistic diversity to plurilingual education***

The aim of the Guide is to offer an analytical instrument which can serve as a reference document for the formulation or reorganisation of language teaching policies to promote plurilingualism and diversification in a planned manner so that decisions are coherently linked. The Guide does not promote any particular language education policy but attempts to identify the challenges and possible responses in the light of common principles. As we have seen in Chapter 1, the Guide conceives of plurilingualism as one competence, encompassing – potentially – several languages, ‘a communicative competence to which all knowledge and experience of language contributes and in which languages interrelate and interact’. In this fluid and cumulative model of linguistic competence, all languages encountered by the learner have an important role to play, both in enhancing the learner’s overall competence and enabling her or him to participate fully in social and cultural encounters in a wide range of contexts. Each language and its associated social and cultural spheres is unique, but none can be defined, *a priori*, as more significant than another.

#### ***The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment (CEFR)***

The CEFR includes a descriptive scheme of language use and learning and scales of proficiency for the different parameters of this scheme. The comprehensive descriptive scheme is a tool for reflecting on what is involved not only in language use, but also in language learning and teaching. The CEFR provides a common basis and a common language for the elaboration of syllabuses, curriculum guidelines, textbooks, teacher-training programmes, and for relating examinations to one another. It allows the different partners involved in planning and delivering language provision and in assessing language progress and proficiency, to co-ordinate and situate their efforts.

The description is based on an action-oriented approach to language learning and use. It provides six ascending levels of proficiency with specific outcomes – a compendium of descriptors of language proficiency (proficiency implying not only the knowledge of a language, but also the degree of skill in

using it). These descriptors were developed scientifically and take the form of a descriptor bank that can be added to, updated and edited to meet present and future needs.

It is in effect a common reference tool across languages (the CEFR is non-language specific) and is widely used in developing coherence in provision across different languages. It is also used in policy making as a means of ensuring coherence and transparency through the different sectors or stages in language education. Many countries have used the publication of the Framework to stimulate curriculum and examination reforms in different educational sectors.

Its potential in the context of additional language learning is considerable. Without the CEFR, definitions of the parameters of language learning would reside with national education systems or with bodies concerned with the teaching and learning of specific languages, principally the dominant languages of different European states. Few of those involved in supporting additional language learning can take on a task of this kind in relation to languages which lack such status, as the work requires extensive funding over long periods of time. In the absence of developed models of language use, and of the teaching and learning needed to achieve specified levels of proficiency, those used in relation to additional languages are often rudimentary and inconsistent, and therefore unlikely to be valued by wider society. The Framework is both a guide to producing sophisticated and rigorous models of learning and teaching related to use, and also an increasingly well-understood guarantee of standardised proficiency to outsiders. Work will still be required to bring much current provision into line with the CEFR, but the benefits of undertaking this task, for learners themselves and the wider community are considerable.

### ***The European Language Portfolio (ELP)***

The European Language Portfolio is a document in which those who are learning or have learned any language – whether at school or outside school – can record and reflect on their language learning and cultural experiences. It is the property of the learner. In the Portfolio, all competence is valued, regardless of whether it is gained inside or outside formal education. It is linked to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages.

The Portfolio contains a Language Passport which its owner regularly updates. A grid is provided where his/her language competences can be described according to common criteria accepted throughout Europe and which can serve as a complement to customary certificates. The document also contains a detailed Language Biography describing the owner's experiences in each language and which is designed to guide the learner in planning and assessing progress. Finally, there is a Dossier where examples of personal work can be kept to illustrate one's language competences.

The Portfolio aims to document its holder's plurilingual language proficiency and experiences in other languages in a comprehensive, informative, transparent and reliable way. The instruments contained in the Portfolio help learners to take stock of the levels of competence they have reached in their learning of one or several foreign languages in order to enable them to inform others in a detailed and internationally comparable manner. There are many occasions to present an up-to-date Language Portfolio: for example a transfer to another school, change to a higher educational sector, the beginning of a language course, a meeting with a careers advisor, or an application for a new post. In these cases the Portfolio is addressed to persons involved in making decisions of importance to the owner. A learner may also be interested in having such documentation for him-/herself.

