



LEARNMe: POSITION PAPER ONE

**Rhwydwaith Mercator: Prosiect LEARNMe 2013-2015
Mercator Network: LEARNMe Project 2013-2015**

**Gweithdy Rhyngwladol Deuddydd / International Two Day Workshop
Prifysgol Aberystwyth University, Cymru/Wales**

Hydref 17-18 October 2013

<p>THEMA: Ailymweld, Ail-ddadansoddi ac Ailddiffinio ymchwil ar amrywiaeth ieithyddol: y cyfryngau, addysg a pholisi</p>	<p>THEME: Revisiting, reanalysing and redefining research on linguistic diversity: media, education and policy</p>
---	---

Contents

- 1. Introduction, production and structure of the Position Paper 2
 - 1.1 Introduction 2
 - 1.2 Production..... 3
 - 1.3 Structure 3
- 2. Outlining the theoretical concepts presented at the First Workshop..... 4
 - 2.1 List of theoretical concepts 4
 - 2.2 Tagzedo Word Cloud 5
- 3. Analysing the papers and discussions in the framework of the five pre-identified sub-themes..... 6
 - 3.1 Sub-theme 1: Policy and Practice: Top-down and Bottom-up Approaches 6
 - 3.2 Sub-theme 2: Terminological diversity and its consequences 9
 - 3.3 Sub-theme 3: Socio-political approaches and ideological objectives 11
 - 3.4 Sub-theme 4: Methodological issues 13
 - 3.5 Sub-theme 5: Sociolinguistic practices in media, education and policy 15
- 4. Concluding Remarks: Towards a Revised Working Definition of Linguistic Diversity..... 18

1. Introduction, production and structure of the Position Paper

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 This Position Paper was developed following the first LearnMe Workshop held at Aberystwyth University (Wales) on the 17th – 18th October 2013. It presents and reflects the main tenets of debate that took place over this two-day event, drawing on the eleven discussion papers presented and incorporating the comments and reflections of the 25 participants – 15 invited experts and 10 members of the Mercator Network. (Full list of participants and titles of papers in Appendix One)

1.1.2 The focus of the LearnMe project is to explore *Linguistic Diversity as a dynamic and challenging concept*. Its approach is one of an iterative methodology: formulating a Preparatory Document, a number of Discussion Papers invited to be presented at a Workshop and a reflective Position Paper produced after the workshop. This process is repeated for the Second and Third Workshops, with the Final Position Paper – the White Paper – presented at the Final Conference. This first Position Paper will be revisited and re-examined in the second LearnMe workshop to be held in Sweden in May 2014.

1.1.3 The first workshop was entitled ‘Revisiting, reanalysing and redefining research on linguistic diversity: media, education and policy’. This broad base of approaches and contexts provided a wide range of opportunities for researchers to examine, question and evaluate the presuppositions of theory and practice at all points in the research process. Prior to the workshop, five preliminary sub-themes were identified in the Preparatory Document by the LearnMe team as a focus for discussions and presentations. These were:

- Policy and Practice: Top-down and bottom-up approaches to research, policy and practice; International Level; Nation-state/Country/Regional and Local levels;
- Terminological Diversity and its consequences; Terminology as an institutionalised field (e.g. language, dialect, vernacular, bi-/multilingualism, plurilingualism, translanguaging, second vs foreign language, multilingual competence, minority language, immigrant languages, lesser used language, state language, official language etc);
- Socio-political approaches and ideological objectives: e.g. assimilationist, additive/multicultural/segregated linguistic and cultural independence etc; identities
- Methodological Issues: e.g. Indigeneity and Research; “Languaging” and approaches to Linguistic Diversity; Permeable and impermeable language frameworks;
- Sociolinguistic practices in the fields of Education, Media (including social media) and Policy.

1.1.4 Discussion Papers were requested from the experts on aspects of these pre-

identified sub-themes. Papers were sought on media, education and policy, with some additional emphasis on media in this first workshop.

1.2 Production

1.2.1 This paper was produced using the following documentation:

- Preparatory Document / Invitation to Participate (Appendix Two)
- Abstracts supplied by the participants prior to the workshop (Appendix Three)
- PowerPoint presentations and papers (Appendix Four)
- Audio-visual recording of the two day event
- Transcription of the audio-visual recording of the workshop (over 50 000 words)

This methodology allowed the organisers of the first workshop and authors of the first position paper to have access to a very extensive reproduction of the workshop. However, this in itself meant that the preparation of the material was very labour intensive, and the production of a concise and reflective position paper from such a volume of documentation required significant time and resources. For this reason, the methodology was modified in this respect in order to be implemented in the Second Workshop. This is further indication of the iterative approach adopted by the project.

1.3 Structure

1.3.1 Analysis of the documentation showed clearly that the discussion papers presented and the ensuing debates consistently addressed more than one of the five sub-themes identified in the Preparatory Document. This interconnectedness is particularly characteristic of interdisciplinary work as it is of cross-cutting themes such as Linguistic Diversity. This interconnectedness is also representative of the interdisciplinarity of the research profiles and expertise of the workshop participants, as well as a reflection of the dynamic nature of research in this area as highlighted in the very theme of workshop, 'Revisiting, reanalysing and redefining...'. Finally, it is also an identifiable feature of the iterative practices associated with the workshop methodology.

1.3.2 The First Position Paper aims to map out and identify different interpretations of linguistic diversity, according to language context, historical approaches, political landscape, languages policies and language practices. The paper outlines some of the **theoretical concepts** presented during the course of the workshop across all papers and discussions. It approaches each of the **five pre-identified sub-themes** and presents the reflections and discussions most relevant to each (bearing in mind that there is significant overlap between them, as noted in 1.3.1 above). Finally, in its **concluding remarks** it signposts specific points for further exploration at other stages in the LearnMe project, and most specifically in connection with the Second Workshop.