We have seen in Chapter 6 that the Dutch version of the Portfolio was developed specifically to enable plurilingual children to draw attention to their additional language skills and experiences, and that this has been particularly successful in encouraging pupils and their teachers to value these. Given that any version of the Portfolio should – theoretically at least – provide scope for all language competences, not just those in ‘foreign’ languages, to be documented, the tool itself is already well suited to inclusion of additional languages, but there may be a need for guidance to those supporting its use, drawing their attention to language learning experiences outside mainstream education and encouraging them to promote these areas as well as the more formal, ‘foreign’ language learning for which the Portfolio may have been introduced.

### ***The Autobiography of Intercultural Encounters***

The Autobiography is a document developed within a general framework of language education, education about religious diversity and education for democratic citizenship. It is a tool to foster respect for diversity, dialogue and social inclusion. With its emphasis on critical analysis of users' intercultural experiences, it complements other Council of Europe tools such as the European Language Portfolio; and like the Portfolio it is the property of the learner, who can choose what information she or he wishes to share and what she or he prefers to keep private. The Autobiography invites users to reflect critically upon their own memorable intercultural experiences, and helps them to analyse them in retrospect and in the light of the most defining aspects of each encounter. An intercultural encounter can be an experience between people from different countries, but it can also be an experience with individuals from other cultural backgrounds in the same country – for example, from other regional, linguistic, ethnic, or religious backgrounds. Therefore, the *Autobiography* aims to promote respect for diversity both nationally and across borders.

The Autobiography is designed to be used across the curriculum in school or any other educational context contributing to lifelong learning. Intercultural experiences can be analysed within disciplines as diverse as language learning, history, geography, religion, citizenship education, etc. The *Autobiography* can also be used as a self-evaluation and development tool.

There are two versions of the *Autobiography*: a version for younger learners, up to around age 11, including those who are not yet able to read and write, and a version suitable for other users in schools and beyond. The *Autobiography* is accompanied by a *Facilitator's Guide* with details of the rationale, including the underlying model of intercultural competence, and specific guidelines concerning how to use and make the most of this tool. Piloting of the first version of the document is taking place in 2007/2008. It is anticipated that the Autobiography will be translated into local languages and adapted as appropriate.

Those who grow up with additional languages typically also grow up with 'additional cultures' which may differ very considerably from the dominant culture of the society in which they live. They experience intercultural contact on a daily basis and the Autobiography provides a valuable opportunity for them to reflect on these experiences, learn from them and demonstrate the high level of understanding and competence which additional language speakers will often have acquired, as a result of the fact that they 'live' interculturality in ways which those from the dominant linguistic and cultural groups in a society rarely experience. It is, however, increasingly important that these experiences are understood and valued by individuals and by wider society, in a Europe where linguistic and cultural diversity are, as we have emphasised throughout this report, ineluctably on the rise.

## **4. In conclusion**

Europe's additional languages are a valuable resource, for the individuals who speak them and for wider society. But to take full advantage of this resource, we need to provide opportunities within the formal education system, for people to study these languages, so that they can develop a wide range of oral and written language competences – just as we do for dominant and foreign languages.

The VALEUR Project has identified different types of provision across Europe, developed to support the learning of some additional languages. These range from monolingual and bilingual schools where additional languages are used as media of instruction, to after school classes organised by the communities in which the additional languages are spoken, often with volunteer teachers and *ad hoc* resources. Committed teachers, linguists, policy-makers and other activists have already made significant contributions, ensuring that certain additional languages can be taught within the formal education system, that teachers are trained to high standards and that materials meet the needs and aspirations of learners. Attention to progression and attainment are key factors in enabling learners to develop fully their

language skills, and important work has already been initiated in this context, in devising versions of the European Languages Portfolio which stress the inclusive nature of this project.

However, it is important to be aware that existing provision caters for only a small proportion of the additional languages in use. Of the 440 spoken languages and 18 sign languages the VALEUR project has identified as being in use in our 21 participant states, we found provision of some kind only for around a quarter (24%). This means that there is no provision at all for three quarters of the additional languages in use in Europe. Even in the case of those languages for which provision does exist, it may be available only for a small proportion of the potential learners. And the quality of provision may vary very considerably from one place to another, so that even where provision is available it may not meet learners' needs. We cannot therefore conclude that Europe is currently in a strong position to realise the benefits of its linguistic resources.