2. Outlining the theoretical concepts presented at the First Workshop

2.1 List of theoretical concepts

2.1.1 In order to explore Linguistic Diversity as a dynamic and challenging concept, it is important to identify some of the key aspects of the theoretical bases that can inform our thinking. During the course of the Workshop, a wide range of theoretical concepts drawing on numerous disciplines were used in presentations and discussions. These have been collated here in this First Position Paper so that they can be revisited in the next stages of this project and re-evaluated in the process of producing the White Paper. The theoretical concepts listed here are further contextualised and explored in the individual presentations and discussions.

Assimilationism
Autochthonous
Bottom-up Approach
Code switching
Codification
Collective Rights
Commodification
Diglossia
Diversity within Diversity
Ethnography
Fragmentation
Geolinguistic regions
Global private spaces
Heteroglossia
Holistic Language Practice
Human Rights
Ideologies
Impermeable Linguistic Frameworks
Indigeneity
Language competence
Language equality
Language rights
Language use
Language vitality
Languaging
Lesser-used Languages
Linguistic representation
Macro-linguistics
Medium Languages
Methodological approaches.
Micro- and Macro Approaches
Minoritisation
Minoritised language
Minority language
Mono-centricity

Monolingualism
Multidimensional approach
Multilingualism
Multiplicity of interpretation of language equality
Nation/al
Non-Official
Non-Standard
Normalization
Normative Policy
Old Minority Languages
Official Languages
Parallel Monolingualism
Permeable linguistic frameworks
Pluricentric
Pluricentricity
Plurilingualism
Public sphericules
Regional or Minority Languages
Sociolinguistic practices
State languages
Superdiversity
Territoriality
Top-down approach
Transculturalism
Translanguaging
Translation
Transnational Communities
Transnationalism

2.1.2 Although this list does not represent the weighting given to each individual concept during the course of the Workshop, it does of course represent the range of concepts underpinning the discussions. It is an initial attempt at bringing together key concepts that can enable the process of further exploration of the viability of a revised working definition of Linguistic Diversity as a dynamic and challenging concept.

2.2 Taggedo Word Cloud

A Taggedo was produced using the whole text of this Position Paper, resulting in the following image. This technology application collates the words and terms in a specific document (omitting words such as 'and', 'the', 'or' etc) and produces a visual representation of the comparative frequency with which they are used.

Policy: A Legal Perspective’ and Dr Wini Davies ‘Pluricentricity of German: academic ideal or everyday reality.

- 3.1.2 Professor Vitek Dovalil discussed the implications of two attempts to resolve disagreements in the field of linguistic diversity at institutional level. The examples selected in his presentation concerned language disputes at European Union level. These disputes did not originate on the micro-level, but in fact were problems anticipated on the macro-level by the institutions themselves before the users of the languages in question or the individual applicants had had the opportunity to object to the practice of prioritising particular European Union languages. Professor Dovalil’s research suggested that such top-down solutions to linguistic diversity disputes have clear limitations. Therefore in the context of equality of languages at European Union level, the most usual practice is the interpretation of equality as (a) legal status (b) the quality and availability of services and (c) equal capacity to participate in public institutions in every official language. However, it is important to recognise the socio-cultural and socio-economic factors that are at play in these contexts. Language Management Theory has a role to play as a framework within which to better understand ‘who intervenes in whose language use, how, why, with which expectations and with which consequences’.
- 3.1.3 Dr Wini Davies presented her research on the concept of pluricentricity and the everyday practices in the context of education in German-speaking countries. Education systems play an important role in legitimising certain varieties over others, with policy makers, curriculum writers and teachers as norm transmitters. Dr Davies’s ongoing research project with Melanie Wagner (Luxemburg) and Eva Wyss (Koblenz), suggests that the pluricentric model, albeit extensively discussed in theory, has made little impact outside academia.
- 3.1.4 A number of participants suggested that in the specific cases of minority or minoritised languages, it was important to further contextualise ‘top-down’ approaches in relation to power structures. For example, Dr Eithne O’Connell remarked that this terminology does not always capture the sociolinguistic realities in these contexts, and thus a more complex and more cooperative hybrid form of top-down and bottom-up language planning should be considered. This can be seen for instance in crowdsourcing translations for digital and social media. In the same vein and drawing on the perceived dichotomy between micro- and macro- approaches to language planning, Professor Jeroen Darquennes pointed to the possible common ground between the ‘top-down’ and ‘bottom-up’ approaches.
- 3.1.5 Professor Dovalil contributed to this view with the emphasis on **the language management framework**. He argued that if language problems are expected to be solved in an effective way, the potential of socio-cultural or socio-economic level of language use and social networks should be brought to the fore. In order to construct a viable legal provision the micro and macro level have to be interconnected, binding together the individual and the general, as well as bringing the macro frameworks down to the level of individual speakers or the institutions acting on behalf of the speakers. The same framework applies to the specific case of minority languages: effective support for the minority languages requires analysis of the conditions in which these minority languages are used by certain actors on the level of socio-economic management or socio-cultural management. Acquisition of thorough knowledge of a language influences *ipso facto* the socio-cultural basis of the languages, followed by reproduction and contribution to reproduction by proficient speakers. Top-down and bottom-up approaches have to be simultaneous – otherwise language management is faced with a paradox where it is impossible to establish whether the change should originate in the socio-cultural context to stimulate extending the institutional provision or whether it should be provided or

imposed from the top-down to create conditions for language development on the grassroots level.

- 3.1.6 Papers presented by Dr Huw Lewis and Dr Noemi Nagy sparked discussion about the position of linguistic/minority rights in the wider framework of universal human rights. This issue was found to be strongly linked with the collective/individual nature of such rights. Dr Lewis noted that the normative assumption of the benefits of linguistic diversity presupposes a collective focus that does not give sufficient or due consideration to the individual members of particular linguistic communities. Due to its preoccupation with the general wellbeing of humanity, the normative line of reasoning could theoretically in his view lead to the imposition of language maintenance duties on the members of certain communities. That is problematic as it shifts the discourse from the moral *right* of a community to maintain a particular language to the concepts moral *obligations*.
- 3.1.7 While theoretical normative discourse may have validity in certain contexts, it also has serious limitations and may end only as an exercise in political philosophy. This argument was opposed by Dr Lewis, who emphasised that normative arguments can carry legitimating force but for that they have to be incorporated into the political discourse. It was pointed out that for this a shared all - encompassing system of values would have to be created. While it was acknowledged that a top-down approach is unlikely to generate strong justification or argument for linguistic diversity, a different line of reasoning was suggested, which, although it combines the bottom-up approach with emphasis on the individual, looks at linguistic diversity as a by-product of implementation and development of the concept of human rights rather than a goal in itself.
- 3.1.8 The **re-conceptualisation of linguistic rights with universal human rights** was also discussed by Dr Noemi Nagy. Given the overwhelming variation in interpretation of linguistic diversity in European law, Dr Nagy suggested two possible answers that could facilitate the development of a common legal solution. Firstly, the concept of linguistic diversity as a legal entity detached from sociolinguistics should be challenged, and replaced by a bottom-up approach, emphasising the actual needs of language communities and individual language users. Secondly, instead of a prevailing focus on the economic value of linguistic diversity, a more human rights-centred, conceptually universal approach should be considered as a guiding all-inclusive principle to be implemented in all linguistic legislation and policy, in line with the concept expressed by Professor György Andrassy: 'Everyone shall have the right to use his/her own language *somewhere in the world*.' At the same time Dr Nagy admitted that this principle would not solve the diversity stemming from different linguistic contexts and actors. She underlined, however, that it would serve as a firm legal base for coherent regulations.
- 3.1.9 Some comments followed regarding the incorporation of basic minority rights into the existing principles of Human Rights and Freedom of Expression. It was pointed out that these principles were established from an individualistic perspective; although some further documents designed with collective interests in mind were later developed (e.g. the Declaration of the Right of the Child of the UN). It is characteristic of a Western approach to rely on **individual rights** legislation and leave the **collective or community based perspective** to the domain of so-called 'soft law'. Dr Nagy and Dr Lewis pointed out that collective rights are actually intrinsically tied to the concept of human rights in general e.g., "everyone has the right to use his/her own language in his/her community with their group'. Political theory explains furthermore that in a community understood as the culmination of various interests which individuals hold, the collective interest and rights do not necessarily clash with individualism.
- 3.1.10 The question of conceptually connecting minority or linguistic rights with human rights

was developed in further discussion. Professor Moring voiced his doubts whether further incorporation of minority rights into the framework of basic human rights, beyond the existing documents and agreements such as the UN Declaration of Human Rights, or the Council of Europe's Convention for Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms would bring about significant change, given that these already existing provisions do not result in any proactive obligations for the state. An attempt to tie minority rights further with such a model could be in fact restrictive for the development of linguistic diversity. In response Dr Nagy underlined that her argument focused specifically on the inclusion of linguistic rights into universal human rights and although there are some commonalities between language rights and minority rights, they are not identical. She also noted that the provisions for linguistic rights as universal human rights constitute a minimum standard further supported by specific measures carried out by state parties.

3.2 Sub-theme 2: Terminological diversity and its consequences

- 3.2.1 Terminological diversity is recognised to be highly prevalent in the field of linguistic diversity and the consequences featured in all discussions. Many participants reflected upon the changes in terminology during their own careers.
- 3.2.2 Professor Jeroen Darquennes drew attention to the implications of **micro and macro perspectives** on language related terminology; while micro linguistics promotes individual and specific context, macro linguistics relies on generalisation, 'predefined categories' and 'standard' forms of language. Both approaches fall short of providing a solution to terminological confusion. Despite intended homogeneity, macro linguistics is not itself free of heterogeneous and contextually defined notions such as 'ancestry', 'language', 'self-categorisation' or 'social organisation'. The macro-linguistic terminology appears to be questionable with regard to the micro context, but it is not clear what kind of notions should be developed to replace it. On the other hand, the challenges of the micro-linguistic approach are illustrated by the most extreme form of micro-sociolinguistics which denies the very existence of languages, or promotes the notion of **translanguaging**, a term which indicates that the speaker does not use a single variety of language, but mixes varieties that are encompassed within their linguistic repertoire. This approach emphasises language as a dynamic ever-changing phenomenon. However, it can be argued that translanguaging falls prey to the same relativity that brought it into being. While translanguaging, or dynamic multilingualism, has been suggested on the level of the Council of Europe as a future model for multilingual education in Europe, the practicalities of the idea are restrained by its dynamic and undefined status. If it is forced into the framework of a competence than can be taught and passed on, it acquires the uncomfortable 'standardised' status of a mother tongue.
- 3.2.3 In defence of the macro-linguistic tendency towards generalisation it was noted by Professor Jarmo Lainio that although attempts to generalise may give rise to controversy, the importance of some prefabricated concepts should not be underestimated, as it is necessary to operate within some established concepts that generalise some kind of human behaviour. Thus it is virtually impossible to manage without, for example, using reference to language. It was also underlined by Professor Jeroen Darquennes that the criticism of the validity of existing notions pertaining to linguistic diversity has to account for the **importance of established labels in real socio-political context**. Language remains the notion used in political discourse and it is only possible to hold the debate on linguistic policy and planning if the participants operate within the same conceptual framework. Dr Csilla Bartha argued on the other hand that the established models and frameworks may rely to a large extent on out-dated or no longer relevant conceptual basis.