The policy which needs to underpin better provision for additional languages is already in place. We have noted in this report a policy shift from monolingual, separatist policies in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century to plurilingual and inclusive policies at the start of the 21<sup>st</sup>. At the same time, there has been a move from a vision of language learning focusing principally on communicative competence to support economic mobility to one in which the role of language learning and of the plurilingual competence which ensues also encompasses social and political participation and intercultural communication. Key instruments to support the implementation of this policy, such as the Common European Framework and the European Language Portfolio, are already available and others, such as the Autobiography of Intercultural Encounters will soon join them. Provision for additional languages will be greatly enhanced by the application of these instruments, just as has been the case with the major 'foreign' languages taught across Europe, and the key recommendation from the VALEUR project is therefore to raise awareness of their potential in this context and to support their use.

## **Appendix**

### **Appendix to Recommendation No. R (98) 6**

#### **Measures to be implemented concerning the learning and teaching of modern languages**

##### *A. General measures and principles*

1. Pursue education policies which:

1.1. enable all Europeans to communicate with speakers of other mother tongues, thereby developing openmindedness, facilitating free movement of people and exchange of information and improving international cooperation;

1.2. develop learners' respect for other ways of life and equip them for an intercultural world, in particular through direct links and exchanges and through personal experience;

1.3. ensure that appropriate resources - both human and material - are made available for increased teaching of modern languages throughout the education system so as to meet the growing demands of international communication and understanding.

2. Promote widespread plurilingualism:

2.1. by encouraging all Europeans to achieve a degree of communicative ability in a number of languages;

2.2. by diversifying the languages on offer and setting objectives appropriate to each language;

2.3. by encouraging teaching programmes at all levels that use a flexible approach - including modular courses and those which aim to develop partial competences - and giving them appropriate recognition in national qualification systems, in particular public examinations;

2.4. by encouraging the use of foreign languages in the teaching of non-linguistic subjects (for example history, geography, mathematics) and create favourable conditions for such teaching;

2.5. by supporting the application of communication and information technologies to disseminate teaching and learning materials for all European national or regional languages;

2.6. by supporting the development of links and exchanges with institutions and persons at all levels of education in other countries so as to offer to all the possibility of authentic experience of the language and culture of others;

2.7. by facilitating lifelong language learning through the provision of appropriate resources.

##### *B. Early language learning (up to age 11)*

3. Ensure that, from the very start of schooling, or as early as possible, every pupil is made aware of Europe's linguistic and cultural diversity.

4. For all children, encourage and promote the early learning of modern languages in ways appropriate to national and local situations and wherever circumstances permit.

5. Ensure that pupils have systematic continuity of language learning from one educational cycle to another.

6. Develop appropriate forms of evaluation and recognition of early language learning.

7. Devise appropriate policies and methods, based on analysis and comparison of results achieved by modern language programmes for young learners.

### ***C. Secondary education***

8. Continue to raise the standard of communication which pupils are expected to achieve so that they can use the language studied to communicate effectively with other speakers of that language in everyday transactions, build social and personal relations and learn to understand and respect other people's cultures and practices.

9. Ensure that pupils have the opportunity to study more than one European or other language.

10. Incorporate a wider range of languages and learning levels into the curriculum.

11. Make sure that all upper secondary school pupils are able to continue learning modern languages, to improve the quality of their use of the language(s) learnt in lower secondary education and to enrich their intercultural understanding.

12. Assist the learning of further European or other languages in upper secondary school through the development, where appropriate, of partial competences, which should then be assessed and officially recognised.

13. Encourage authorities and institutions to enter international networks to promote co-operation between administrators, teacher trainers, teachers and pupils, particularly with a view to setting up joint projects or exchanging experience, ideas and teaching materials.

14. Encourage teaching institutions at all levels to foster the development of student autonomy, that is the capacity to learn more efficiently and independently as a basis for the life-long maintenance, development and diversification of language skills in accordance with changing practical and cultural needs.

15. At a suitable stage in general education, sensitise pupils to the role of languages in working life and prepare them, where appropriate, for vocational contacts in their chosen field.

### ***D. Vocationally-oriented language learning***

16. In the period of transition from full-time education to working life, and at all stages of vocational preparation and training, offer all young people language courses wherever possible and appropriate so as to widen their access to

information, equip them to participate in international projects, prepare them for taking up an occupation and increase their vocational mobility.

17. Ensure a balance between vocational, cultural and personal development by offering language courses that combine general and vocational components.