She expressed her view that a new approach is needed to adopt a holistic view on a specific multilingual situation, beyond the terminological boundaries such as ‘micro’ ‘macro’, or ‘language’. The importance of common reference base on the EU institutional level cannot be underestimated; however it also has to be realised that superdiversity in regions (for example in Eastern Europe) is increasingly neglected as a result of competition for the EU funding and convergence of policy. It is an issue that requires attention and action.

- 3.2.4 The presentation of Professor Tom Moring on indigeneity in Sami journalism highlighted that the **concepts of language and minority depend heavily on context and perspective**. Professor Moring explained that within indigeneity language is a contested matter: although there are approximately 80,000-100,000 people who define themselves as Sámi in the world today only some 35,000 speak one of the nine Sámi languages. Indigenous communities like Sami may identify themselves primarily on the basis of economic considerations and the scope of their interests may be more affected by geographic rather than linguistic barriers. As a result of the conceptual discrepancy between ‘indigeneity’ and ‘minority’, indigenous communities may be less likely to refer to European institutions and legislation on minority rights (eg European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages or the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities)- as their main points of reference. Instead they may tend to rely more on institutions and legislation that will protect their land rights, their resources and ensure the stability of their livelihood against strong economic interests of powerful actors (the UN, the Arctic Council and ILO). It is on the basis of these shared interests that the networks of indigenous communities are built.
- 3.2.5 Professors Josu Amezaga and Edorta Arana commented on the effect of the **nation-state paradigm** on defining and redefining minority. The dominant narrative sees the nation state as a major agent of what can be perceived as the **minoritisation of languages**: minority languages are by definition not state languages. However, although state territory has traditionally been crucial in the state’s assertion of control of the language and homogenisation, the emergence of trans-territorial, trans-national, inclusive spaces of communication forces a reconceptualization of the position of minority. Josu and Edorta urged to consider further to what degree the exclusive national paradigm has been instrumental in shaping the definition of linguistic normalisation in the context of Regional or Minority Languages. In the Basque Country, for example, the ambition to achieve the status of majority (state) language is quite noticeable, and it is invariably accompanied by territorial claims. It would also require further consideration whether communication spaces can be actually successfully realised apart from the state. The project of constructing a Catalan communication space as a means to build the Catalan nation was not successful, and the Spanish media remain overwhelmingly dominant. It is a phenomenon that will have to be acknowledged in the future discourse on the communication spaces. A good example of the strength of the nation-state paradigm was suggested by Dr Vanessa Bretxa, who drew attention to the fact that some languages e.g. Catalan have more speakers than official state languages, they are still labelled as ‘minority languages’. A new term ‘medium languages’ is being promoted in Catalonia to address this conceptual paradox.
- 3.2.6 The contextual meaning of the concept of ‘minority’ can be further seen as defined in relation to other dominant languages, primarily English as the new lingua franca. While the domination of English may be perceived as a potential threat to the minority languages, it can also be understood as an opportunity. A number of speakers emphasised that the minoritisation does not affect exclusively those languages traditionally recognised as less-spoken or stateless - as a result of the supremacy of English, most languages, including German and French etc. are minoritised. The experience of the European Bureau of Lesser Used Languages showed that according to the general sentiment it is more beneficial for

minority languages to accept the three working languages of the EU rather than 24 equal languages regime. While 24 languages could be potentially seen as a threat for minority languages in the national context, the three working languages regime would by definition minoritise all other languages in the EU. Professor Elin Haf Gruffydd Jones reflected upon the presence and absence of the notions of dynamism and agency in the respective terms 'minoritised' and 'minority', with the former indicative of social/political action and the latter viewed as natural condition. Yet again, Professor Jarmo Lainio urged to bear in mind the diverse dynamics of minoritisation in specific national contexts.

- 3.2.7 It was further underlined that the existing terminology **lacks cohesion** across different administrative contexts, domains and methodological approaches. Professor Tom Moring noted that within the context of the EU there are about five or six different abbreviations or conceptual terms, not least the misleading and remarkably unclear 'lesser used languages'. Varied national contexts stimulated development of further terminology, such as the notion of 'regional languages' in France, designed to direct the debate away from the issue of minority. Csilla Bartha complimented this argument with an example of the paradoxical implications of the terminology adopted in the new Hungarian Constitution and the 2011 Law on the Rights of Nationalities. The Constitution identifies the Hungarian language as the official language, while in the latter document, thirteen further languages are labelled as 'nationalities' languages'. Hungarian Sign Language is also protected as part of the Hungarian culture. However, although the Roma community is included in this group, 85% of the Roma population is Hungarian speaking, giving rise to a paradoxical situation where Hungarian is at the same time the official state language and a protected minority (or 'nationality') language. Professor Moring acknowledged that there is no simple solution to resolving this 'terminological chaos' although he suggested that clearer labelling at least within specific contexts if not across a number of domains would be a valid starting point.

3.3 Sub-theme 3: Socio-political approaches and ideological objectives

- 3.3.1 In his presentation Dr Huw Lewis tackled the question of the value of **linguistic diversity in the context of normative political theory**. Over the last twenty to thirty years political theory has repeatedly attempted to explain what the implications of cultural diversity are for the understanding of how a fair and just society should be organised. Recent years have seen a clear move towards expanding the considerations of cultural diversity in general terms towards specific linguistic communities. One key question arising from this approach is on what grounds measures to support these communities should be viewed as normatively required aspects of cultural diversity management beyond purely political considerations. The so-called green or ecological linguistics, advocated among others by David Crystal in his book 'Language Death' (CUP, 2000) and Daniel Nettle and Suzanne Romaine 'Vanishing Voices' (OUP, 2000) focuses on the linguistic diversity as collective benefit to humanity; other benefits suggested are of aesthetic or scientific nature. This line of argument is however too diffuse to justify potential imposition of obligations and costs not only on the speakers of a particular language but on the general public as well.
- 3.3.2 Dr Noemi Nagy drew attention to the economic focus of the EU policies implemented within the framework of the broad complimentary power for promoting linguistic diversity. In the EU context, linguistic diversity appears to be strongly linked with such notions as mobility, employability and profitability, which all **reflect the perceived role of language as a marketable resource**. This emphasis on the economic value of language can be evidenced in the considerable investment in language learning, compared to other aspects of enhancing linguistic diversity. While resolutions and programmes aimed at supporting regional or minority languages or lesser spoken languages often lack legally binding obligations, the support for language learning is far more formalised through

strategies, action programmes, working groups and council decisions and communications of the European Community.

- 3.3.3 Dr Eithne O'Connell spoke of the role of **translation as a key enabling mechanism of linguistic diversity**. She noted that despite its importance translation is often taken as a given even by linguists and the challenges of translation are not always appreciated. Dr O'Connell underlined that linguistic diversity is an inevitable outcome of the translation process. It is a common misunderstanding that the knowledge of two or more languages automatically results in the ability to translate between them. Normatively, there are almost endless possibilities of translation that would be in some sense correct. Translation of the same piece by different translators will deviate enormously. There are limits to what translation can achieve. It is not commonly realised that a translation is always an interpretation and that the meaning plays a profound part in the creation of the finished product. In addition, translation supports linguistic diversity by increasing the visibility of different languages, their speakers and/or their cultures, creating openness and interest. Translation is the first way of engaging with other languages in the case of monolingualism. It provides a tool for linguists from various backgrounds to exchange expertise and improves accessibility of content from other languages, e.g. subtitles and dubbing. Finally, translation and audiovisual translation plays a role in formal and casual language learning and can have a profound effect on literacy levels. At the same time it can be a double-edged sword; a translation that reinvents and adapts the original to the translator's own context can obscure differences between languages and cultures and thus can work as colonisation effect. It can negate the need to learn other languages. This tendency is especially evident for English speakers. To counteract this Lawrence Venuti, for example, argues for 'abusive translation': a translation that calls to your attention the fact that you cannot in your language access fully the language and culture of the other.
- 3.3.4 The importance of translation has to be understood and applied in the context of minority languages. The primary audience – in the original language – could be overlooked as a part of the unintended consequences of translation. For example, with creative works, translation can open possibilities of wider publicity and more financial resources through the creation of translated versions of original works. Another danger is censorship, not only by states and corporations but also conscious or unconscious individual censorship by translators. In recent years corpus linguistics has been able to process huge amounts of electronic material, parallel concordances etc. and it was found that the translated texts differ even from original texts from the same author. The process of translation causes some systematic changes to occur. Translators tend to explain more, i.e. dumb down; they normalise what seems to be unusual and simplify what can be considered too difficult, for example cultural references or difficult vocabulary for children. This is extremely relevant for minority languages since they usually rely on the translations of import texts for certain domains from other cultures. While the phenomenon is not affecting minority languages exclusively, one can talk of the **disproportionate influence that translation has on minority languages**.
- 3.3.5 Approaches to assimilationism were also discussed, as were the complex challenges faced by minority/indigenous communities in the process of identity building in the multilingual context. The presentation of Professor Tom Moring illustrated the intricacies of such challenges. He explained that the structure of the new MA degree in Sami Journalism recognised the need to strike a balance between an inward focus of indigenous communities and an openness to the membership of a global scientific community. Developing indigenous journalism and **assimilating** the concept of indigeneity into a scientific community requires a new complex narrative. On the one hand indigeneity has a clear local dimension and will understandably express its specific interests and concerns. The MA in Sami Journalism is firmly planted in the notion of local network and service to

local community. On the other hand, indigeneity cannot isolate itself within its own definition - to build a genuine dialogue both inside and outside perspectives are needed. In order for such a degree to be successful it has to consciously open up to the influences of internationalisation and globalisation and to become part of the global network without losing its local relevance. The creation of a MA Sami Journalism can be thus seen as an empowering tool for the Sami community, giving it the tools to develop the indigenous narrative in its own voice, style and with community concerns in mind. It is also vital in reclaiming rights of self-determination, by making a marker on the field traditionally dominated by majority media with little understanding of the indigenous context. The **scientification of indigeneity**, together with the resources to put the ideas into action, allows the indigenous community to transform the media narrative and express its own unique perspective. This scientific approach manifests itself through the development of Sámi and Sámi language social sciences. Sámi philosophical traditions and religious perspective are also explored. However, in terms of media studies the degree is at a very early stage; a fast, often tokenistic news narrative borrowed from Western media will not reflect the intricacies of indigeneity and a broader narrative form with stronger element of documentary is needed.

- 3.3.6 Professor Tom Moring noted however, that such openness has its limits. It is also counterbalanced by a strong desire to strengthen the community from within and to preserve its collective identity. Although in the Sami context the debate is phrased in terms of indigeneity rather than minority, language still remains a strong and important element of Saminess, and the ultra-liberalistic stance on language and **superdiversity is strongly opposed**; continuous community building through languages is seen as a condition *sine qua non* of the preservation and development of Saminess. Professor Moring concluded that while an easy acceptance of vibrant and constantly changing language patterns could be found among the cohorts of cosmopolitan academic linguists, however this approach might not be so readily shared by the Sami media professionals'.