18. Promote training courses that use a flexible approach (modules, for example) to meet special vocational needs so that credit is given progressively as competences are built up.

### ***E. Adult education***

19. Encourage the development of appropriate facilities to enable adults to maintain and further develop their language skills and to encourage those with little or no previous language learning experience to acquire the ability to use a foreign language for communicative purposes.

20. Promote adult learners' development of both general and vocational language skills on a lifelong basis in order to assist their personal development, facilitate intercultural understanding, mobility and international co-operation at all levels.

21. Support the provision of national and international structures so as to ensure the widest availability of facilities for distance education (including the use of communication and information technologies), in order to promote the development of diversified advanced communication skills, where possible linking autonomous learning to institutionalised learning.

#### ***F. Bilingual education in bilingual or multilingual areas***

22. Take the necessary steps, particularly - although not only - in bilingual or multilingual areas to ensure that:

22.1. the provisions of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages and the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities are taken into account as indicating desirable parameters for policy on regional or minority languages or cultures;

22.2. there is parity of esteem between all the languages and cultures involved so that children in each community may have the opportunity to develop oracy and literacy in the language of their own community as well as to learn to understand and appreciate the language and culture of the other;

22.3. where bilingual and bicultural education is provided, it develops a genuinely intercultural outlook and provides a foundation for the learning of further languages.

23. Continue to promote bilingualism in immigrant areas or neighbourhoods and support immigrants in learning the language of the area in which they reside.

24. Facilitate and promote learning the languages of neighbouring countries in border regions.

#### ***G. Specification of objectives and assessment***

25. For all European national and regional languages, develop realistic and valid learning objectives - such as are to be found in "threshold level" type specifications developed by the Council of Europe - so as to ensure quality in language learning and teaching through coherence and transparency of objectives.

26. Encourage institutions to use the Council of Europe's Common European Framework of Reference to plan or review language teaching in a coherent and transparent manner in the interests of better international co-ordination and more diversified language learning.

27. Encourage the development and use by learners in all educational sectors of a personal document (European language portfolio) in which they can record their qualifications and other significant linguistic and cultural experiences in an internationally transparent manner, thus motivating learners and acknowledging their efforts to extend and diversify their language learning at all levels in a lifelong perspective.

28. Encourage institutions engaged in assessment and certification - especially those which award recognised qualifications - to make their objectives, criteria and procedures clear both to candidates and teachers, thus facilitating the comparability of qualifications and European mobility.

29. Promote the development of varied forms of assessment and recognition of plurilingual competences which take into account the considerable diversity of needs, paying particular attention to the definition of objectives for partial competences and the assessment of their attainment.

30. Promote and facilitate the awarding of certificates and diplomas at the end of a course of study followed in more than one language.

#### ***H. Teacher training***

31. Take steps to ensure that adequate numbers of suitably trained language teachers are available at all levels so that, where appropriate, a wide range of languages may be taught.

32. Provide all future teachers of modern languages with a high standard of training which strikes a proper balance between study of academic subjects and professional preparation.
33. Take steps to ensure close co-operation between education authorities, universities, educational research centres and schools in the training of future teachers.
34. Promote, in the design of teacher training courses, the elaboration of precise and coherent objectives in the form of a set of core competences which include linguistic, intercultural, educational and psychological components.
35. Through bilateral or multilateral agreements, enable intending teachers to spend a part of their degree course in a country where the language they will be teaching is spoken as a language of daily communication.
36. Recommend to institutions responsible for initial and in-service training that their courses take account of:
  - 36.1. the particular importance of the intercultural component in creating awareness of and respect for cultural differences;
  - 36.2. the "learning to learn" dimension, which assists lifelong development of plurilingualism;
  - 36.3. the use of modern technology, so that teachers acquire the ability and confidence necessary to make flexible use of it in their day-to-day classroom practice and their professional lives;
  - 36.4. the principles and practice of language testing and assessment, including learner self-assessment.
37. Offer teachers of modern languages in-service training so that they:
  - 37.1. retain a high level of language ability and teaching skill;
  - 37.2. keep abreast of methodological advances (such as the use of new technologies);
  - 37.3. extend and deepen their experience and knowledge of the cultures of the country whose language they are teaching, in particular through time spent in that country;
  - 37.4. create and develop international interaction networks for pooling of experience and expertise;
  - 37.5. contribute fully to the implementation of the European dimension in education.



## Bibliography

- Aarts, R. & P. Broeder, Experiences with a language portfolio – with special focus on Moroccan children in the Netherlands. In N. Alem & J. J. de Ruiter (eds.) *The Culture of Moroccan Migrants in Europe* Oujda: Faculté des Lettres de l'Université Mohammed Premier, 2006, pp.79-91.
- Arthur, J., 'Baro Afkaaga Hooyo!' A case study of Somali literacy teaching in Liverpool, *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 6 (3&4), pp253-266, 2003.
- Bakker, P., (2001) "Romani in Europe", in: G. Extra & D. Gorter (eds.) *The Other Languages of Europe. Demographic, Sociolinguistic and Educational Perspectives*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, 2003
- Baker, C., *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, Clevedon, Avon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 1996.
- Beacco, J.-C. and Byram, M., *Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe: From Linguistic Diversity to Plurilingual Education* (Main Version, Draft 1, Revised), Strasbourg, Language Policy Division, Council of Europe, 2003.
- Beacco, J.-C., *From linguistic diversity to plurilingual education: Guide for the development of Language Education Policies in Europe*, Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 2007 (revised edition).
- Bekemans, L. and Ortiz de Urbina, Y., *The Teaching of Immigrants in the European Union*. Luxembourg, European Parliament, 1997.
- Bialystok, E., *Bilingualism in Development*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Bialystok, E., Luk, G. & Kwan, E., 'Bilingualism, biliteracy and learning to read: Interactions among languages and writing systems', *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 9 (1): 43-61, 2005.
- Block, D. and Cameron, D., *Globalisation and Language Teaching*, London, Routledge, 2002
- Broeder, P. and Extra, G., *Language, Ethnicity and Education: Case Studies on Immigrant Minority Groups and Immigrant Minority Languages*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, 1998.
- Brutt-Griffler, J., *World English: A Study of its Development*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, 2002.
- Cenoz, J. & Valencia, J., 'Additive trilingualism: Evidence from the Basque Country', *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 15 (2): 195-207, 1994
- CILT, the National Centre for Languages, *Languages Year Book*. London, CILT, 2004.
- Commission of the European Communities, *Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity: An Action Plan 2004- 2006*, Brussels, Commission of the European Communities, 2002.
- Commission of the European Communities, *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at School in Europe*. Brussels, Eurydice, 2006.
- Commission of the European Communities, *Integrating Immigrant Children into Schools in Europe*. Brussels, Eurydice, 2004.
- Council of Europe, *Recommendation 1539 (2001) European Year of Languages*, 2001.
- Council of Europe, *Autobiography of Intercultural Encounters*. [[http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic%5CAutobiogrWeb\\_EN.asp](http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic%5CAutobiogrWeb_EN.asp)] (visited 6 June 2007).
- Council of Europe, *Recommendation Rec (2005) 3 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on teaching neighbouring languages in border regions*, 2005;
- [<http://assembly.coe.int/Documents/AdoptedText/TA96/EREC1291.HTM>] (visited 12 April 2007)
- [<http://assembly.coe.int/Main.asp?link=http://assembly.coe.int/Documents/AdoptedText/ta98/EREC1383.htm>] (visited 6 June 2007).

[<http://assembly.coe.int/Main.asp?link=http://assembly.coe.int/Documents/AdoptedText/ta01/EREC1539.htm>] (visited 6 June 2007).

[<http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/EN/Treaties/Html/148.htm>] (visited 12 April 2007)

[[http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page?\\_pageid=1334,49092079,1334\\_49092702&\\_dad=portal&\\_schema=PORTAL](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page?_pageid=1334,49092079,1334_49092702&_dad=portal&_schema=PORTAL)] (visited 12 April 2007)

[<http://www.ciemen.org/mercator/UE21-GB.HTM>] (visited 12 April 2007)

[[http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/Linguistic/Guide\\_niveau3\\_EN.asp#TopOfPage](http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/Linguistic/Guide_niveau3_EN.asp#TopOfPage)] (visited 6 June 2007).

[<https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?id=817425&BackColorInternet=9999CC&BackColorIntranet=FFBB55&BackColorLogged=FFAC75>] (visited 6 June 2007).

Council of Europe (1992) *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages*, Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 1992.

Council of Europe Committee of Ministers, *Recommendation No. R (98) 6 of the Committee of Ministers to member states concerning modern languages*, 1998.