3.4 Sub-theme 4: Methodological issues

- 3.4.1 The issue of methodological approaches was a recurring theme throughout the workshop. In each presentation, the leading expert reflected upon the methodologies used and this was further explored in the ensuing discussions with the participants. The efficiency and appropriateness of methodological tools and approaches were shared concerns among the participants.
- 3.4.2 In his discussion on some profound differences between macro and micro – linguistics approaches to the questions of society, language, language use, and language and power, Professor Jeroen Darquennes **referred to the challenge of choosing and adapting appropriate methodological frameworks**. From a sociological point of view, micro-linguistics stresses the level of the individual; it looks at community networks and institutions in practice. Micro studies emphasise the heterogeneity and complexity of society, making the case that society is far more complex than any category that sociolinguistics could suggest, and pointing to hyper or super diversity and notions such as transnationalism, and the permeability of linguistic borders. In discussing language, the micro perspective takes variation as its starting point. Macro sociolinguistics in turn is interested in the bigger picture; it tends to work with 'predefined categories', such as groups, minorities, old minorities, historical minorities, immigrants, and tends to concentrate on 'standard' forms of language. Both approaches therefore have their strengths and limitations, as well as further implications for perspectives on the validity of established terminology and implementation of language policy (generalising top-down approach with the specific bottom-up take on multilingualism).

- 3.4.3 Professor Darquennes suggested however, that these two frameworks may not be as irreconcilable as it would at first appear. The way forward could be an attempt at a compromise position between the two frameworks which would stimulate the debate and challenge fixed opinions on the autonomy and heteronomy of languages.
- 3.4.4 The application of micro level analysis was further discussed. It was acknowledged that one of the challenges of research in the field is the **specificity of the minority context** which often requires a particularly focused approach to data collection. This however can be precluded by the scarcity of micro data available in the field. During the discussion on readership figures in the Basque Country it was noted that it would be useful to examine, for example, the age profile of the readers. However, only the number of copies sold can be obtained. While typically a single copy could be expected to reach 4-5 readers in some countries, this ratio in the Basque country could be much closer to 1-3 readers, due to a high degree of mixed linguistic abilities in Basque households.
- 3.4.5 The issue of sample groups were also raised in the context of Lysbeth Jongbloed's presentation on the use of social media by Frisian teenagers. The aim of her research into social media in bilingual contexts as used by Frisian teenagers was to verify the widely accepted idea that the growth of the social media has resulted in more frequent use of Frisian among the teenagers, and that it stimulated the shift to phonetic spelling of Frisian. The methodologies used to answer these questions were analysis of Twitter feeds and an online questionnaire through schools and social media. The analysis of over 6000 tweets produced before, during and after the Twitterday by a sample of 50 teenagers, allowed Lysbeth to assess the language use in tweets of adolescents aged 14-18 years who used the #Frysk during the Frisian Twitterday, identifying the ratio Frisian:Dutch, the variables of influence on language choice and particular linguistic features of the Frisian tweets.
- 3.4.6 The effect of the Twitterday was significant, although afterwards a drop in participation features was almost immediate. By analysing the level of participation by gender, Lysbeth was also able to establish that males responded almost twice as actively to the initiative as females. The research also found evidence to support the claims that language is simplified when used in the online context. Despite the simplification, local dialects of Frisian are still detectable in the written language. Large numbers of Dutchisms were observed in the Frisian tweets. Furthermore, specifically Twitter-related language is commonly used (btw, gm etc.) adding an element of code-switching. These phenomena call for further and more detailed research.
- 3.4.7 The comments in response to the research case studies presented by Vanessa Bretxa and Dr Wini Davies highlighted some practical **limitations** and challenges of **multidimensional approach to research into minority languages field**. For the purpose of the RESOL project in Catalonia data was collected on two levels: data describing language competence, language use, linguistic representation, and linguistic system was further analysed in the context of specific domains, such as language use at home, in school, in cultural consumption and in the context of social network language. This multidimensional approach required the use of a variety of tools such as focus-groups, sociolinguistic questionnaires and video-recorded linguistic competence assessments. However, even this comprehensive methodological framework was found to have some limitations, for example the challenge of identifying the degree of discrepancy between the declared and observed language competence. It was noted that the main difficulty in the RESOL project was associated with the collection of longitudinal data and significant attrition rate: the same sample of students (1194) was followed from the age of 12 through to their last year of secondary education.

- 3.4.8 In the case of Dr Davies' research project, it was suggested that expanding the scope of questions (from set lexical items to more open questions) would recognise different degrees of codification of written and spoken language, since it would allow the teachers to express their views on linguistic matters that may differ between the standard varieties. An added benefit of this approach could be that it would allow an insight into the expertise of language practitioners in different areas or different nation states, and identify linguistic trends from bottom-up, as it may be often the case that teachers become aware of new forms of language use before the researchers. It was further suggested that this research could consider schooling at earlier ages, and also that multi-methodological approaches (such as combining the questionnaires with participant observation) could further verify what practices take place.
- 3.4.9 The **diversity of the minority context** was raised by a number of contributors as an important factor in research design. Dr Eithne O'Connell emphasised the diversity within the group of minority languages in terms of number of speakers, status, domains of strength or weakness, oral or literary basis. Some are linked to a particular territory, others are transnational. Some languages can be seen to have problems with intergeneration transmission; some have codified standards, whereas others are based on competing varieties, some have deliberate language policies and others are strong or large enough to operate in a more or less laissez faire approach. Given this high level of variation it is a challenge to develop common language policies and strategies that can work in all contexts. In terms of research, Vanessa Bretxa illustrated this problem with an example from the Catalan context, where demographic factors, such as waves of immigration during the 20th century stimulated dynamic shift from typically homogenous to highly heterogeneous minority language communities. Professor Tom Moring expressed his view that the solution to the problem lies not in formalisation of comparative research, but in emphasis on benchmarking; thus the comparative models characteristic of natural sciences should be rejected in favour of study of examples and best practices. Csilla Bartha emphasised that it is precisely the mission of the Mercator Network Project to draw attention to best practices in their local contexts.
- 3.4.10 Finally, the experience of RESOL supported by examples of similar research in the Basque Country has highlighted that it is crucial that research methodology **develops effective tools to investigate the use of languages in the domain of social networks**. The family domain in the context of minority languages is traditionally quite strong and often supported by good educational provision in schools. For example, in the Basque Country, since the Basque language is compulsory in schools, there exists a controlled space where language policy can be implemented. The social networks domain is beyond such control and it is crucial to recognise and use the potential of media in influencing private interpersonal relations. The challenge of such attempts lies not only in the difficulty associated with entering the private sphere of language users but also in constructing research that will allow to develop informed strategy. The case of RESOL research highlighted the challenge of distinguishing private use and engagement in social networks from consumption of linguistic offer, participatory nature of online communication and the structured nature of that production.

3.5 Sub-theme 5: Sociolinguistic practices in media, education and policy

- 3.5.1 Sociolinguistic practices were explored across a number of case studies presented at the First Workshop. Several of these focussed specifically on aspects of media – including social media – as well as the other fields of education and policy. It was also evident that there is increased convergence between these fields, with media policy and practices interrelating with policies and practices in education and other field.

- 3.5.2 Professor Tom Moring noted that although there is a widely accepted belief that the relationship between media and language is beneficial to the language, more **evidence is needed in order to identify how exactly this inter-relationship works**. We can identify several fields where it is most likely that media in a language can affect the language: symbolic, economic, agenda setting and framing, representation, culture formation, routine and daily language use, construction and reconstruction of the language/culture (cf. Cormack 1998, 2004, 2007; Moring and Husband 2007; Jones 2007;). Professor Elin Haf Gruffydd Jones also remarked that many of these widely accepted beliefs are in fact based on the discourses of nation building and media in the context of state nationalism (e.g. Benedict Anderson, Michael Billig, John Tomlinson etc.). Despite the assertions of activists, researchers and policy makers in relation to the positive impact of the media on language vitality there is little discussion on the exact linguistic arrangements and the specific policies and practices in the minority context. For instance, should the media in minoritised languages aim to reproduce the same linguistic policies and practices as those of their counterparts operating in state languages? If so, how can this be possible, given the fundamental socio-linguistic difference between dominant state languages and minoritised non-state languages? If not, what kind of bespoke language policies and practices should the media adopt in order to acknowledge and accommodate the specificity of the community's linguistic profile? What inter-language and intra-language arrangements should minoritised language media take into account when they are communicating with their bilingual and multilingual audiences?
- 3.5.3 The perceived causal relationship between language and media can also be examined using the framework of 'moral panic' (Cohen, 1972). Media – for example television, social media etc – can be perceived as 'threats' or as 'saviours' alike. The use of minority language in the media is considered in terms of macro language planning as well as micro-level planning, for example clear-cut issues of terminology or register.
- 3.5.4 Professor Jones also drew attention to a possible dichotomy in that academic debates about minoritised language media are typified by positive attitudes towards the language, while public debate on the ground can often take a more negative tone. The range of critiques of the policies of the practices of the minority language media can stem from across the socio-political spectrum: minority language media organisations can be criticised simultaneously for being too monolingual and too bilingual, too exclusive and too inclusive, too formal and too informal, too correct and too incorrect, too complex and too impoverished, with too much or too little emphasis on dialectal forms or translation. There is a potential risk that due to the fact that media in minority languages are scarce, there is a necessity to appeal to the entire audience based on linguistic identity alone. Therefore the media cannot always serve all parts of the heterogeneous and diverse communities within that language community.
- 3.5.5 Lysbeth Jongbloed highlighted the **importance of young audiences** in minority languages, both in terms of policy/practice and in terms of undertaking research. Ó Riagáin et al (2008) & Cunliffe et al. (2013) argue that teenage years are a key period for the development of attitudes towards a minority language. Language competence and patterns of use developed in adolescence are influential in later life, for example in parenthood, work etc.
- 3.5.6 Social networks (both online and offline) as well as notion of perceived and intended audiences can have significant effects on language use (see Jones and Uribe-Jongbloed 2013 for specific examples). Lysbeth Jongbloed observed the role of 'one-day language initiatives' such as the Frisian Twitterday or the 'Shwmae Sut mai' day in Wales. Her initial findings pointed to an immediate positive effect – more people tweeting more tweets in Frisian on the day. However, it appeared that there was little or no sustained effect on

language use on subsequent days.

- 3.5.7 Such initiatives provide a timeframe and platform within which a minority language becomes temporarily 'normalised' for the duration of the event, and can be used without apprehension of being misunderstood or breaking certain expected sociolinguistic norms. For example, the Welsh language Twitter community has developed hashtags in Welsh for discussing different topics, and has designated a specific time – one hour per week – where the hashtag #yrawrgymraeg or #yagym is used for businesses, organizations and individuals to specifically use the Welsh language. This phenomenon indicates that once a consolidated online platform can be disaggregated into smaller spheres these in turn can offer safe spaces for people to communicate in their own language in a relaxed and friendly environment. Additional benefit of these specialised spaces could be introducing minority languages into uncharted domains traditionally closed due to lack of relevant vocabulary or means of translation. Further research is necessary in order to understand how to successfully make the transition from one day campaigns to sustained changes in behaviour, in the context of language.
- 3.5.8 Professor Josu Amezaga and Edorta Arana commented on the rise of new media-centred spaces of communication and associated concepts such as **geolinguistic regions**, **transnational communities**, **public sphericules** and **global private spaces**. Spaces of communication can be seen as complimentary to the traditional national spaces but at the same time they add elements of inclusivity absent from the rigid territorial divides. Their dynamic and fluid character is consistent with the principle of **transculturalism**, which refers to the growing recognition that many people move at the same time within and between different cultural spaces.
- 3.5.9 These concepts were illustrated in the context of current research into the distribution and circulation patterns of the Basque language newspaper *Berrria*, as an example of media stimulating the creation of a non-territorial communication space in a minority or minoritised language. The increased fragmentation of the traditional geographical communities of minoritised languages presents additional challenges to the production and reproduction of the language community. In the case of the Basque Country, some 60% of Basque speakers nowadays live in a home with no other Basque speaker; and most of them live in villages, towns and cities where Basque is a minority language.
- 3.5.10 Professor Elin Haf Gruffydd Jones considered the notion of permeable and impermeable linguistic boundaries as a framework to understand the relationship between two languages in the media of bilingual communities. In the context of the inter-relationship between Welsh and English, Elin explored the ways in which the English-language media content is produced in Wales by public service broadcasters within this framework. She presented the case that English language content is retaining its impermeability (as a monolingual space) as traditional broadcasters become online content producers. Conversely the linguistic permeability of Welsh-language media content produced by traditional broadcasters is increasingly permeable as traditional broadcasters become online content producers.
- 3.5.11 The study was based on three methodological approaches: (a) analysis of the policy documents pertaining to linguistic guidelines of public service broadcasters in Wales; (b) content analysis of television and radio broadcasts and web and social media output produced by broadcasters; (c) a series of semi-structured interviews with mid-career media producers, who have the experience of media production before the advent of social media.
- 3.5.12 The analysis concluded that media convergence has resulted in increased levels of literacy-