[<https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?id=470007&BackColorInternet=9999CC&BackColorIntranet=FFBB55&BackColorLogged=FFAC75>] (visited 6 June 2007).

Council of Europe Language Policy Division, *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*, Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 2001. [[http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/CADRE\\_EN.asp](http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/CADRE_EN.asp)] (visited 6 June 2007).

Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly, *Recommendation 1281 on Yiddish Culture*, (1996).

Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly, *Recommendation 1383 (1998) Linguistic Diversification*, 1998.

Council of Europe, *Warsaw Declaration: Third Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Council of Europe*, 2005.

[<https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?id=860039&BackColorInternet=9999CC&BackColorIntranet=FFBB55&BackColorLogged=FFAC75>] (visited 6 June 2007).

Council of European Communities, *Directive on education for immigrant minority children*. (Directive 77/486), 1977.

European Parliament *Resolution on the languages and cultures of regional and ethnic minorities in the European Community*, 1987.

EUROSTAT, *Europe in Figures. Eurostat Year Book 2005*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2005.

Hagège, C., *Combat pour le français: Au nom de la diversité des langues et des cultures*, Paris, O. Jacob, 2006.

House, J., "English as a Lingua Franca: A threat to Multilingualism?", *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, Vol. 7, No. 4, 2003, pp. 556-578.

Kenner, C., 'Living in simultaneous worlds: Difference and integration in bilingual script-learning. *Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 7 (1): 43-61, 2004.

Little, D. & Perclová, R., *European Language Portfolio: Guide for Teachers and Teacher Trainers*, Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 2001.

[[http://www.coe.int/T/DG4/Portfolio/documents/ELPguide\\_teacherstrainers.pdf](http://www.coe.int/T/DG4/Portfolio/documents/ELPguide_teacherstrainers.pdf)] (visited 6 June 2007).

Lo Bianco, J., *Language and Literacy Policy in Scotland*, Stirling, Scottish CILT, 2001.

Novak-Lukanovič, S., *Minority Languages in Education in Slovenia*. In Dónall Ó Riagáin (ed.) *Voces Diversae: Lesser-Used Language Education in Europe*. Belfast Studies in Language, Culture and Politics 15. Belfast: Cló Ollscoil na Banríona, 2006, pp. 113–125.

- Pasanen, A. Inarinsaamelainen menestystarina: kielipesästä kaksikielisyyteen [The success story of Inari Saami: from language nests to bilingualism]. In Latomaa, S. (ed.) *Äidinkieli ja toiset kielet: kaksikielisyytyöpaja Tampereella 18.–20.10.2002*. [Mother tongues and other tongues: a workshop in bilingualism in Tampere October 18-20, 2002]. Tampere Studies in Language, Translation and Culture. Series B1. Tampere, Tampere University Press, pp. 117-124.
- Phillipson, R., *Linguistic Imperialism*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Phillipson, R., *An English-Only Europe?*, London, Routledge, 2004.
- Ribelus, A. Kokemuksia kaksikielisestä opetuksesta [Experiences of bilingual education]. In Latomaa S. (ed.) *Opas oman äidinkielen opetukseen* [A guide to teaching additional languages] . Helsinki: Opetushallitus, forthcoming.
- Sanz, C., Bilingual education enhances third language acquisition: Evidence from Catalonia', *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 21 (1): 23-44, 2000.
- Schneider, G. & Lenz, P. *European Language Portfolio: Guide for Developers*, Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 2003.  
[http://www.coe.int/T/DG4/Portfolio/documents\\_intro/Eguide.pdf](http://www.coe.int/T/DG4/Portfolio/documents_intro/Eguide.pdf) (visited 6 June 2007).
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T., *Linguistic Genocide in Education – Or Worldwide Diversity and Human Rights?*, Mahwah, New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2000.
- Vertovec, S., *The Emergence of Super-diversity in Britain*, Working Paper No. 25, Oxford, Centre for Migration, Policy and Society, University of Oxford, 2006.
- Wicherkiewicz, T., A Decade of Kashubian in Education. In Dónall Ó Riagáin (ed.) *Voces Diversae: Lesser-Used Language Education in Europe*. Belfast Studies in Language, Culture and Politics 15. Belfast: Cló Ollscoil na Banríona, 2006, pp. 103-112.