based communication practices on the part of broadcasters. This has been accompanied by decisions in terms of policy and practice. In the case of Welsh language media production there was a marked difference in the approaches used for television production and for online content production. The television language guidelines demonstrated an understanding of the complexities of producing media content in a minoritised language on a single channel to a linguistically diverse audience. Although the policy and practice in this context show relatively high levels of linguistic permeability (due to the fact that the Welsh language programme can also contain contributions in English), there is a clear objective that that this permeability should not undermine the linguistic integrity of the content. In contrast, the policies adopted for online production are significantly less elaborate and more prescriptive, with a strong focus on producing Welsh-English bilingual content. This results in parallel monolingualism online, despite the shared audio-visual content.

- 3.5.13 On the other hand, the analysis showed that English language media productions continued to operate with very little linguistic permeability of Welsh language material into English language media content. Linguistic permeability within Welsh public service output continues to be largely one way: permeability of Welsh-language content and the impermeability of English-language content. The linguistic boundaries of English language output are quite impermeable and rarely permit any kind of material in Welsh. Contrary to popular view perhaps, it can be argued that linguistic gatekeeping in English language material is by far more robust than that of Welsh.

4. Concluding Remarks: Towards a Revised Working Definition of Linguistic Diversity

- 4.1 The initial stages of drafting and developing a **revised working definition** of Linguistic Diversity, that would give due recognition to the dynamic and challenging dimensions of this concept, was considered to be an important objective in the overall LearnMe project.
- 4.2 Many participants remarked that this would be a lengthy and complex process, and that devising an initial working draft of a definition would not be possible without first exploring some of the **key concepts** that are fundamental to our collective understanding of Linguistic Diversity.
- 4.3 In addition, it was recognised that there would be **multiple interpretations** of these key concepts, and therefore it would be important to discuss and analyse not only the differences in interpretations but also the difference in emphases placed on various aspects or dimensions of the key concepts.
- 4.4 Furthermore, it was noted that our various interpretations would **coincide** to a certain degree, in light of the content of the papers and the discussions during the first workshop itself. Nonetheless it was also acknowledged that there would be different stances and also that further exploration was required in the subsequent workshops.
- 4.5 The ways in which this discussion could be developed were also debated. Several participants suggested different ways in which LearnMe could proceed: (a) literature review of existing definitions (b) individual experts forming and exchanging statements (c) reflective analysis of all the material collected during the three workshops (d) reflective analysis as researcher-subjects of our own research.

- 4.6 The following proposals were put forward for discussion as a result of the first workshop.
- 4.6.1 Linguistic Diversity should include and give due recognition to the following three broad groupings: 'regional minority languages (recognising that not all are tied exclusively to a particular region e.g. Hungarian case)', 'immigrant minority languages' and 'newly minoritised languages'.
 - 4.6.2 Linguistic Diversity should recognise the importance of social, economic, cultural, demographic, geographic and political contexts in the present-day formulation of dynamic language relations between people, communities and agencies of governance.
 - 4.6.3 Linguistic Diversity should include all aspects of language, and not merely languages defined in the sense of nomenclature (e.g. French, Sami, Urdu), and recognise variety within one (or more) language(s).
 - 4.6.4 Linguistic Diversity should make reference to linguistic rights of people.
 - 4.6.5 Linguistic Diversity should include the need for individual plurilingualism and/or societal multilingualism for the well-being of people living in any named area.
 - 4.6.6 Linguistic Diversity should include the diversity of and between the non-standardised vernacular languages.
 - 4.6.7 Linguistic Diversity should reflect upon the relationship between territorial considerations and linguistic continuity across language communities, and not confine this relationship to the level of states and recognised sub-state governance.
 - 4.6.8 Linguistic Diversity should be connected to language vitality, in breadth and in depth.
 - 4.6.9 Linguistic Diversity needs to challenge prevailing definitions that are based on restrictive and exclusive groupings of standardized state-languages.
 - 4.6.10 Linguistic Diversity needs to be considered as a dynamic, non-definitive, non-finalised, working definition.
- 4.7 These reflections represent the initial suggestions made during the Final Session of the First Workshop. They should not be interpreted to represent the conclusive, agreed views of all the participants or of any specific group of participants. These reflections will be further explored in later stages of the project.
- 4.8 This Position Paper was written and developed by Professor Elin Haf Gruffydd Jones and Ania Rolewska, with the assistance of Anna Lou Dijkstra.